

Teacher-induced error: The case of language students of University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Benita C. Odii, Nkechi Ukaegbu, Ndubuisi Ahamefula,

Miracle O. Uzoagba and Chioma Okonkwo

University of Nigeria, Nsukka

benita.uzoigwe@unn.edu.ng; nkechi.ukaegbu@unn.edu.ng; ndubuisi.ahamefula@unn.edu.ng,
ogechukwu.uzoagba@unn.edu.ng and chioma.okonkwo@unn.edu.ng

Abstract

Mother tongue (MT) interference, intralingual and developmental errors are seen as the basic causes and classifications of errors by error analysts. One other cause of error is the errors of inducement. This paper looks at an aspect of induced errors 'teacher-induced errors'. The paper investigates the influence of the teacher's pronunciation of choice words that have homophonous or have near homophonous tendencies on the spellings of Linguistics students of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Dictation tests were administered twice in a classroom environment. 80 students, 20 students each from the four levels of study constitute the sample size for the study. Sets of sentences were read out to the students by their teacher to test: if the pronunciation of words by the teacher influences the spelling abilities of the students even when the words are contextualized; to know if it is an inherent spelling challenge of individual students and then to establish Stenson's (1974) view on the existence of induced errors as a cause and classification of error. The paper realized that the teacher-induced pronunciation is one of the causes of errors to be looked into in the spellings of the students. Individual student's competence in spelling is seen to play a big role in the spelling errors committed by the students. Again, the degree of exposure of the learner to the L2, judging by the level of study of the students, prove to be a stronger point for less responses of the 4th level students to teacher-induced pronunciation errors.

Keywords: *Error analysis, transfer of training, intralingual errors, interlingual errors, induced errors*

Introduction

Errors are a crucial part of language acquisition and learning. They are milestones and hurdles that must be crossed over on ones way to acquiring and learning languages. Errors are systematic; they are conscious and not correctible by those who commit them even when they are drawn to the ill-realized forms. Errors are seen to be informed by the interference of mother tongue (MT) structures with the structures of the second language (L2) (interlingual errors) (Lado, 1957), the complexities of the second language (L2 henceforth) which is captured as intralingual errors (Corder, 1967; Richard, 1971) and developmental errors which Kim (2009, p.14) sees as that which occurs when a learner attempts to build up hypothesis about the target language based on the limited knowledge the learner has of the L2. Stenson (1974; 1983) introduces another error known as induced errors which are seen as an error resulting from the incorrect instruction and instructional materials of the L2. Stenson (1983), AbiSamra (2003), Dinter (2004), note that induced errors are of various types; material-induced, teacher-talk deficiencies, exercise-based, pedagogical or methodological priorities and look-up induced errors.

This paper looks at teacher-talk induced error which is a major focus on the pronunciation influence of the teacher on the spellings of the students of Linguistics department, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. Homophonous words are lexical items that are not spelt alike but they have similar pronunciation. Near homophonous words are lexical items that are not spelt alike but their pronunciations sound alike. These two word forms in the English language have contributed largely to the errors in the pronunciation and spellings of words by the L2 learner. It is observed that homophonous and near homophonous words ill-realizations are also common among the teachers of the L2 which can influence the use of the L2 by the learner. As a result, this paper sets out to address the problem of induced errors resulting from ill-pronunciation of homophonous and seeming near homophonous words by the teacher. The general objective of this paper is to establish the fact that teacher-induced errors influence the written language of the learner and user of the English language. The specific objectives are: to know if the pronunciation of words by the teacher influences the spelling errors of the students significantly even when the words are contextualized (used in a sentence suggesting the word choice) and to know if it is an inherent spelling challenge of individual students.

Review of Literature/framework

Error analysis (EA) was introduced by Stephen Pit Corder in 1967. It became an alternative to contrastive analysis which was a theoretical framework suggested by Fries (1945) and improved upon by Lado (1957).

