

# Language Teachers and Teachers' Language: A Study of Communicative Skills of Selected Nigerian University Lecturers

Anana Mariam, Ph.D

Mountain Top University  
Department of Languages  
Lagos-Ibadan Expressway  
Kilometre 12, Prayer-City  
Mowe  
Ogun State, Nigeria

[meanana@mtu.edu.ng](mailto:meanana@mtu.edu.ng)

## Abstract

Language teachers and teachers' language are very necessary in developing and building /molding the entire lifestyles of students in and out of every academic environment. Their language can make or mar the understandings of the learners. Teachers generally are the audio-visuals that students at all levels emulate; their language is always accepted completely by some students (especially students at the lower levels). Without them academic activities cannot be successful. Also, where there are scarcities of language teachers; and teachers, unable to speak appropriately, the whole educational system will suffer a colossal loss and by extension, the society will be groping in total darkness (i.e. backward at all spheres of human life). This study therefore investigates language teachers and teachers' language in Nigerian universities. Data were sourced from lectures, teachers' interactions at meetings, workshops, seminars, messages from lecturers' WhatsApp groups and conferences. This study adopts Error Analysis and Symbolic Interactionism as its theoretical frameworks. One of the major findings is that teachers' language has duplicating effects and indelible imprints on the lives of the students; therefore, teachers should recognise who they are and use language appropriately for effective communication.

*Keywords:* Language, language teachers, symbolic interactionism, audio-visuals, communication

## 1. Introduction

Every teacher speaks a language or languages in and out of the classrooms. The language of a teacher has the capacity to influence people (especially students positively or negatively; and to make or destroy people, things, events, etc. depending on how the teacher uses it in every

communicative event. A language is a potent tool in teaching and learning; it is a “system of producing meaningful and coherent expressions by a speech community for communication purposes” (Nwala & Obisike, 2014). It is “the teacher’s basic tool” (Johnson) in disseminating information and dissecting ideas to the learners and others in and out of the classrooms. It is also “a communication tool” (Rabiah, 2012), a verbal symbol for everyone in their day-to-day interactions and transactions. There is no effective teaching without language (oral, written or sign). The major agents in language usage are the language teachers.

Language teachers, as custodians of effective language usage; they employ language in teaching (either directly or indirectly), hence the indispensability of language teachers and teachers’ language in teaching and learning. They (language teachers) are professionals who are vast in the language they use. They are the engine houses of every educational activity and educational system in the world. Show me where teachers are not needed in the affairs of mankind, and I will show you where errors are predominant and progress retarded. Teachers teach in and out of classrooms using language. In other words, the business of a language teacher is to teach language and to use language in teaching.

Teaching is very necessary for a society that aspires to move forward. It is “a form of interaction, a particular exchange of knowledge, skills, and understanding (Pollard et al 2005: 294). It is the “teacher’s planned activities to create an ever-lasting change in the learners’ behavior which is done in the form of a mutual relationship” (Bambaeero & Shokrpour 2017). It is what leads to a seemingly permanent change in individuals and groups of people in the society.

It, therefore, becomes necessary for teachers to be very conscious of the language they use in teaching. They have to master the intricacies, components, use, and functions of the language they use. Besides these, language teachers have to realize who they are, understand the learners and their characteristics and idiosyncrasies, the learning environments (physical, temporal and psychological); and master the subjects, topics, strategies and methods that should be adopted for individual classes.

Different classes require different communication skills that are suitable to the classes in question. Besides this, teaching in today’s educational system should be student-centred. This negates the operations in most traditional classrooms where teachers dominate classroom discourses. Walsh 2006 observes that teachers’ talk constitutes  $\frac{2}{3}$  of classroom speech. Teachers’ language is very necessary for determining the outcome of students’ performance in and outside classrooms. According to Adeleke et al (2022), one of the indices that determines teachers’ effectiveness is communication skills. In the same way, Najafi (2013) affirms that one of the major characteristics of a good teacher is possessing communication skills.

