

# **Acquisition of English Vocabulary among Kenyan Learners: Challenges and Implications for Classroom Teaching Practice**

Martin C. Njoroge & Ruth W. Ndung'u

Department of English & Linguistics

Kenyatta University

P.O. Box 43844-00100

NAIROBI

**Martin C. Njoroge** is the Director, Confucius Institute and a senior lecturer of linguistics at Kenyatta University, Kenya. He is a former SRF postdoctoral fellow and a visiting professor at the University of Pennsylvania, USA. He has published widely in language variation, English language teaching and multilingual education.

**Ruth W. Ndung'u** is a Senior lecturer in phonology and applied linguistics, Department of English and Linguistics, Kenyatta University, Kenya. She is a researcher on second language use and education and a member of the Multilingual Education Network, Kenya. Ruth has published journal articles and textbooks.

### **Statement of the issue**

While teaching and examining English language in Kenyan high schools, we observed that learners displayed difficulties in acquisition and use of vocabulary. In this connection, we got interested in discovering the factors that come into play during the learners' acquisition of English vocabulary. Thus, we sought to investigate our own classrooms so that we could develop strategies to alleviate the difficulties our learners experienced in vocabulary acquisition and use.

The teaching and learning of English lexical items in the Kenyan context is through formal instruction and learner motivated processes (Kenya Institute of Education, 1995). One of the suggested instructional methods is the use of synonyms. In our study, we thus chose to focus on the use of synonyms because, apart from being evident in grammar patterns (Snow & Kim, 2007), synonymy also reveals the way the learners have been instructed.

The use of synonyms is based on interchangeability or substitution. For instance, a learner who asks for the meaning of the word *skinny* could be told that it is *slender*. Interchangeability of synonymous words is, according to Cruse (1986) and Diana & Graene (2006), the best method of delimiting synonyms. However, Aitchison (1994) and Carter (1994) argue that the interchangeability should be determined by the propositional meaning of the sentence as a whole for the interchangeability to be appropriate.

The Kenyan learner of English acquires his/her vocabulary without overt structured instruction. As the Kenyan syllabus for secondary school English states, the learning of vocabulary is a continuous process. It is important to note that there is no such a thing as a formal vocabulary lesson. Vocabulary is best acquired in context through listening, speaking, reading and writing

activities (KIE 1995, pp. 45-60). What lexicon is to be learned, therefore, depends on the learner and it is not stated beforehand. What the syllabus implies is that the Kenyan learner of English is capable of acquiring on his/her own an English vocabulary of the ideal depth and breadth. The argument in our research is that this may not be the case. Therefore, in our classroom research, we investigated what English lexical items the Kenyan learner acquired against such a pedagogic background with the aim of arguing for different lexical pedagogy. Our classroom research thus sought to answer the following questions: What are the lexical / synonymy challenges of the learners in our classroom experience? How do we explain the prevalence of these challenges in our classrooms?

### **Literature review**

Literature on second language lexis, such as Jullian (2000) and Jiang (2000) shows that the English of second language learners has non-native features. These non-native features, some of which are lexical in nature, are accounted for variously. For instance, Jullian (2000) states that the learner's vocabulary could have semantic features, which indicate transferring meaning from one language to the other. However, as Martin (1984) notes, the non-native features could also emanate from confusion of lexical items in the second language itself. The second language learner could, for instance, confuse English lexical items that are semantically similar or have slightly different shades of related meaning.

In addition, literature on second language lexis (for example, Schmitt and McCarthy, 1997; Martin, 1984) indicates that some aspects of a word are complex. Diana & Graene (2006), for instance, say that the use of words with related meanings presents learners with perception and

production problems. The presence of non-native lexical features could thus emanate from the learner's first language, lexical shortage and lexical confusion or from the second language itself. What is of interest in the current research is how the lexical features of words with related meaning of the second language manifest themselves in the learner's use of the language.

Jullian (2000) observes that a second language lexicon could manifest varied features related to reception and production. On the reception side, learners fail to understand any word which falls even slightly outside ordinary language, and on the production side, they produce very plain utterances which are unable to convey different emotional loads, or to express shades of intensity or connotation.

