

## Language Predation: How L<sub>1</sub> Interference Contributes to Lexico-Grammar Errors in the Pupils' Written Work among Tugen Speakers from Baringo County, Kenya

Daniel Kandagor Chepyegon\*<sup>1</sup> and Antony Somba Mang'oka<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, Egerton University Kenya

<sup>2</sup>Department of Education, Kabarak University, Kenya  
kangon2004@yahoo.com, asomba@kabarak.ac.ke

Received: July 12, 2018

Published: July 27, 2018

### Abstract

This paper progresses from the contention that human communication cannot be complete in the presence of errors that emanate from L1 interference, a phenomenon that is discernible in the written works of pupils. This paper picks the Tugen speakers from Baringo County as a sample to investigate how L1 interference contributes to lexico-grammatical errors with the aim of mitigating this unwelcome phenomenon. The paper locates its analysis within Selinker's and Corder's interlanguage theory and Error Analysis conceptual frameworks. Simple random sampling was used to get a total of six students in five classes in four selected schools. The chosen pupils were Tugen speakers from Baringo district in Rift Valley province, Kenya. Data was collected using a written composition, translation test, dictation exercise and a short grammar test. The data was transcribed, organised and analysed for errors. In the final analysis, the paper contends that learners make errors while writing their compositions or when answering questions in English. These errors may hamper the L<sub>2</sub> learners' communicative competence thus affecting them in the end while they are writing or while they are communicating using English. Lexico-Grammar errors, in addition, should not be seen as an error or a mistake on the part of the L<sub>2</sub> learner but a means in which he/she is trying to master the second language.

**Keywords:** L1, L2, Tugen, Baringo County

© 2016 by the author(s); Mara Research Journals (Nairobi, Kenya)

**OPEN ACCESS**

### 1. INTRODUCTION

To interrogate how L1 interference contributes to lexico-grammar errors in the pupils' written work among Tugen speakers from Baringo County, Kenya. This paper looked at the different types of Lexico-Grammar errors that were made by Tugen L<sub>1</sub> speakers learning English as a second language. As a result of these inappropriate forms, there are lots of complaints from the general public about the dismal performance of students in languages, particularly English.

For our students in upper primary to be able to communicate effectively, they need to master the target language forms by writing in Standard English. But this has never been the case. The students do in fact deviate in their written forms. This is evident from this researcher's own background as a high school teacher that a majority of students join Form One even though they have not mastered the English language appropriately. Ellis (1997) made some observation about a second language learner who had been subjected to a new environment and was required to learn English even though this particular L<sub>2</sub> learner was Chinese. In the three years that this L<sub>2</sub> learner was in the USA, he was able to use the auxiliary 'be', the plural '-s', third person '-s', and the progressive '-ing'. It was found out that this L<sub>2</sub> learner had indeed

mastered the use of these features with the same accuracy as a native speaker. However, it was found out in the same study that the same L<sub>2</sub> speaker did not use the ‘-ing’ progressive in all circumstances as it was required as in the example *I’m sitting*. The same L<sub>2</sub> learner used the ‘-ing’ progressive in all contexts even those that were not allowed. For example, *I didn’t painting*. This learner didn’t have the same knowledge as a native speaker who would have been able to regulate the haphazard use of rules. This learner moreover omitted -s from the plural nouns, rarely put -s on the third person singular verbs, and never used the regular past tense.

This study by Ellis (1997) came up with very important findings that L<sub>2</sub> learners make errors of different kinds. These are errors of omission, overuse or sociolinguistic errors where they fail to make requests appropriately. Another finding is that L<sub>2</sub> learners acquire a large number of formulaic chunks, which they use to perform communicative functions that are important to them and which contribute to the fluency of their unplanned speech. Krashen (1982) elaborates that L<sub>2</sub> acquisition involves different kinds of learning. One is that learners internalize chunks of language structure i.e. formulas. On the other hand, they acquire rules and are aware that a given linguistic feature should be used in a particular context and not another. Krashen calls this item learning and system learning. That L<sub>2</sub> acquisition is systematic, a learner follows a particular developmental pattern because their mental faculties are structured in such a way that this is the way they have to learn. These faculties regulate what learners take from the input and how they store information in their memories.