For effective communication (to occur), the teachers are supposed to understand the language system (the grammar, phonology, semantics, morphology, etc.) of the language they used, each student they teach, their levels of understanding, the appropriate time for their receptions; disengage in winding oral presentations, boring and uninteresting messages; and teach when they have actually understood what they want to teach and how they want to teach it. Besides these, the teacher’s non-verbal language such as facial expressions, eye contact, body language, dressing, and paralinguistic cues (such as the volume, rate, body, pitch, etc.),

knowledge of the world (and culture) and their reasoning are very necessary in and out of the classrooms.

The language a teacher uses is infectious; it possesses the capacity to influence the learners greatly. The teachers are the language they teach; in other words, the level of the teacher's comprehension of the language they teach is what the teachers gives out to the students and others. Therefore, language teachers are supposed to master the communicative skills of the language they teach (Sari 2016). Errors, if at all they occur should be very minimal mainly based on the phonological realisations and not syntactic or sematic. Phonological, due to mother tongue (MT) interference. In other words, there errors that are noticeable in teachers' interactive events.

Although errors are permissible in the course of the learners' attempt to acquire a second language; because they "allow for prediction of the difficulties involved in acquiring a second language." (Khansir, 2012: 1029); and are unavoidable and necessary part of learning (Chomsky (1990 as cited in Chelli, 2013), teachers are expected to avoid errors by all means. Again, errors are said to help in designing remedial exercises and focus of "trouble spot" (Khanksir). Richards et al (1992) also state that the study of errors are useful in: (i) identifying the strategies that learners used in language teaching; (ii) identifying the causes of learner's errors and lastly (3) obtaining information on common difficulties in language learning .

Although teachers are supposed not to commit errors, some teachers still made both 'avoidable and unavoidable errors.'" Teachers' errors are unintentionally committed; this affirms (James 1998)'s observation that errors are made "only when there was no intention to commit one". No good teacher will want to misinform the learners, transfer errors to them, or be ridiculed in the course of his/her communication by those who actually understand the said errors he or she has committed. He/she should have understood the generational effects of how his or her name will have gossiped from one class to the other when the correct version of "infected communication" is exposed.

This work adopts Error Analysis (EA) and Symbolic Interactionism (SI) as its theoretical framework. EA deals with errors committed mainly by learners in the course of their learning. This is the major theoretical framework of this study. SI is a complementary theory; it is based on three major principles, namely: meaning, language, and thinking. Meaning is reciprocal; language is said to provide symbols for meaning and thinking which changes people's interpretations of symbols.

Pit Corder is the founder of EA. According to Corder (1973) there are two major objectives of EA: theoretical and applied. The theoretical-based objective helps learners to understand what they learn while the applied-based objective is to help the learners to learn their Target language (TL) appropriately; and for errors in L2 to be identified. After the identification, teachers of English as Second Language/English (ESL) or as a Foreign Language (EFL) will swing into action; Al-Khreshh 2011 maintains that this will help ESL/EFL teachers to pinpoint "students' weaknesses and revise their teaching methods and learning materials" (50). The question is, what if the teachers themselves cannot identify students' weaknesses (errors); who is going to correct these errors?

The aforementioned point will present an unfortunate situation if not addressed urgently. Teachers (especially the language teachers) are to wake up and endeavor to be equal to the task.

They have to braze up to disapprove Selinker's (1975)'s statement (which tallies with the researchers) that some teachers still commit both interlingual and intralingual errors in their daily interactions with students and others. Overgeneralization, ignorance of syntactic, phonological, morphological, semantic, pragmatics and discourse rules still permeate and replete the communicative events of some teachers. Abrusan (2019) calls these linguistics "abnormities," "weirdness" (320) and considers only three namely: ungrammaticality, semantic anomaly and pragmatic infelicity. These and many other errors are supposed to be avoided by teachers.

It, therefore, becomes very necessary for teachers to consciously work on their communication and language skills with a view to enhancing their communicative competence and enabling them to effectively transmit error-free communicative events to students and others. By so doing, they will be able to correct the mistakes and errors of students when they occur; hence the need for this research.