Snow and Kim (2007) further note that even the lexicon of advanced second language learners displays problems of lexical shortage and confusion. Learners of a second language are first presented with core words that are the "simplest and most frequent words in any language" (Jullian, 2000: 38). Core words are universal in meaning and do not carry connotative or associative loads. The active vocabulary of most learners of English as a Second Language is thus made up of such words. Of interest because of the underlying implication is the observation that the core words become "deeply rooted in the learner's lexicon and become very difficult to replace with others which have a more specific meaning, or a different semantic load" (Jullian, 2000, p.38).

Martin (1984) expresses similar views on the lexicon of advanced learners of English as a second language for she reports: As the fluency of advanced language learners increases, so too does the number of vocabulary errors they generate, both in speaking and in writing. Some of the errors

are a result of first language transfer, but the majority are interlingual; that is, they reflect confusion between and among lexical items in the second language itself.

These observations by Snow & Kim (2007), Jullian (2000) and Martin (1984) call for attention to lexical reception and production problems in the second language learner's lexicon such as the failure to convey different emotional loads, or confusion of lexical items. However, unless the grammar patterns and lexical strategies in the learner's lexicon are identified and analyzed, it would not be possible to make informed conclusions about the features of their lexicon, hence a rationale of this study. These features of lexical meaning can be revealed by the grammar patterns in the learner's lexicon. We note that the literature available on second language lexis is not sufficient to account for the phenomena we are investigated in our classroom. This, therefore, provides a rationale for our research.

## **Procedures**

The mode of research used in this study is what Nunan (1990) calls applied rather than experimental. We based the research on our students during the actual class time. We taught these students English for six months in 2006.

The respondents were Kenya secondary school students in form three. The rationale for using these students is that secondary school level is a critical stage in the acquisition and use of English (Snow and Kim, 2007; Francis, 1996). It is the final stage of formal English learning for most of the learners. Some of the secondary school learners graduate into the tertiary level of the education system. The research sample was made up of one hundred and sixty secondary school students of English in the school that we taught. A bigger sample would not necessarily have

given varied data (Milroy, 1987). The research sample is representative according to Nunan (1990) in that it includes different types of respondents in terms of level of intelligence and exposure to the language in and out of the class context and different first language systems.

We presented the respondents with a list that had twenty sets of synonymous nouns and twenty sets of synonymous verbs. They used these synonyms in gap filling exercises that required them to choose one of the words in each set as the correct answer, some of which are presented in the results section. The respondents also used the synonyms to construct sentences.

### **Methods of data analysis**

The study required a framework that would describe the learner's use of the selected lexical items into grammar patterns and also categorize the lexical strategies. The model used for pattern identification and description was adopted from the COBUILD pattern grammar series (Francis, 1996). The model was adopted for two reasons. First, because the methodology used in the research leading to the grammar pattern series was the examination of lexical item by lexical item (Hunston & Francis, 2000). Second, the grammar series uses word-class coding for the words, phrases or clauses that co-occur with the target item. This coding has the advantage of presenting pattern information consistently without mixing functional and word-class labels. It also gives the surface categories in actual words. The patterns are mainly sorted to the right to give the verb or the noun complementation but for the nouns some patterns are sorted to the left as well.

After identification, the patterns were grouped according to the meaning of the node lexical item (Hunston & Francis, 2000). Patterns that shared meaning were grouped together. For such patterns, the respondents constructed sentences in which the items were fully interchangeable or partially interchangeable. The analysis of the study data also identified the words that commonly co-occur with the target items. Collocates were determined by the lexical and grammatical features of the target item (Willis, 1993; Hunston & Francis, 1998).

## **Results**

Our classroom research indicated various lexical challenges for the Kenyan learners. These challenges are in recalling lexical items for use due to inadequate lexical knowledge and failure to make use of lexical information; challenges due to imprecise presentation of lexical information; and challenges due to shifts in meaning. Some of the data from our classroom research that supports our findings are presented in the next section in relation to the two research questions we sought to answer.

### **Challenges in the recall and use of items**

In our classroom research we found out that the learner's language background has varied influence on the recall and use of the second language lexical items. Our findings concur with Swan's (1997) observation that the second language learner's first language "can influence the way second language vocabulary is learnt, the way it is recalled for use, and the way learners compensate for lack of knowledge". Each of the three areas of influence is confirmed by the findings as illustrated in this section.