But Chomsky (1965) posits that apart from these internal factors (LAD) that determines L<sub>2</sub> acquisition there could also be other external factors that may influence L<sub>2</sub> acquisition. He believed that a person’s environment contributed to the acquisition of language structures. Consequently, as a result of these findings that show clearly that L<sub>2</sub> learners do make different types of errors while attempting to master or acquire a second language. This research therefore had sufficient background information which clearly indicates that L<sub>2</sub> learners do make errors while acquiring a second language. For the purposes of this research, it is assumed that Tugen L<sub>1</sub> speakers make Lexico-Grammar errors and the research was carried out on this premise.

Lexico-Grammar errors are errors that indicate inappropriate usage of words by L<sub>2</sub> learners. Lexo-Grammar errors in the students’ written work hamper their communicative competence. It is evident from students’ written work that they fail to use words correctly in that they end up misspelling words, misusing words or switching to their mother tongue in an effort to try and express themselves. This may be because they lack the proper vocabulary to use. It is for this reason that this paper sought to determine and describe the nature of Lexico-Grammar errors made by the Tugen speakers and to find out the influence of these errors caused by the first language i.e. Tugen on the learner language.

## 2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORY

There are a number of works that were reviewed in this section; the first one is Corder (1967) in his work, he advocated in applied linguistics community the importance of errors in language learning process. In Corder (*op cit*), he mentions a paradigm shift in linguistics from a behaviouristic view of language to a more rationalistic view and claims that in language teaching one noticeable effect is to shift the emphasis away from teaching towards a study of learning. He goes on to say that in L<sub>1</sub> acquisition, we interpret a child’s ‘incorrect’ utterances as being evidence that he is in the process of acquiring language and that for those who attempt to describe his knowledge of the language at any point in its development, it is the ‘errors’ which provide the important evidence. In SLA, Corder proposed a working hypothesis that some of the strategies adopted by the learner of a second language are substantially the same as those by which a first language is acquired. It doesn’t mean however that the course or sequence of learning is the same in L<sub>1</sub> and L<sub>2</sub>. By classifying the errors that learners make, researchers could learn a great deal about the SLA

process by inferring the strategies that second language learners were adopting. He further claims that 'errors' are 'indispensable', since the making of errors can be regarded as a device the learner uses in order to learn. He claims that the study of errors is carried out by means of Error Analysis (EA).

In addition, Corder (*op cit*) continues to say that Error Analysis supplanted Contrastive Analysis, since Contrastive Analysis sought to predict the errors that learners make by identifying the linguistic differences between their L<sub>1</sub> and the target language. The underlying assumption of Contrastive Analysis was that errors occurred as a result of interference when the learner transferred his/her native 'habits' into the L<sub>2</sub>. Interference was believed to take place whenever the 'habits' of the native languages differed from those of the target language. This view was, however, challenged by many linguists who argued that whereas contrastive analysis looked at only the learner's native language and the target language, Error Analysis provided a methodology for investigating learner language at a deeper level. For this reason, Error Analysis constitutes an appropriate starting point for the study of learner language and L<sub>2</sub> acquisition.

More evidence of the widespread appeal of Error Analysis can be adduced from the works of Burt *et al* (1982:140) who contend that the instant and widespread appeal of Error Analysis stemmed from the refreshing alternative it provided to the then prevailing but more restrictive 'Contrastive Analysis' approach to errors. The Contrastive Analysis treatment of errors, which was popular up to the 1960s rested on a comparison of the learners' native and target languages. Differences between the two were thought to account for the majority of L<sub>2</sub> learner's errors. The associationist or behaviourist view of learning prevalent at that time provided the theoretical justification for Contrastive Analysis, but attentive teachers and researchers however noticed that a great number of student errors could not possibly be traced to their native languages. Therefore the theoretical climate of the late fifties and the early sixties provided the ultimate rationale for the Error Analysis approach.