## **2. Language Teachers: Their Identity and capacity**

Language teachers are tutors, teachers, and lecturers that teach any language in the world, such as Greek, Latin, French, English, Arabic, Hebrew, etc. Khatri & Chauhan (2014) posit that out of the language in the world, English is the most widely spread language (in the world). Every language teacher is expected to understand the language he/she teaches; the teacher is not supposed to be a novice in it. Language teachers are supposed to know who they are, their belief system, values, capability, behavioural pattern, environment, and contexts of teaching.

Every teacher is a language teacher because language is embedded in the concepts, context, and big ideas across all subject areas (Miller, ). In this context, every teacher uses language (oral, written or sign) to communicate with others. Again, a teacher's language is an exemplary language, every student is expected to imitate the language of a teacher because it is believed that he/she "knows" what he/she sends out to the students.

Language teachers are powerful agents in transacting all human activities therefore, abnormalities and deviants should be eliminated in their day-to-day communication so that one will not waste time ruminating over what others are trying to say. At least if non-experts are doing so, teachers should not join them. If there are mistakes, slips and lapses in their communication, teachers should immediately identify them and correct them as soon as possible.

Besides these, they (language teachers) are expected to adopt teaching methods that are suitable to the learners; suitability entails that the learners understand what and how they are taught. Some of these teaching methods are the Direct Method, Reform Movement, The Audio-Visual Method, The Situational Approach, the Functional Approach and the Communicative Approach. Teachers can also use a combined method but should ensure that their teaching is student-centred and should be blended, (Information and Communication Technology (ICT) should play a major function in today's education.

## 2.1. Characteristics and Roles of Language Teachers

Language teachers play multiple roles both in and outside their classrooms. Competent language teachers are the admirers of every educated person especially students who look up to become like them. They are “facilitator of learning” (Littlewood 1981 as cited in Choudhury, 2011). This includes teachers’ sub-roles such as the overseers, classroom managers, consultants, advisers and a co-communicators. A teacher is a controller, organizer, assessor, prompter, participant, resource, tutor and observer (Brown & Harmer, 2007). Also, teachers are said to be motivators, organisers, conversational partners, supporters, proficient, knowledgeable interlocutors (Van den Branden 2009).

Considering the role of the teacher in the classroom, Levinsen (2007) avers that teachers should be able to organise their courses according to different conditions (subject domains, group sizes and variations within communication and interaction. They are said to act as guides, facilitators, and counselors (Brown, 2000, Richards & Rogers, 2001). They have to ensure that the competence and the performance of students based on the language they taught the learners are achieved. These can be achieved by both formal and informal teaching and corrections in and out of the classes. Language serves as personal and private identity (Sabiah, 2012) to everyone especially the teachers.

It is worth adding that the teacher’s language is directional; students are meant to do things with them. Their language leads people (especially students) to where to go, what to do, and how to do them. Since they had been taught effectively, appropriately, consistently, holistically, earnestly and realistically, to earn the title (TEACHER), the language of a good teacher easily gives directives to the learners and other listeners.

In addition, teachers’ language should be regulatory and not derogatory. Since many students spontaneously emulate the communicative patterns of the teachers, they (teachers) are supposed to “possess” good communicative competence and performance. Halliday, (2004) observes that this is an instrumental function of language. Besides these, teachers are not expected to use abusive, collusive and negative languages even when they are provoked. They should learn how to manage their emotions in the face of their provocations because these can also be imitated by the students and others.

Furthermore, teachers’ language are supposed to be factual; there should be a concretization of what they teacher says in both their formal and informal communicative events. The classroom should present an arena where facts are stated by all participants and the teachers should act as the first producers of these facts.

The teachers’ language system (pronunciation, grammar, semantics,) and paralanguage (voice, speed, mannerism, etc.) are very necessary in transfer of information to the students; therefore, the teachers’ linguistic and paralinguistic systems are to be of paramount concern to the teacher. He/she is expected to understand and use these rather than being an amateur in them.

## 2.2. Language Infelicities: Definitions and Types

Language infelicities are the linguistic abnormalities or deviances made by speakers especially second language learners. They are the “inappropriate and displeasing manner or style”, inconsistency, anomalies that speakers commit in the course of their communications. Adepoju (2019) avers that they are the irregularities in spelling and pronunciation inherent in communications of people.