#### ***Recall of English items***

The first language influence evident in our research results is more often syntactic than semantic. Syntactic features from the first language are manifested as problems of omission of a required item; inclusion of a redundant item; and collocating the wrong items. For example, absence of prepositions in the first language accounts for the construction of sentences in English that lack the necessary preposition as in:

1. The teacher *responded* our argument\*

The syntactic construction without the preposition, however, is appropriate in Gikuyu, a Bantu language spoken in Kenya. The direct translation for it is *Mwarimu niacokirie mateta maitu*. The noun group ‘the answer’ in example 2, here below, is redundant because it is entailed in the meaning of the node verb.

2. The student replied the answer\*

The Gikuyu translation is *Murutwo acokirie macokio* and it is an appropriate pattern. Since the verb *reply* in Gikuyu is synonymous with the verbs ‘respond’ and ‘answer’, a speaker has to clarify what the object of the verb is. The first language influence is denoted too by the collocation pattern of the item, especially the right collocate as in:

3. She *responded* using her head\*

4. I was surprised to meet him *weeping* in his bed\*

In example 3, the phrase ‘using her head’ denotes the means of *answering* or *responding*. The head is a reference that supplies answers or an instrument that is used to answer. This is a literal translation of ‘he answered without consulting any references’, which in Gikuyu is *Acokirie na mutwe*. The left collocates that are indicative of first language are mainly denoted by a co-occurring verb as in example 4. The collocation of *weep* and *meet* is a literal translation from the

respondent's first language, which in Gikuyu is *Ndimukorire akiririra uriri*. The pattern structure is appropriate but the appropriate verb in this sentence is *find* (Francis, 1996).

There is evidence that the first language of the learners in our classrooms overtly influences the way they learn English lexical items. There was no appeal to the learner's first language in the process of learning English. If anything, learners are discouraged from 'thinking in their first language' when dealing with English vocabulary (see KIE, 1995 p.46). However, the learner's first language was seen to play a pivotal role in the learning of the second language.

The semantic inappropriateness we observed could be attributed to the fact that synonymous English items once translated into the learner's first language have different lexical sets. For example, the items *respond, answer, reply* when collocated with items such as *question* or *letter* are semantically equivalent to just one word 'cokia' in Gikuyu. So the first language item has several equivalents in English.

### ***Compensating for lack of knowledge of an English item***

There is evidence for first language influence in the way that the learners compensate for lack of lexical knowledge of English lexical items. For instance, there is the implication that the respondents were in some patterns using the lexical item of the first language but taking its equivalent in English. For instance, in

5. He wrote a letter to his girlfriend and asked her to *reply* back after reading.

The lexical item *reply* is in English but the grammatical pattern is from the respondent's first language as can be deduced from the co-occurring adjunct 'back after reading'. In Gikuyu, *reply*

could be equated to ‘give back’ or ‘answer’, both of which are represented by one lexical item *cokia*. In example 5, the English item is used in the syntactic frame of the first language. The two meanings of *reply* in the first language could have influenced this usage. There are very few instances of such observation but wherever they were identified they suggest the influence of the first language on the recall of English items for use.

Our research findings reveal a correlation between the processes of lexical acquisition and the use of such items. The grammar patterns observed in the respondents’ lexicon could be interpreted in view of the lexical strategies these respondents employ. The following interpretations of the research data are appropriate:

### ***The learners acquire lexical items in chunks***

The grammar patterns and the lexical strategies attest that the learners in our classrooms acquire lexical items in chunks and not as single items. For instance, instead of acquiring *answer*, the learner acquires *answer a question*. It is possible that the collocates for core words such as *answer* are learned this way too. The chunk provides a frame and any related items learned after the core items are fitted into the existing frame.

Snow & Kim (2007) and Moon (1997) argue that the lexical chunks are retrieved and used as such. The lexical chunks reveal the word relations and associations that are part of the second language learner’s lexicon. In view of this, the learner associates the synonymous lexical items with specific words, for example, *information* with a source such as *books, library, teacher* or *head*. *Chance* is associated with *to go abroad, for higher education, or pass the exams*. Moon

(1998) argues that the lexical chunks became like fixed phrases or almost idiomatic. There is thus very close association between certain lexical items because of the way the items are presented to the language learner. The retrieval of items in chunks is thus directly related to the narrow range of collocates in the grammar patterns.