Contrastive analysis is a behaviourist tool that is based on the assumption that “in the course of language learning, L1 learning habits will be transferred into L2 learning habits” (UKEssays, 2015, p.1). This implies the mapping of the mother tongue (MT) or native language (NL) structures on L2 structures or the transfer of or interference of structures of MT with the structures of the L2. They believe that this was the major cause of error in the learning of the L2. Therefore, CA was used to compare and contrast the structures of the MT and L2 structures to draw out areas of similarities which are captured as facilitators and areas of differences which are captured as difficulties in the learning of the L2. Since CA could not account for difficulties not stemming from structural differences of the MT and L2, Error analysis was proposed. Error analysis is used to account for many errors committed by the L2 learner which are not related to the NL or MT interference. Error analysis distinguishes between errors and mistakes. Errors are seen as failure resulting from competence in the L2 while mistakes are seen as failures in performance. According to Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2016), error analysis studies types and causes of language errors. According to Center for advanced Research on Language Acquisition CARLA (2016), error analysis is a method that documents errors that appear in learners’ language for the purpose of determining whether those errors are systematic and possibly explain their causes. Errors are seen to be classified thus: modality (level of proficiency, speaking, writing, reading and listening)- linguistic levels (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, style), -form (omission, insertion substitution) – type (systematic errors/errors in competence is occasional errors, errors in performance; - cause (e.g interlingual, intralingual) and -norm (that deals with the system), (Wikipedia, 2016).

Corder (1967;1974) acknowledges three stages of EA: -data collection: the stage at which idiosyncrasies are recognised; - description: accounting for the idiosyncratic dialect and –explanation: giving reasons why those idiosyncrasies are observed. Wikipedia (2016) further advanced the steps of EA as: - collecting samples of learner language; -identifying the errors- describing the errors; explanation of errors; evaluating/ correction of the errors. Selinker (1972) notes that there are five sources of errors: - language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication and overgeneralisation of target language (TL). In Corder (1974, p. 130), some of the sources of errors identified are language transfer, overgeneralisation or analogy and methods or materials used in teaching (teaching-induced error). James (1998) recognizes three main diagnosis-based categories of errors. They include: 1. Interlingual errors stemming from MT interferences 2. Intralingual based errors which he subdivided into: learning strategy-based errors and communication strategy-based errors and 3. Induced errors. Since, error analysis identifies and describes errors; it will be needful to know scholars’ opinion of errors. Errors according to UKEssays (2015) are seen as the integral parts of language acquisition. They are seen as deviations from language rules and standards which reflect the learner’s deficiencies in the competence of the language. Selinker (1969) notes that errors are important because they: - are indicators of the learners’ progress in the learning of the L2; - provide insights as to how languages are learnt; - create room for the learner to evaluate himself and improve on the L2 learning. Types of errors abound. Performance and competence errors are identified by Corder (1967). Performance errors are unsystematic deviations from the norm of a language. They are usually associated with exhaustion or hurry. Again, they are seen as mistakes made and can be corrected by the person who made them. Competence errors are systematic deviations from the norms of a language. Touchie (1986, p. 76) notes that they are the reflection of the inadequate learning of the L2 by the L2 learner. Gefen (1979) in this same light says that competence errors result from inadequacies in the competence of the L2, while performance errors which are mistakes are as a result of lapses in the performance of the L2. Burt and Kiparsky (1974) differentiate between local and global errors. Local errors are deviations where communication and understanding of the meaning of an utterance are not affected while in global errors, deviations from the norm of the language interrupts meaning of utterance. Touchie (1986, p.78) notes that examples of local errors can include noun and verb inflections, the wrong placement of articles, prepositions and auxiliaries while global errors can be the wrong arrangement of words in a sentence. Richards (1971) notes that the causes of competence errors include interference (which reflects the use of elements from one language to another), intralingual errors which is further subdivided into overgeneralisation, ignorance of rules restriction, incomplete application of rules and false concept hypothesized, and thirdly, developmental errors- this happens when a learner builds a hypothesis about the L2 on limited knowledge. Schachter and Celce- Murcia (1977) see intralingual and developmental errors as one and the same thing, especially since they adopt the same procedure. Touchie (1986) adopting Schachter and Celce-Murcia’s (1977) merger classification observes that the causes of errors are errors due to the influence of the NL introduced by Fries (1945) and Lado (1957) and intralingual and developmental errors which is informed by the difficulties of the second language. The intralingual and developmental errors

involve the same processes as simplification, overgeneralisation, hypercorrection, faulty teaching, fossilization, avoidance, inadequate learning and false concepts hypothesized. Of interest in this paper is faulty teaching which is sometimes, is seen as teacher-induced errors. Stenson (1983), Touchie (1986) and James (1998) note that this is usually caused by the teacher, teaching materials, or the order of presentation (which Stenson captures as the way a teacher arranges practices).