Chomsky (1959) in his 'Review of B.F Skinner's Verbal Behaviour' questioned the very core of behaviourist habit theory as an account of language learning and proposed that all learners are equipped with an internal device of acquiring language which he called LAD. In addition, Gass (2001) says it is important for us to understand how second languages are learned, that when we study human language, we are approaching what some might call the human essence, that is the distinctive qualities of mind that are, as far as we know, unique to humans. This means that only human beings are capable of speech and other creatures cannot reach the complexity of a human being in terms of speech. The study of how second languages are learned is part of the broader study of language and language behaviour. It is no more central or peripheral than any other part of linguistic study, which in turn has as its larger goal, the study of the nature of the human mind.

In fact, a major goal of SLA research is the determination of linguistic constraints on the form of second language grammar. Klein (1986) brings another dimension and says that first language acquisition occurs when the learner – usually a child – has been without a language so far and how he/she acquires one. In languages like English, French and German, practically every sentence carries some tense marking affected by a finite verb. Correct tense marking presupposes that the learner has acquired temporal concepts like present, past and future tenses. This is in itself an intricate and laborious process. Many children tend to confuse 'yesterday' and 'tomorrow' right into their early school years. Even if four year olds are found to form grammatical sentences, we cannot be certain- short of misunderstandings in communicative failures that their use of say, the past tense is that of the adult language. Two important conclusions can be drawn from this. First, the products of well-formed utterances do not imply that the speaker has mastered the language. The learner may endow these utterances with quite a different meaning. Secondly, a speaker must have acquired the cognitive categories, which underline the various expressive means of natural language categories such as time, space, modality and casualty.

Fred *et al* (1993: 7) state that language teaching during the past 50 years or so has relied heavily on linguistic theory and on theories of learning. In 1960s and 1970s, teachers were trained in contrastive analysis. Among other things, they were often expected to write a Contrastive Analysis of a portion of the grammars of two languages. This was of course based on the then prevalent theories of language teaching, which in turn were based on earlier models of language, and language learning. When the theoretical basis of Contrastive Analysis was shown to be inadequate, teaching based on Contrastive Analysis went out of fashion and therefore the emergence of Error Analysis.

The Error Analysis movement can thus be categorized as an attempt to account for learner errors that could not be explained or predicted by L<sub>1</sub>. Richards (1971) expounds that learner errors are of two types: those resulting from interference from the mother tongue, he calls them transfer errors or interlingual errors. And those that result from the process of learning the L<sub>2</sub> itself, he calls them intralingual or developmental errors. Interlingual errors reflect the intrusion of features of learners' L<sub>1</sub> into the L<sub>2</sub>. Examples can be seen from our data where the L<sub>2</sub> learners coin new words without the /b/, /ð/, /θ/, /v/ sounds since these sounds are non-existent in Tugen which is their L<sub>1</sub>. In addition, there are many more examples of sentences and words which show the intrusion of their L<sub>1</sub>.

Intralingual errors are those errors whose origin lies within the structure of the L<sub>1</sub> itself, and are errors, which can be made by any learner, irrespective of his/her L<sub>1</sub>. Richards (1971) also argues that intralingual errors are those, which reflect the general characteristics of rule learning such as faulty generalizations, incomplete application of rules and failure to learn the conditions under which the rules apply. Overgeneralization errors involve the creation of one deviant structure in place of two target language structures. For example: \**He can sings*. On the other hand, ignorance of rule restriction implies application of rules to contexts where they do not apply. An example is: \**You like to sing* instead of 'Do you like to singing?'

This research was guided by these findings by Richards's classification of errors based on those that were considered as being due to interference from the learners' mother tongue or those that were due to the process of learning, which have been referred to as learning induced errors in this paper.

The paper also utilised Burt *et al* (1982) categorization of errors into surface strategy taxonomy. Errors that are based on linguistic category taxonomy classify errors according to language component or the particular linguistic constituent the error affects. The language components may include: phonology (pronunciation), syntax and morphology (grammar), semantics and lexicon (meaning and vocabulary), and discourse (style).