### ***Equating related items due to the lexical strategies employed***

When the learners in our classrooms asked lexical questions we usually gave the synonym of an item or a paraphrase of the meaning. Such strategies were not supplemented with relevant lexical information that would enable the learner to determine the subtle differences between the related items. The learners, therefore, acquired the items as substitutes of each other and they did not differentiate the items even in subsequent use. The related items substituted each other in the same syntactic and semantic slot. The substitution was over-generalized leading to inappropriateness in some of the contexts.

### ***The existence of more than one lexical store***

Though the question of lexical stores is peripheral to this research it has some interesting relations to the finding, which strongly suggest that the second language learner has different lexical stores for his/her first and second language. The two lexicons seem to operate parallel to each other but there are some partial semantic and syntactic overlaps because the English items are not used in exactly the same way that they would be used in the first language. If this were the case, the patterns would make a strong argument for the first language influence and not for a shift in the meaning of the synonymous items.

There is some evidence of first language transfer but what the findings support more consistently is a shift in meaning. The evidence available is not strong enough to prove that in the examples given, the meaning is transferred from the learners' first language. The findings, therefore, bear out what other researchers (such as Swan, 1997; Nunan, 1990) report on the first language influence. The findings also add a new dimension to the second language learner's lexicon - that of a shift in meaning of English item in the respondents' lexicon.

### **Challenges from lexical instruction**

The lack of awareness of the subtle differences between synonymous items also accounts for some of the inappropriate grammar patterns we observed. For instance, the omission of a grammatical item in examples

6. Kamau did not *respond/answer/reply* the question\*
7. The teacher *responded* our argument\*
8. He *responded* the teacher's advice\*

occurs when the respondent assumes that synonymous items share a syntactic frame even in contexts of use where this is not the case. The inappropriate grammar patterns could be attributed to methods of presentation, both in the textbooks used for the teaching of English and by the teachers of English. The specific findings of this research that are seen to emanate from lexical instruction are as follows:

### ***Lack of or inadequate lexical knowledge***

From the findings the two things that are evident are that the learners in our classrooms were not given sufficient lexical information and that even when such information has been given some details are missing. Where the lexical information is given, the learner does not access it.

The inappropriate grammar patterns could be interpreted as an indication that the learners of English as shown by the respondents in this study lack understanding of some word features. The respondents' lexicon implies inadequate knowledge of the form, syntactic, semantic and lexico-grammatical features of the synonymous items. What is most relevant to this research is the inadequate knowledge of lexico-grammatical features of synonymous items. However, even what is considered elementary word knowledge can have adverse effects on the use of second language lexical items. The use of a noun in place of a verb in a sentence or the nominalization of a verb, for instance, implies inadequate knowledge of form features. This inadequate knowledge leads to confusion between different word classes as in examples

9. She *answered/replied* the letter

10. The *answer* to this question is correct\*

In examples 9 and 10 the lexical items have the same morphological shape but there is a lack of distinction between the noun 'answer' and the verb 'answer'. Though knowledge of the form is considered to be basic knowledge of a word (Melka, 1997) it is significant in the use of lexical items.

The observations on inadequate lexical knowledge present a case for the need for formal instruction on vocabulary in context or for the learners in our classrooms to acquire vocabulary in context. For instance, in the presentation of *danger* and *menace* (KIE, 1987) the learner is

supplied with a context in which the two words are synonymous. However, this is not enough, the learner also needs to be supplied with contexts in which the two words are not synonymous. In so doing the learner's awareness of the subtle differences between the two items will be raised. Such contexts would minimize or eliminate cases of word-class confusion.

### ***Imprecise presentation of lexical information***

This is evident in the textbooks that the learners use for English lessons. In most cases related words are presented to the learners without any explanations on how they are related and in what ways they are different (KIE, 1987; 1990). The presentation of synonymous items in test exercises does not go beyond the sense relation that is relevant in the textual context. The respondents are, therefore, not encouraged to think of syntactic or semantic contexts in which the lexical items may not be synonymous. Such presentation of words as argued in this chapter could confuse the learner into thinking that the related words are interchangeable in all contexts.