Induced-errors was proposed by Stenson, in the year 1974 which he notes results from incorrect instruction of the language. According to Sompong (2014, p.120), induced errors are errors that result from “being misled by the way in which the teachers give definitions, examples, explanations and arrange practice opportunities.” It is caused by the teaching and the processes it involves.

Choroleeva (n.d) identifies and defines forms of induced errors.

- material-induced errors: teaching materials with errors will make the learners confused, and they will commit similar errors again and again.
- teacher-talk induced error: this kind of errors might be caused by both native or non-native teachers if they do not provide models of the standard target language in class.
- exercise-based induced errors: the learners commit errors while doing exercises on sentence combining for example, the teacher feeds to the learners the raw materials for them to generate compound and complex sentences. If not properly understood, it can bring about errors.
- errors induced by pedagogical priorities: learners’ achievement tends to match other teacher expectations of what they will achieve. Some teachers choose to prioritize one of the following: accuracy, fluency or the idiomatic in teaching communication, thus if fluency is considered as superior, accuracy would have lower priority or vice versa.
- look-up errors: there are many learners’ dictionaries and grammar books in recent years and these publications usually come with useful guidelines on how to look up aspects of the L2 about which one is in doubt. If instructions are not adhered to by the learner, the learner may be misguided and will not be far from committing errors.

Stenson (1983, p.256) says induced errors are learner errors that “result more from the classroom situation than from either the students’ incomplete competence in the target language grammar (inralingual errors) or first language interference (interlingual errors).” Kim (2009) believes that induced error though a source of error, it is difficult to distinguish induced errors from interlingual and intralingual errors.

Phonological-induced errors according to Choroleeva (n.d), is one that manifests from wrong pronunciation and intonation. This may be informed by none observance of vowel length, voice and voiceless segments, word stress etc. Non- adherences to these rules may lead to meaning differentiation function as it is with the example stated by Chololeeva- live/leave, leave/leaf, exit (n.)/exit (v) etc. It is in the light of this explanation that we examine the manifestations of teacher-induced pronunciation errors on the spellings of the language students of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Methodology

A survey design is adopted in this paper. Two dictation tests were conducted by the L2 teacher. The test contained sentences where words with homophonous implications and near homophonous implications were used to generate sentences that may suggest the right orthographical spelling based on contextual usage. The first test contained eighteen sentences while the second test contained fifteen sentences. The dictation tests were administered to the 400, 300, 200 and 100 level students. 20 of which were purposively sampled in each class for the collection of data. So the sample size of this study is 80 students of the department of Linguistics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Spelling errors were identified, classified and explained descriptively in line with the objectives of the paper. No basic teaching process was carried out because the students have been exposed to the English language being their lingua franca as well as their official language. This invariably makes it the language of instruction from the primary levels to the tertiary institutions in the country. Also, being a multilingual nation, it is expected that an average Nigerian makes use of the English language in his day to day activity.

The words of interest are transcribed based on the received version contained in the Longman dictionary. Also, the teacher’s realizations of the words are transcribed to check for induced pronunciation errors on the spellings of the students.