Constituents include the elements that comprise each language component. For example, within syntax, one may ask whether the error is in the main or subordinate clause; and within a clause; which constituent is affected whether it is the adverb, the adjective or the verb. Burt *et al* (*op cit*) however claimed that errors based on surface structure taxonomy highlight the ways surface structures are altered in this respect. Learners may omit necessary items or add unnecessary ones; they may come up with wrong constructions of items or misorder them. Analyzing errors from a surface strategy perspective holds much promise for researchers concerned with identifying cognitive processes that underlie the learners' reconstruction of the new language. It also makes us aware that learners' errors are based on some logic. That is, they are not the result of laziness or sloppy thinking, but of the learners' use of interim principles to produce a new language. This research therefore classified errors based on the surface strategy taxonomy whereby errors were classified into different error categories, for example those that were considered as malformation of words were grouped together under, Malapropisms, Misspelt words amongst other categories. The others which were as a result of misordering items were looked at under Collocation Errors, Learning Induced Errors amongst others. After this was done, the same errors were subjected to some statistical analysis to rate the extent of each error category.

### 3. L1 INTERFERENCE ON L2: ANALYSIS OF THE ERRORS IN TERMS OF OCCURRENCE

All along we have been looking at the different types of errors that were then classified into seven categories/classes depending on the type of error. It is also necessary to analyze the extent to which these errors have been observed and in the end, we will be able to estimate which ones need immediate remedy compared to the other.

In our analysis of the error frequency and occurrence; we have also decided to see which data collection tools contributed which type of error. Moreover; we have also looked at the frequency of each type of error from each type of test that was administered to the L<sub>2</sub> learners. This is aimed at establishing which error type was more prevalent from the other so as to be able to come up with remedial action for each type of error. The other objective of finding out the contribution of errors from each test is to be able to see which testing techniques can reveal more errors than the other. This is very necessary because the research may not meet its objective of collecting as many errors as possible if only one type of data collection technique is used. The idea of finding out the error frequency from each test may also aid in the recommendations that will be made. Ideally, this may help in establishing which testing methods will in the end help the teachers and language planners to adopt. And thus in the end, help the L<sub>2</sub> learners. Let us therefore look at Table 1 on the next page and see the error category and frequency from the composition exercise.

**Table 1:** Errors from the Composition Exercise

	Category	No of Errors	Percentage
<b>Composition Exercise</b>	Errors due to Ignorance	5	6.09
	Misspelling Errors	26	31.70
	Malapropisms	8	9.75
	Language Switch	1	1.21
	Learning Induced Errors	22	26.82
	Collocations	12	14.63
	Calques	8	9.75
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100</b>

From table three above, we are able to see the prevalence of errors from the composition exercise. From this analysis, it was noted that in general, the composition exercise was the single highest contributor of the total number of Lexico-Grammar errors collected. This is because the learners had a humble time to express themselves freely without any inhibitions compared to the other structured tests. In the same composition writing exercise, all the error categories posted one type of error or another. (See table 3 above.) An observation was therefore made that composition writing is one of the best methods of data collection because of the fact that it allows learners to express themselves freely. It is important to note from the analysis of these errors that there is a significant variation statistically in as far as the number of errors in each category is concerned, for instance, Misspelling Errors posted 31.70 percent compared to Language Switch with a percentage of 1.21 in this case; the lowest. This demonstrates that although learners have been allowed to write composition so as to express themselves freely, they still rarely switch to another language. This shows that they have improved in their language acquisition and hence hardly

need another foreign language to express themselves. The picture we get is that most of these learners have gone past the stage of switching directly to either their Mother Tongue or Kiswahili in an effort to communicate. It shows us that they have already acquired the target language but they have not mastered the rules governing the use of these words.