From the observation sessions, it was noted that the teacher of English hardly ever supplied lexical or grammatical information to the language learners when they asked questions on word meaning. The language learners could assume that the items are used interchangeably in all contexts leading to inappropriate patterns similar to those observed in the respondents' lexicon. Similar methods of presentation were observed during the English lessons whereby the teacher would simply supply a synonymous word or a paraphrase of the meaning without any explanations when the learners asked for word meaning.

Given that imprecise presentation of synonymous lexical items is shown to be counter-productive in the use of the items (Martin, 1984; Jullian, 2000), there should be a review of the presentation methodology both in the textbooks and by the teachers of English.

### ***Failure to make use of lexical information***

This is deduced from the fact that the inappropriate patterns were not consistent in all the samples. If all the respondents used any one of the synonymous items in an inappropriate syntactic or semantic frame, it could have been argued that all the respondents did not have the requisite lexical information. However, this was not the case. The samples in the schools ranked at the bottom in the examination results roll had more instances of inappropriate selection than those ranked at the top. The use of lexical information, therefore, correlates to the level of intelligence with the respondents from the highly ranked schools performing better than those in the low ranked schools did. The inference that some of the respondents failed to make use of lexical information is confirmed by the fact that even in the same respondent sample, there were inappropriate and appropriate grammar patterns for items in the same lexical set. This means that some of the respondents utilized the lexical information at their disposal while others did not. It is not feasible that some of the respondents in the same sample had been exposed to lexical information to which others had not been exposed.

### ***Lack of understanding of lexical information***

Though apparent to some extent this argument is difficult to verify. Evidence from the textbooks and observation of the English lessons shows that lexical items are presented to the learners in lexical phrases. Such evidence is recognized by arguments on language use as lexical phrases

rather than as individual words as reported by Snow & Kim (2007) and Moon (1998; 2000). Presentation of vocabulary as lexical phrases could lead to some inherent problems in the use of related lexical items as reported by Martin (1984) in that the learner could use a related word in the grammatical frame open only to the other word. For example:

11. Kamau did not *respond/answer/reply* the question\*

As explained earlier, in the above example the respondents use the three lexical items interchangeably in the same syntactic slot. Yet, this slot is not open to *respond* because the verb requires the particle *to* to link it and the noun *question*. When such usage occurs it indicates that the learner does not understand clearly the role the core item plays in defining the new or related item. What the learner misses out is the kind of lexical association that exists between the two items and how far it can be extended syntactically or semantically.

### **Challenges of shifts in meaning**

The term 'shift in meaning' denotes usage that is not in accordance with the lexicon of the educated native speaker's English standard. From the semantic and syntactic features of the patterns, reinforced by the lexical strategies taxonomy observed in this study sample, could be argued a shift in meaning. Some of the grammar patterns identified imply that the second language learner considers certain senses of a lexical item synonymous with those of another item, which the native speaker of English does not. These patterns are unique to the Kenyan learner's lexicon and imply a shift in the meaning of an item from that of native speaker's English. The patterns are unique rather than inappropriate, as they would not be marked for inappropriateness in the second language learner's context yet they would be in the native speaker's context.

From these patterns are inferences for the underlying meanings of the items that lead the second language learner to use the items in these unique patterns. For one, it could be inferred that the second language learner has slightly different core meanings of some of the items from that of the native speaker. For instance, in the set *respond*, *answer*, *reply* the learners in this study have the core sense ‘saying something as an answer to what has been asked’. However, as illustrated in native speakers’ corpus such as the COBUILD Direct corpus (online) or ICE-EA (online) this is not always the case, especially for *respond*.

The shift in meaning could also imply that the learner of English has stronger lexical relations among certain related items than the native speaker does. For instance, in the learner’s lexicon *respond*, *answer*, *reply* are likely to be first encountered and used often in the classroom situation which conjures up association with words such as *question*, *teacher*, or *correctly*. Yet, this is not always the case in the native speakers’ context where according to Jiang (2000) the verbs are likely to be encountered first in informal contexts.