Data presentation and analysis

Table 1: First test

S/N	Choice words and their transcriptions	Homophones of Choice words	Near homophones resulting from erroneous usage	L2 teachers pronunciation	students spelling or realization	Induced errors (IE)
1	Been /bin/	Bin	Being	/bin/	being (4) been (76)	-
2	Being /bi:ŋ/	-	Been	/biin/	being(68), been(10), begin(1) bieng(1)	-
3	Brake /breik/	Break	-	/brek/	brake (46), break(34)	IE
4	Weather /weə/	Whether	-	/weda/	wender(1) wether(2) wheather(2) wither(2) whether(8) weater(1) wilder(1), welther(1), wealthier(1), wheather(6), weather(49)	-
5	Pisses /pɪsɪs/	Pieces, peace's	-	/pisis/	Peases(1), pices(1), peaces(1), pissing(1), piceses(1), pisses(1), pisses(50)	IE mildly significant
6	Stock broker /stɔ:k brəukə/	Stork	Stalk Brocker	/stək broka/	Stop(3), stalk(3), stork(1), stoke(1) stock(72) Broker (65), brocker(6), brooker(1), brocher(1), procar(1), rocker (2), broaker(2), blocker(1), broacher(1),	-
7	Wretched /retʃɪd/	-	-	/retʃeed/	Reched(4), reched (1), recheared(1), wrenched(1), reched(4), wreched(3) rached(1), retched(1), wercthed(1), reacherd (3), recheard(1), rechaired(1) recheered(1), riched(1), reached(2) rachard(1), rehead(1), rechealed(2), Wreached(2), wretched(1), wretchet(1), wretched(46)	IE present but mildly significant
8	Outweighs /autweiz/	Out ways	-	/autweiz/	Out weights(3), far aways(14), far away (6), at ways(2), outweigh(2), upways(1), out way(1) outways(12) awaits(1) awarts(1), outweighs (37)	IE significant
9	Future /fju:tʃə/	-	Feature	/fiʃə/	Feature(3), picture(1), future(76)	-
10	Alighted /əlaɪtɪd/	-	A lite	/alaɪted/	Highlighted(3), alighted(1), highlited(1), enlightened(1), enlighten(1) enlightened(2) lited(1), alighted(70)	-
11	Hole /həʊl/ & their /ðaɪə/	Whole	There	/hol/ & /deɪə/	whole(2), hole(78) their(76) Thier(1), there(1), the(2)	-
12	Once/wʌns/ & there/ðeə/	Ones	Their	/wans/	Once(78), ones(2) & there (78), their(2)	-

13	Most /məʊst/	-	Must	/most/	Must(2), most(78)	-
14	Clenched /klenʃɪd/ & fist /fɪst/	-	Feast	/klenʃɪd/ &/fɪst/	Clenched(1), clinged(1), clinched(1), clenched(3), clenched(1), clatched(1), clainsted(1), clenched(1), clinched(1), cleanch(1), kreched(1) Clenched(67) Feast(8), feet(5) fist(67)	IE present but insignificant
15	Heely /hi:l/	-	Hilly	/hili/	Hilly(31), heel(4), heelly(5), helley(1), hilling(1), heely(38)	IE significant
16	Chose /ʃəʊz/	-	Choose	/ʃos/	Choose(24), chosed(3), choosed(4), choos(1), chose(48)	IE present but very significant
17	Bleat /bli:t/	-		/blit/	Blist(1), breeds(1), bleet(4), bleets(3), split(2), bleeth(1), spleets(1), bleds(1), breath(1), bleads(1), blits(3), blirts(1), bleeds(2), meet(1), leaped(1), lits(1), licked(1), bleat(58)	IE present not significant
18	Break /breɪks/	Brake	-	/breks/	Brakes(4), brake(1), breakes(3), breaks(72)	IE present though not significant

Table 2: Second test

The symbol ‘-’ is used to show that induced error does not influence the spelling of the choice words by the students.

1	Seize /si:z/	Sees, seas	Cease	/siz/	Sees(1), cease(32), sieze(11), seise(1) see(1), size(1), seeze(1), case(1), seize(31)	IE very significant
2	Hail /heil/	Hale	-	/heel/	Hill(22), hale(5), hills(4), hell(3), heel(3), hey(1), hair(1), hairs(1), hail(40)	IE present significant
3	Least /li:st/	-	List	/list/	List(8) lease(2) least(70)	IE present not significant
4	Rises /raɪzɪs/	-	Raises	/raɪzɪz/	Raises(2), rises(78)	-
5	Whose/hu:z/ & wheels /wi:ls/	Who’s & wills	-	/huuz/& /wils/	Who’s(4), whose(1), whose (75)& weens(1), wills(1), wings(1), wheeles(1), wheels (76)	-
6	Curses/kɜ:sɪs/	-	courses, causes	/kɜ:sɪs/	Causes(12), cause (3) courses(1), courses (5), caused(1), curses(58)	IE not significant
7	Right /raɪt/	Write	Wright	/raɪt/	wright(5), right(75)	-
8	Strait /stret/	Straight	-	/stret/	Strent(1), straight(30), strict(2) strite(5), street(9), stright(6), stride(4), striped(1), streets(3), steert (1), treat(1), stra(1),	IE present but influenced by wrong usage of homophones