Misspelling Errors therefore had the highest number of errors, for instance; in the grand total, it posted a mean of 34.68 percent. (See Table 2 on page 31). In general, Misspelling Errors remain the single highest contributor of Lexico-Grammar errors in our analysis. This gives us reason enough to believe that L<sub>2</sub> learners in almost all instances have problems with the English language spelling system which is very unpredictable. What we mean by this, is that most L<sub>2</sub> learners do not easily master the spelling of words as early as possible or as easily as we may be thinking. Most English words have the same spelling yet; in the end, we are still dealing with quite different words, for example; the word 'fine' can be classified into different word classes: verb, adjective or adverb. This is quite confusing to not only young learners but also more advanced learners, say in high school.

L<sub>2</sub> learners also have a problem differentiating how certain words should be spelled. There are words that have similar sounds, but are spelled differently. For example, a word like *cool* may be wrongly spelled as *gool* or *kul* by the L<sub>2</sub> learner. However, *kul* is the correct pronunciation of the said word but *gool* is not. Such an error occurs because of the inability of the L<sub>2</sub> learners to distinguish between the voiced and voiceless sounds in English or because of the confusing nature of the English spelling system which is hard to master. From this research, it was evident that Learning Induced Errors could be said to be the second highest contributor of Lexico-Grammar errors with a mean score of 24.27 percent (See table 2 on page 31). This is enough evidence to make a conclusion and say that one factor cannot be said to be the only cause of Lexico-Grammar errors. This is so considering that even the process of learning the second language in this case English could as well be the reason as to why learners make errors. This shows us that teachers play a very crucial role in the process of learning a second language. Consequently, it really matters what the teachers emphasize to the L<sub>2</sub> learners. If they overemphasize certain sounds at the expense of others, the learners will be conditioned into believing that a particular word sound is the right one to be used in all circumstances. Malapropisms and Calques had the same percentage 9.75. But we cannot say that these two error categories are the same, the reason why they posted the same percentage from the composition exercise was possibly a mere coincidence.

At the end, we still discover that Calques score a higher percentage 9.82 compared to Malapropisms with a percentage of 8.67. (See table 2 page 31 above). Therefore, it is still in order to say Calques are more prevalent in this research compared to Malapropisms. The other category of errors which is wrong collocations had a total mean of 14.63 percent. Since this was a free expression exercise, most of these learners expressed themselves freely, no wonder we have so many errors on wrong collocations. This shows that they were unable to join words appropriately. In composition writing, one is required to join ideas so as to communicate sensible ideas. But if someone has limited language capabilities, this ability is severely hampered. When we look at the collocations errors, most of the L<sub>2</sub> learners had problems with the usage of the prepositions. They joined words with inappropriate ones. Lastly, Errors Due to Ignorance were also relatively few with a percentage mean of 6.09 (See table 3 above). Such errors were those that were difficult to categorize.

Let us now turn our attention to those errors that were picked from the Translation Exercise. Their percentages are shown on Table 2 on the next page.

**Table 2:** Errors from Translation Test

	Category	No of Errors	Percentage
<b>Translation Test</b>	Misspelling Errors	12	25
	Malapropism	3	6.25
	Language Switch	5	10.41
	Learning Induced Errors	6	12.5
	Collocations	2	4.16
	Errors Due to Ignorance	11	22.91
	Calques	9	18.75
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>100</b>

Under the translation test, Misspelling Errors had the highest percentage 25 percent; this explains why Misspelling Errors even in the final analysis had the highest percentage as stated earlier. It was followed by Errors Due to Ignorance with a percentage of 22.91. We need to remember here that under this section, the L<sub>2</sub> learners were required to translate certain items that had been set beforehand for them. A number of errors falling under those we have classified as being as a result of ignorance were quite many because the learners didn't have the equivalent of certain words as a result, they came up with words that could not pass any meaning. This hence motivated us too refer to these errors as being due to ignorance on the part of the L<sub>2</sub> learner. Besides Errors due to Ignorance, we also had the other category of errors that is Calques with a relatively high percentage of 18.75. As stated earlier, these are errors caused by the learners' L<sub>1</sub>. Furthermore, in this section that is Translation Test, there were quite a number of Learning Induced Errors. In total, they posted a percentage of 12.5. They were followed closely by Language Switch errors having a mean percentage of 10.41. In the end, Collocations and Malapropisms had the lowest number of Lexico-Grammar errors each posting 6.25 and 4.16 percent respectively. (See table 4 above). Of importance is the fact that the Translation Test like the composition writing exercise had all the error categories covered.