The shift in meaning has not been attributed to the learner’s first language factor illustrated in this chapter. Second Language Acquisition literature apportions most of the problems that lead to inappropriate selection to first language interference or influence (as in Jiang, 2000 and Swan, 1997). In this research however, there is not enough evidence to support this view. Rather, what the shift in meaning draws attention to is the need to define the scope of the second language lexicon. Defining the scope of each language is essential when one is dealing with learners from a multilingual context because many issues arise that are crucial for their theoretical relevance.

***The respondent's context supplies the sense of the lexical item***

Some aspects of the meanings of a word are culture-bound, such as connotations, and they are elusive for the second language learner. It follows, therefore, that the lexical items of the second language acquire some cultural features specific to the second language context, which are different from those of the native speaker context. Though the sense expressed is from English there is some shift in the associative meaning of the items. Such associative meaning would account for a pattern such as **Vn** where the verb takes a proper noun subject as in 12 and 13:

12. She **answered/replied** Jane\*

13. N **replied** him / the letter / the question

The shift in meaning is manifested in collocations as in examples 14 and 15:

14. I was surprised to meet him **weeping** in his bed\*

15. The mourners were **weeping** in the funeral\*

**Reply** collocates to the right more frequently with a noun group than with the other right collocates. Though **reply** also appears in patterns in which it is used with a preposition and then the object noun group, this pattern in which it co-occurs with the noun group directly is prevalent and acceptable in the respondents' lexicon (see KIE, 1987; 1990). In this pattern, **reply** is a true synonym of **answer** and the syntactic requirements for **answer** are used for both items. This denotes a change in the meaning of the **reply** that is marked by the collocation pattern.

In example 15, the prepositional phrase consisting of *in* and the noun group *the funeral*, indicates a different meaning of funeral in the respondents' context. In this example, funeral means a period that starts at death and ends after the burial. This is in contrast to the meaning given in

monolingual English dictionaries in which funeral means an event, a meaning that is denoted by the preposition *at*. Since both prepositions are evident in the research data, the use of *in* can only be interpreted as denoting a different meaning of the noun group *the funeral*. This meaning of the noun group affects the node verb in that *weeping* is also seen to be a continuous action, extending over time. The continuity of *weeping* is emphasized in other patterns where *weep* co-occurs with direction adjuncts. For instance in

16. My mother *wept* on my shoulder as I walked away

The prepositional phrase consisting of *on* and the noun group locates where the *weeping* takes place, while the adverbial ‘as I walked away’ gives a duration over which the *weeping* took place.

### *Different languages supply the grammar patterns*

Apparently, the grammar patterns described in this study are based on English lexico-grammar. During the presentation of English lexical items, the core meaning is given but it is illustrated with a context that is familiar to the Kenyan learner for example, *cry* co-occurring with *baby*, *answer* with *question* but not *phone*, *bell*, or *his critics*. The outcome of such illustrations is that from the time the Kenyan learner is introduced to English s/he forms lexical associations between the English items on the bases of the second language context.

The lexical associations based on a Kenyan context are reinforced by the lexical strategies that the learner employs such as the use of the textual context and reliance on the teacher. In most cases, the lexical associations the second language learner forms are appropriate but they would not be considered natural, as Sinclair (1988) argues, in the native speaker’s context. For instance,

the subject noun group is an integral part of the meaning of the verb. For instance, *weep, cry, wail* co-occur with *baby, she* or *mourners*. In such sentences the meaning of the sentence is expected in the sense that these are the people who are expected to *weep, cry* or *wail*. When the subject is *he* the right collocate has a negative connotation. For example

17. He *wept / cried / wailed* like a baby

18. He was *crying* like a baby

The subject in examples 17 and 18 behaves in an unacceptable manner. This is evident also in the adverb that locates the *weeping, crying* or *wailing* when the subject is *he* as in example 14 where the subject *weeps* ‘in bed’. The *he* does not express his emotions or feelings in places where he can be easily observed. Such negative connotations are not part of the native speakers’ patterns as reported by Francis (1996). The connotations marking the shift in meaning are denoted by the choice of collocates.

Similar lexical association is portrayed in example 19 in which someone or something causes *weeping, crying* or *wailing*.

19. The sad love story made her *weep, cry, wail*

Something negative necessitates the action denoted by the node verb. The only exception to this was when the node verbs co-occurred with *tears of joy*, which is a fixed expression.