In this study, language infelicities refer to errors committed by teachers in the course of their interactions. Although, it is not ideal for teachers to commit errors, I discover that in the course of their interactions, some teachers still commit both intralingual and interlingual errors. Interference, overgeneralization, transfer of L1 components and strategies to L2, spoonerism, lapses and slips are some major causes of linguistic infelicities prevalent in the language of teachers.

There are many types of infelicities; some are:

Syntactic Infelicities are grammatical errors that occur as a result of disagreement of the verbs with their subjects, passivity, overgeneralization Grapho-phonological Infelicities occurs where the written words and their pronunciation pose a barrier for the learner of the second language. Phonological Infelicities occur where the speakers find it difficult to pronounce the words in Semantic Infelicities occur where the speaker finds it difficult to understand what is in the target language.

## 2.3. Teachers' Language in a Multilingual Classroom

Teachers' language comprises both verbal and non-verbal forms. The Non-verbal communication skills, (sign language or silent language) include behaviours, “performed or perceived either consciously or unconsciously” (Bambaero & Shokrpour 2017). They (Bambaero & Shokpour) further maintain that the non-verbal communication is multifaceted, continuous and more reliable.

Teachers are expected to be proficient in their pronunciation, vocabularies, grammars, and semantics; and basically in all what they do with language. The oral and written language of an ideal teacher should be winsome. Also, his body language and paralinguistic cues such as voice (the volume, speed, intonation and breath) of the teacher should be effective. An effective teacher is one that is able to get students to understand what he/she teaches and come out with flying colours.

Teachers' language is a very powerful tool in deciding the direction and careers of the students they teach. Murfadila et al (n.d) maintain that teachers' language can be grouped into two broad forms: the interactional talks and the management talk. The interactional talks are manifested in discourse of teaching while the management talk is exhibited in organizing things.

## 2.4. Language and Communicative Skills of a Teacher

Language is the “most important and powerful set of conventional signs and symbols” (Alln & Brown 2002:2) that is solely humans. A fundamental human faculty used for the expressions of our thoughts and creation of ideas, mainly in face-to-face situations. Language is used in education, business transaction aviation, religion, business and all other fields of human endeavour. Without language, interactions of all sort become hellish.

It is also a verbal symbol that is used in communication, a process of sending and receiving verbal and non-verbal messages that attract feedback. Language and communication have skills that have been used interchangeably by some scholars. In other words, some communicators do not demarcate language skills from communication skills. Both language skills and communication skills are complementary but not the same.

Language skills are listening, speaking, reading and writing skills while communication skills are the capabilities that people have to communicate effectively with others. They are also additional skills such as body language, gestures, movements, and other paralinguistic cues. It is one thing for people to understand language skills and another thing to know how to apply both the language skills and communication skills in order to achieve appropriateness in communication.

Teachers are expected to acquire both language and communicative skills. Some communication skills of the teachers are the ability to learn and use students’ names, understand the likes and dislikes of the students, praise good work and offer instructive feedback and be observant of how they behave in classrooms (50 National University). Other communication skills of the teacher are the ability to arrange, organize, minister and advise the students and others appropriately.

An effective teacher is expected to master both language skills and communicative skills, and apply them where necessary.

## 2.5. Error Analysis

Stephen Peter Corder and his contemporaries propounded Error Analysis (EA) in the 1960s as a reaction to Contrastive Analysis which focuses on the analysis of two or more languages or sublanguage structures with a view to identifying their similarities and differences. Errors can be overt or covert; global or local (Brown 2000).

EA centres on the linguistic errors that second language learners made. It is based on the view that learners’ errors are caused by the universality of language techniques rather than what is inherent in the learners’ native languages. Be as it may, some scholars also believe that EA is caused by the persistent influence of MT on the target language.