After looking at the two data collection tools, we need to also study the other remaining two that is the grammar and dictation tests. These two research tools contributed a relatively smaller number of errors because they had fewer items that were tested. They have been grouped together in Table 3 on the next page.

**Table 3:** Errors from Grammar and Dictation Tests

	Category	No of Errors	Percentage
<b>Grammar Test</b>	Misspelling Errors	11	39.28
	Learning Induced Errors	14	50
	Errors Due to Ignorance	3	10.71
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>

<b>Dictation Test</b>	Misspelling Errors	11	73.33
	Malapropism	4	26.66
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>

The other test that was administered to the learners was a brief grammar test. This was an important test that was intended to test the learners' mastery of the English language tenses. From the data, (See Table 3 above), Learning Induced Errors scored the highest percentage that is 50.0 percent. Then it was followed by Misspelling Errors with a mean of 39.28 percent and finally Errors Due to Ignorance having 10.71 percent. The other error categories did not post any type of error. It can be seen from the above table that it was not possible for all the categories to be covered because of the type of test that was administered to the learners in this case, a grammar test that required the learners to fill in the blank spaces with the appropriate word given in brackets. It therefore follows that it was not possible to get errors such as wrong word collocations. In general, one thing that is un-debatable is the fact that Learning Induced Errors scored very highly here. This was because of the fact that most of these learners make overgeneralization while applying the language rules, or maybe they are ignorant of the rule restrictions since they would apply rules even in areas that were not covered by the said rules, in other instances, they had problems such as incomplete application of rules. This is to say, they would apply the rules but not fully. This can be seen in the following examples 26a *falld* instead of *fell* or 32a *gone* instead of *went* (See Appendix 6 on page 94).

From our data as seen on Table 3 on page 68, the Dictation Exercise that was administered to the L<sub>2</sub> learners ended up posting the following results, Misspelling Errors 73.33 percent, Malapropisms 26.66 percent. The other error categories did not have any error at all. From the said test, Misspelling Errors had the highest percentage of 73.33. But, this was from only the two categories that were posted that is Malapropism and Misspelling Errors. This indeed shows that most L<sub>2</sub> learners have a big problem with the spelling of English words. They are not aware of the different word classes and how to join words appropriately or avoid omitting certain letters unnecessarily. They, as a result, generate their own new words in place of those they are not able to spell appropriately.

While considered one of the objectives of this study, which was to see if there were errors that could be because of L<sub>1</sub> and thus compare these errors with those errors which were not caused by L<sub>1</sub>. This study was able to establish that L<sub>1</sub> played a major role in that, it contributed quite significantly to the number of errors that were collected. Let us study Table 4 on the next page.

**Table 4:** Errors That Were as a Result of L<sub>1</sub>

<b>ERROR CATEGORY</b>	<b>NO OF ERRORS</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
Misspelling Errors	14	22.58
Malapropisms	9	14.51
Language Switch	3	4.83
Learning Induced Errors	7	11.29
Collocations	5	8.06
Errors Due to Ignorance	7	11.29
Calques	17	27.41
<b>Totals</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>100</b>

After looking at the different error categories, it is important as well to see how the learners' L<sub>1</sub> has contributed to the making of Lexico-Grammar errors. This is because part of our objective which was to find out to what extent L<sub>1</sub> contributed to the formation of the different kinds of Lexico-Grammar errors identified (See Table 4 above). From our data analysis, it was found out that first language interference was the cause of a majority of the errors that were collected. It was also evident that each error category at least had errors that could be attributed to L<sub>1</sub> interference. Looking at Table 6 above, Calques had the highest percentage in terms of errors that were collected and were as a result of L<sub>1</sub> interference. Calques posted 27.41 per cent of errors that were caused by L<sub>1</sub> interference. This is a clear indicator that L<sub>1</sub> is the main cause of the Lexico-Grammar errors that L<sub>2</sub> learners make. If we can remember that we had earlier said that Calques are the errors that result because of L<sub>2</sub> learners directly using items that are prevalent in ones L<sub>1</sub> and bringing them directly into the L<sub>2</sub> without even bothering to convert them into target language forms.