					strate(1), strife(1) strait(1) strait(13)	
9	Parse /pa:z/		Pass	/pas/	Pass(35), pars(2), parts(6), passe(1) pack(1) parse(35)	IE very significant
10	Seals/si:ls/	Ceil	Sills	/sils/	Sil(1), sills(1) series(1) seals(2) seals(75)	-
11	Scenes/si:ns/	Seen	Since, sins	/sins/	Seen(1), scences(3), sences(1), scence(1), sceens(1), scenes(73)	-
12	Wade/wei:d/	Weighed	-	/weed/	Wed(1), weild(1), way(6), weighed(24), weed(1), weird(1), waved(1), wight(1), whales(3), wave(2), whealed(2), whealed(2), weighs(1), weigh(2), wale(2), wails(1), wetin(1), weary(1), whealed,(3), weighing(1), wield(1), waled(1), whale(1) wade(20)	IE significant
13	Cease /si:s/		Seize, Sees, seas	/siz/	Seize(13), sieze(4), size(1), ceased(1) case(1), cease(60)	IE very mildly significs
14	Hails /heils/	Hales	-	/hels/	hailed(2), hells(1), hails(77)	-
15	Shearing/ʃiəriŋ/	-	Sharing, sheering	/jeerin/	Sharing(56), sheering(4), shering(1), rearing(1), shearing(18)	IE very significant

Explanation of the contents of the tables

The tables (1 & 2) above highlight the choice words, their homophones and words that are erroneously pronounced like them by the teacher who is a second language user of the English language. The dictionary transcriptions as well as the teacher's pronunciations are also brought to the fore for a clearer analysis. The sixth roll provides the responses of the students to the dictation of the teacher in written form. The numbers by the side of the spellings are indicators of the number of times a spelling occurred.

Discussions

From tables (1) and (2) above, the paper notes that the choice words are thirty eight in number and out of the thirty eight, eighteen have overt teacher pronunciation influence. Though the frequency of teacher-induced pronunciation error is not up to a half (nineteen) of the choice words chosen for this study, the number of times it occurred shows a mild significant influence on the spelling errors of the students. This means that the teachers' pronunciations are crucial in the learning of the L2 and may influence the students negatively or positively. In most of the instances, it brought about a negative inducement, but one major positive inducement is seen in table 1 number 18 'break.'

In the first test, the pronunciation of words like, 'heely', 'wretched', 'pisses', 'outweighs' and 'brake' generated a lot of spelling errors and erroneous homophonous words in place of the choice words. With the words used in contextual sentence forms for such common words as 'wretched and outweighs' one will expect that the students will be conversant with the words having been exposed to the English language for a long time. The paper finds out so many wrong spellings of these words. In the case of the word 'heely', the shortening of the lengthened vowel suggested the widely accepted choice of 'hilly' by the students. Again, the choice of 'break' over 'brake' even when used in contest can be said to be induced by the teachers pronunciation and also by the fact that the students are not conversant with vehicle parts to know that the 'brakes' are spelt differently from the 'breaking' of house wares or 'break' associated with time. 'Break' and 'brake' are only homophones but they are not etymologically related.

In table (2), words such as 'shearing', 'strait', 'wade', 'parse' and most surprisingly 'seize' and 'hail' had the highest occurring number of spelling errors and erroneous homophonous replacements. Even though sheep shearing is not a common activity in the South eastern Nigeria, it exists in literature and as a result should have been a familiar phrase to the students in their readings. The word 'parse' had its highest error occurrence in 200 and 100 levels. This may be so informed because these levels of students have not

come across the word. The 400 and 300 levels have come across the word and so were not taken aback by its contextual usage.