## **Reflection**

Our classroom research has given us a better understanding of the task of vocabulary teaching and learning. We have used our findings to understand the complexities of vocabulary learning, which in turn has guided us in establishing reasonable goals for our learners. We also now

allocate specific time to vocabulary learning during which we teach techniques of vocabulary development rather than specific words. We now know that explicit teaching is vital in vocabulary acquisition.

Our findings have made us reflect on the role of learner's first language. We are currently investigating how we can positively use the knowledge of the first language, though it is a daunting task due to the prevailing attitude that it interferes rather than facilitates learning.

We have changed our approach in teaching vocabulary to our learners. We now do the following: give the collocates of node words to the students; indicate that the interchangeability of the synonymous words must take into account the syntactic and semantic context of the node word; and encourage the learners to examine their usage of words by reflecting on how they use words of similar meanings in their first languages. As we teach vocabulary now, we are careful not to imply that words are absolute synonyms through our presentation methodology.

Our study has also shown that contextualizing the use of lexical items especially in situations where learners ask for the meaning of a new item could alleviate challenges in vocabulary teaching. Reference materials and the methods of presentation and practice have room for improvement. We have learnt that as teachers, we should constantly enrich our knowledge of presentation methodology by examining the language of the learners in order to make informed decisions about teaching of vocabulary.

#### **References:**

Aitchison, J. (1994). *Words in the mind: An introduction to the mental lexicon* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Oxford:

- Basil Blackwell.
- Carter, R. (1994). *Vocabulary: An applied linguistics perspective* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Collins COBUILD (1992). *English usage*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Cruse, D. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diana, I. and Graene, H. (2006). Building and using a lexical knowledge base of near synonym differences. *Computation Linguistics*, 32 (2), 223-62.
- Francis, J. (1996). *Collins COBUILD grammar pattern 1: Verbs*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Hunston, S. and Francis, G. (1998). Verbs observed: A corpus-driven pedagogic grammar. *Applied Linguistics*, 19 (1), 43-72.
- Hunston, S. and Francis, G. (2000). *Pattern grammar: A corpus-driven approach to the lexical grammar of English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jiang, N. (2000). Lexical representation and development in a second language. *Applied Linguistics Journal*, 21 (1), 47-75.
- Jullian, P. (2000). Creating word-meaning awareness. *ELT Journal*, 54 (1), 37-46.
- Kenya Institute of Education (1987). *Integrated English: Student's course book 1*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Kenya Institute of Education (1990). *Integrated English: Students course book 4*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Kenya Institute of Education (1995). *The Kenya national syllabus for English for Kenyan secondary schools*. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.
- Martin, M. (1984). Advanced vocabulary teaching: The problems of synonyms. *Modern Language Journal*, 68 (2), 130-137.
- Melka, F. (1997). Receptive vs. productive aspects of vocabulary. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.) *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 84-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and analysing natural language: A critical account of sociolinguistic method*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Moon, R. (1997). Vocabulary connections: Multiword items in English. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.) *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp 40-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Moon, R. (1998). *Fixed expression and idioms in English: A corpus-based approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moon, R. (2000). Lexicography and disambiguation: The size of the problem. *Computers and Humanities*, 34, 99-102.
- Nunan, D. (1990). *Language teaching methodology*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Schmitt, N. & McCarthy, M. (Eds.) (1997). *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sinclair, J. (1988). Naturalness in language. *Empirical Language Research Journal*, 2, 11-20.
- Snow, C. and Kim, Y. (2007). Large problem spaces: The challenge of vocabulary for English language learners. In R. Wagner, A. Muse & K. Tannenbaum (Eds.). *Vocabulary acquisition: Implications for reading comprehension* (pp. 121-36). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Swan, M. (1997). Design criteria for pedagogical language rules. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.) *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 156-80). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, D. (1993). *The Lexical Syllabus: A New Approach to Language Teaching*. London: HarperCollins Publishers.

### **Online Corpora**

- COBUILD (Retrieved Jan. 30<sup>th</sup> 2008). <http://www.collins.co.uk/corpus>
- ICE-EA (Retrieved Feb. 4<sup>th</sup> 2007). <http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/English/ICE-EA>