The next error category that had a high number of errors that were due to the learners L<sub>1</sub> was that of Misspelt words which had the second highest percentage, which is 22.58 per cent. These were the errors which could be attributed to L<sub>1</sub> interference, among these errors were those that the L<sub>2</sub> learner picked items from his/her L<sub>1</sub> and transferred them to the second language. In some of the examples which have already been discussed, the learners confuse lexical items that are supposed to start with a voiced sound and write them down using the voiceless sounds. Closer to this category were Malapropism errors with a mean score of 14.51 per cent, it was observed from this research that the errors falling under this category were also as a result of L<sub>1</sub> interference. This is where the learners as earlier stated, misused words. We can see this in examples like 4a *teaf* instead of *thief* (See Appendix 6 on page 94). Such errors could be attributed to the learners' L<sub>1</sub> and not anything else.

Malapropism errors were then followed by Learning Induced Errors with a mean of 11.29 per cent. It is interesting to note that even errors that are as a result of the learning process could still be said to be caused by one's L<sub>1</sub>, this is true if you consider an error such as 16a *heat the cow* and 42a *tomorrow I will going....*(See Appendix 6 on page 94). The L<sub>2</sub> learner in the first instance overgeneralizes the word *heat* to include contexts that the same word cannot be used. For example, the word *heat* cannot be used instead of *roast*. But in Tugen, the word *heat* when translated could still mean *roast*. In example 45a...*I will going*, this is the same as *awendi* a Tugen word meaning *I will going*. On the contrary, the phrase *I will going* is ungrammatical because the auxiliary verb *be* is missing. This indicates that the Tugen language doesn't have words that can differentiate between present tense, present continuous, past tense or future time compared to the English language. So, the L<sub>1</sub> learner uses his/her L<sub>1</sub> to explain himself/herself or to put down expressions in the target language. His/her L<sub>1</sub> is the contributing factor in the formation of the said errors. The same errors may also be as a result of the process of learning the L<sub>2</sub> whereby the L<sub>2</sub> learners may inadvertently overgeneralize target language rules to include items not covered by the same rules.

Errors Due to Ignorance also had the same mean with those that were due to the learning process. This is because most of these L<sub>2</sub> learners make errors that may not be easy to classify but which can be closely linked to their L<sub>1</sub>. For instance, 172a on page 93 *father beat me very well* and example 173a on the same page *the child havetall maut*. In the two examples, the L<sub>2</sub> learner wants to tell us he/she was beaten badly and in the second instance that the child is a stammerer. But the same L<sub>2</sub> learner cannot express himself/herself well in English but instead uses expressions that are closer to his/her mother tongue than they are to English. Finally, Collocation errors and Language Switch followed with Language Switch having a mean percentage of 4.0 per cent of the total mean score which in this case was the lowest. This might have been as a result of the fact that the L<sub>2</sub> learner had already gone past making errors showing they were unable to formulate words in English and thus resorting to either their the Mother Tongue or Kiswahili. Collocation errors had 8.06 per cent a slightly higher mean percentage. This could be because of the fact that most Tugen learners still have a problem of joining words into grammatically correct

sentences. This is also a common problem to learners even in higher levels of education. For instance, secondary school pupils also make this mistake while constructing sentences. They do not usually use the correct prepositions with the right verb. This has been seen by this researcher a high school teacher himself.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study, in conclusion, looked at the different types of Lexico-Grammar errors that were made by the Tugen learners learning English as a second language. We can say that many learners make errors while writing their compositions or when answering questions in English. These errors may hamper the L<sub>2</sub> learners' communicative competence thus affecting them in the end while they are writing or while they are communicating using English. Lexico-Grammar errors, in addition, should not be seen as an error or a mistake on the part of the L<sub>2</sub> learner but a means in which he/she is trying to master the second language. The L<sub>2</sub> learners are in essence making closer and closer approximations to the target language form. Therefore learners who make any type of error should not be reprimanded or punished but understood to be trying to master the second language. We can deduce also and say that Lexico-Grammar errors can be classified into different categories this may help any researcher to differentiate these errors and thus be in a position to suggest any remedial action. This research also concludes by saying that many L<sub>2</sub> learners may have problems mastering the English language since this language has very many rules that govern sentence construction and it could be said that it is one of the reasons why a majority of L<sub>2</sub> learners have problems mastering it. The teacher teaching the English language may sometimes not be an expert consequently, learners may end up receiving the wrong instruction leading them to deviate from the norm.