From the above, the paper observes just as Kim (2009) says that there is no clear cut distinction between induced errors and the other causes of errors, interlingual and intralingual and developmental errors. It is seen that these errors induced by the teacher's pronunciation resulted due to his transfer of native language (NL) features into the target language, which invariably, affected his students. Also, in the case of the difficulties in the L2; the teacher may adopt simplification strategies as it is the case with number 15 on table (2). The diphthong /ɪə/ in 'shearing' is simplified by the adoption of the middle vowel /e/ by the teacher. This largely influenced the students' choice of the word 'sharing'. These results show that teacher-pronunciation influences students to a good extent.

Table showing frequency of spelling errors by the students in the first test

Table 3: Spelling errors for the first test by levels

Level of study	Number of spelling errors
400	71
300	112
200	93
100	95
Total	317

Table 4: Table showing frequency of errors by the students in the second test

Level of study	Number of spelling errors
400	85
300	111
200	109
100	110
Total	405

Table 5: Spelling errors as informed by Individuals students' competence

400 level	First test	Second test	300 level	First test	Second test	200 Level	First test	Second test	100 Level	First test	Second test
Students s/n	Errors	Errors	Students s/n	Errors	Errors	Students s/n	Errors	Errors	Students s/n	Errors	Errors
1	10	8=18	1	2	3=5	1	4	4=8	1	6	5=11
2	6	8=14	2	7	2=9	2	1	5=6	2	4	4=8
3	2	3=5	3	6	4=10	3	2	3=5	3	5	3=8
4	Nil	2=2	4	3	5=8	4	2	2=4	4	4	5=9
5	Nil	4=4	5	11	11=22	5	1	4=5	5	3	4=7
6	5	4=9	6	11	8=19	6	4	5=9	6	6	6=12
7	2	3=5	7	7	6=13	7	7	8=15	7	1	5=6
8	5	5=10	8	5	4=9	8	7	10=17	8	Nil	2=2
9	5	3=8	9	1	4=5	9	5	5=10	9	6	8=14
10	Nil	4=4	10	9	6=15	10	5	10=15	10	5	8=13
11	1	4=5	11	3	4=7	11	6	7=13	11	1	4=5
12	2	4=6	12	1	5=6	12	11	7=17	12	4	6=10
13	3	2=5	13	1	1=2	13	4	5=9	13	2	6=8
14	6	4=10	14	9	6=15	14	3	6=9	14	6	6=12
15	1	3=4	15	6	7=13	15	7	1=8	15	5	9=14
16	8	8=16	16	2	2=4	16	3	4=7	16	5	3=8
17	nil	3=3	17	9	7=16	17	6	6=12	17	7	8=15
18	9	6=15	18	12	9=21	18	1	6=7	18	7	6=13
19	3	7=10	19	6	5=11	19	5	5=10	19	6	5=11
20	3	2=5	20	10	6=16	20	9	7=16	20	12	7=19

The tables (3) and (4) show that the number of errors committed by the students in the first and second dictation tests is on the high side. In the first test, the number of errors was 317 and 405 is the number of errors for the second test. The results on the tables (3) and (4) show that the 300 level students committed more spelling and word choice errors than the other levels of study. From table (5), we see that this is because of the individual students' spelling competences.

In table (5) above, we observe that the level of students with the highest number of errors is the 300 level students. Student number 5, 6, 10, 14, 18, and 20 committed 22, 19, 15, 15, 21 and 16 errors respectively in the sum of the first and second dictation tests. This shows that they have problems in the spelling of the English words aside the test given to them for this analysis. Judging by individual students' show of competence, the 100 level had just two students committing errors that exceeded 14, followed by 400 level students who had three students committing above 14 errors. From this, the paper observes that besides teacher-induced pronunciation errors, individual students' competence level in spelling and choice of diction may also contribute to spelling errors.

Table (3) and (4) show that the 100 level students are the next with the highest number of spelling errors. They are followed by the 200 level students and lastly, the final year students who showed by their performance(s), that exposure to the L2 and the knowledge of the L2 vocabulary prevails over the teachers pronunciation-induced errors.