Moreover, we note that a majority of Lexico-Grammar errors are as a result of learners L<sub>1</sub> interfering with the L<sub>2</sub>. We have seen that this makes the same learners to resort to their L<sub>1</sub> so that they can express themselves because they do not have the correct terms to use. What happens here is that these learners think that for every English word there is an English equivalent, they, therefore, end up borrowing from their mother tongue while writing down their compositions or while translating items into English. One other observation that was made is that most of the Lexico-Grammar errors that were collected came from the free expression exercise that is the 'composition test'. This is a good indicator that for any researcher to be able to get reliable data with the kind of information that he/she is looking for; it is advisable that one uses Free Expression Exercises as forms of testing tools. This will enable a researcher to obtain more detailed data. This is because of data collection tools such as 'dictation exercises' only test learners using structured questions that are in most instances not flexible

#### 5. REFERENCES

- Burt, M. Dulay, H. and Krashen, S. (1982) *Language Two*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1959) A Review of B. F. Skinner's Verbal Behaviour. *Language*, 35, pp.26-58, Reprinted in Chomsky, N (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T. Press
- Chomsky, N. (1965). Formal Discussion; The Development of Grammar in Child Language, in Bellugi, U. and Brown, R. (eds). *The Acquisition of Language*, Indiana, Purdue University.
- Corder, S. (1967) 'Idiosyncratic Dialects and Error Analysis' In Richards (ed) *Error Analysis*. London, Longman Group Ltd.
- Corder, S. (1972) *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford University Press
- Corder, S. (1974) 'Error Analysis' in Corder (1981:49) *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
- Cygan, J. (1972). *Tense and Aspect in Slavick*, *AnglicaWratislavia* 2:5-12

- Dulay, H. and Burt, M. (1974b). *Errors and Strategies in Child Second Language Acquisition*. *Tesol Quarterly* 8, 129-136.
- Ellis, R. (1986) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997) *Second Language Acquisition*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Gass, S. (2001) *Second Language Acquisition*. City Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gough, C. 'Words and Words: Helping Learners to Help Themselves with Collocations' *MET* Vol5 No 1 Jan 1996
- Klein, W. (1986) *Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (2002) *Comments on O'Neil's Debt to and Argument with Krashen*; Stephen Krashen Responds to O'Neil's Criticism. Retrieved from the web Nov. 24, 2002.
- Nemser, W. (1971) 'Approximate systems of foreign language learners', *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 115-123. Reprinted in Richards (1974).
- Richards, J. (1984) *Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. New York, Longman.
- Richards, J.C. (1971) 'A Non- Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis' In Richards, J. C. (Ed) *Error Analysis*. London, Longman.
- Richards, J.C. (1974) *Error Analysis*. London and New York, Longman.
- Selinker, L. (1971) *Interlanguage*. United Kingdom: Longman.
- Selinker, L. (1972 a) *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. London, Longman.
- Selinker, L. (1972 b) 'Interlanguage', *IRAL*, 10/3. Reprinted in Richards (1974)

**Cite this article:**

- Chepyegon, D.K., Mang'oka, A. S. (2018). Language Predation: How L<sub>1</sub>Interference Contributes to Lexico-Grammar Errors in the Pupils' Written Work among Tugen Speakers from Baringo County, Kenya.. *Mara res. j. humanities soc. sci.* Vol. 3, No. 2, Pages 1 - 11, ISSN: 2519-1489