Conclusion and recommendations

The paper, from the findings, concludes that teacher-induced pronunciation errors influence students spelling errors to a significant extent (though not measured mathematically), and as a result, it should be classified as one of the major causes of spelling errors in students' writing besides interlingual, intralingual errors and developmental errors. In as much as the above prevails, individual student's spelling competences contribute to the spelling errors observed besides teacher-induced errors. Some of the spellings observed in table (1) and (2) do not show MT interference, difficulties associated with L2 and developmental errors nor induced errors. They are indications of students' incompetence in the spelling of words in the L2. With regard to the level of study, exposure to lexical items in the target language may aid in the improvement in the spellings of students, as it is with the word 'parse' which a good number of the 400 and 300 level students spelt correctly because they have recently come in contact with the word. To solve the problems of induced errors, this study suggests that second language English teachers should come to terms with the fact that they are not above errors and error corrections. When a language teacher acknowledges this, he or she has taken a very huge step to making himself teachable. With the use of smart phones and applications for the learning of the Received Pronunciation of the English sounds, teachers can learn the Received Pronunciation for a better delivery of their lectures or teaching. Constant drill and practice sessions should be adopted by the teacher to ensure that his pronunciation and accent are improved upon. There is the need to get enrolled in online pronunciation courses, especially courses that evaluate ones competence and performance. Finally, in every-day-to-day communication there is the need to grow in confidence with the use of the learnt Received Pronunciation because 'practice' they say makes perfect.

With respect to the students, dictations should be carried out constantly to assess the students on their spelling abilities. Drills and practices on how to pronounce sounds should be carried out constantly. In-class-assessment-reading-comprehension should be incorporated in phonetics and phonology classes. The use of smart phones for gaining the pronunciation skills could be advanced by the teacher to make learning easier and faster for the students; and this should be done under the supervision of the teacher. When the above are done constantly, spelling errors will gradually be eliminated.

The paper recommends that a study of this sort should adopt a quantitative approach so as to make it more objective. Further, studies can look into students' speech as influenced by teacher talk-induced errors.

References

- AbiSamra, N. (2003). *An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers' English Writings*. American University of Beirut. <http://abisamra03.tripod.com/nada/languageacq-erroranalysis.html> Assessed 3-12-16.
- Burt, M. & Kiparsky, C. (1974). Global and local mistakes. In J. Schumann and N. Stenson (Eds.) *New frontiers in second language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishing Inc.
- CARLA Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (2016). Overview of error analysis. University of Minnesota. www.carla.umn.edu/learnerlanguage/error_analysis.html assessed 3-12-16.
- Choroleeva, K. (n.d). Language transfer: Types of linguistic errors committed by francophones learning English as a second foreign language. Retrieved on www.hltmag.co.uk/oct09/mart02.rt. Assessed on 3-12-16.
- Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In J. P. B. Allen and S. P. Corder (Eds.) *Techniques in applied linguistics (Edinburgh course in applied linguistics 3)*. London: Oxford University press. 122-154.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. In J. C. Richards (Ed.) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman. 19-27.
- Dinter, A. (2004). *Induced errors - sources and pedagogical deductions*. Munich: GRIN Verlag
- Fries, C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- Gefen, R. (1979). The analysis of pupils' errors. *English teachers Journal*, 22 16-24.
- James, C. (1998). Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. London: Longman.
- Kim, D. H. (2009). A study on the use of lexical collocations of Korea heritage learners: identifying the sources of errors. A thesis of the University of Southern California.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 25, 204-219.
- Schachter, J. & Celce Murcia, M. (1977). Some rem-vations conceining error analysis. *TESOL Quarterly* 1, 11(4), 441 -451.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL)*, 10 (3), 209-231.
- Selinker, L. (1969). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 3, 114-132.
- Sompong, M. (2014). Error analysis. *Thammasat Review*, 16(2), 109-127.
- Stenson, N. (1983). Induced errors. In B.W. Robinett & J. Schachter (eds), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis and related aspects*. (pp. 256-71). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Stenson N. (1974). Induced errors. In J. Schumman and N. Stenson (Eds.) *New frontiers in second language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishing Inc.
- Touchie, H. Y. (1986). Second language learning errors their types, causes and treatement. *Jalt Journal*, 8, (1) 75-80.
- UKessays (2015). Source of errors in language learning research English language essay. Assessed 3-12-16.
- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2016). Error analysis (linguistics). [http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Error_analysis_\(linguistics\)](http://en.wikipedia/wiki/Error_analysis_(linguistics)) assessed 3-12-16.