Errors are foreign or deviated lexical elements transferred either from one’s native language (first language, L1) to a second language (L2) or a target language (TL); the interference of these deviated lexical items within the target language. Errors are both interlingual (errors made in the target language by the effect of MT) and intralingual (errors in the course of learning a TL). According to (Al-Khresheh, 2016) interlingual errors are errors

between languages, i.e. L1 and L2 while intralingual errors are those within a language, especially a target language; errors “caused by the impacts of NL or MT” (53). Explaining error types, Cameron (2001) states that interlingual errors can be order errors and agreement and dependence errors while

Equally, Richards (1974) identifies types of intralingual errors as overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of the rules, and false hypothesized concepts or semantic errors. According to Richards overgeneralization occurs when a learner constructs a deviated structure due to the experiences that the learner has on the structure of the target language; ignorance of role restriction is made by learners due to failure to observe existing structure; incomplete application of role exists when learners fail to fully develop certain structure necessary for the production of acceptable sentences and false concepts hypothesized take place when there is faulty comprehension of distinction in the target language.

In addition, an expansive view of error was presented by James (1998) in his book titled *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. James observes that there are four types of error namely, interlingual error, intralingual error, communicative strategy-based error and induced errors.

A number of factors are responsible for the occurrence of errors; some are quite confusing and seemingly unrealistic. According to Al-Mounla, 2002; Bataineh, 2005; Khammash and Roos 2002) fossilization and simplification are causes of the occurrence of errors. Without any explanation, Abisamra (2003) observes that age, modality, the succession of the appropriate system, the general increase of difficulties and sociolinguistic situations are the causes of errors. ;

Errors can be caused by four major factors namely intralingual, intralingual extralinguistic and intralinguistic factors (source: author). On the one hand, the extralinguistic factors are those outside the language such as the environment, social class, age, etc of the speaker as they affect the communication of the speakers. On the other hand, the interlinguistic factors are the language inherent factors such as the complexity of speaking, pronunciation, spelling system, morphological realisations, etc, of the language studied. James (1998) observes that errors occur “only when there was no intention to commit one (77).

The main criticism of EA Theory is presented by Schachter 1974) who observes that the theory has made no room for “avoidance phenomena”

## 2.6. Symbolic Interactionalism

Symbolic Interactionalism or symbolic interaction (SI) was coined by Herbert Blumer (Quist-Adade, 2019). It is the major framework in sociological theory (Crossman, 2020) which believes that man lives in both “the natural and the symbolic environment (Aksan, et al 2009: 902). Cartar and Fuller (2015) observe that SI is a micro-level theoretical perspective in Sociology that seeks to address how people “create and maintain society through face-to-face, repeated and meaningful interactions” (1). It developed through two historical periods: the Oral Period (OP) and the Age of Inquiry Period (AIP); the OP shows the era when George Herbert Mead was lecturing at the University of Chicago while the AIP period witnessed the age of George Herbert Blumer, Manford Khum, Robert Park, Albion Small, Peter Burgess ( Quist-Adade). During

this period (AIP), there were two competitive schools: the Chicago school led by Blumer and the Iowa School handled by Manford Khum. The two schools on IS agree on the fact that:

- Humans are symbols users
- Humans create their social world through interactions and role taking
- Interaction, humans and society are linked. (Quist-Adade, 18)

Although the interactionalists in these two schools have similar views, there are points of departure; while the Chicago school observes that individuals are “potentially spontaneous”, interactions, “constantly in the process of change” and organisations, “fluid and tenuous”; the Iowa School maintains that individual personality and social organization are “structured” and interactions, “constrained by these structures” (19). This work is premised on the two major concepts of Mead’s Symbolic Interaction. These are the concepts of symbols, what Mead calls “significant symbols,” and language

SI originated from Max Weber and was introduced into American Sociology by the American philosopher George Herbert Mead in the 1920s (Crossman 2020). It is associated with George Herbert Mead (1863–1931 and Max Weber (1864 –1920) (Nickerson 2021). SI basically explores pragmatism, social behaviourism, social behaviouralism and neo-hegelianism (Quist-Adeda, 2019, Carter & Fuller, 2015). SI focuses on language used in face-to-face repeated and meaningful interactions among participants in society. It considers society as a “product of shared symbol such as language (Nicherson). It centres on subjective meanings, and how people interpret society; and this is known as the “definition of situations.” (Crossman).

It (SI) also considers meaning-related communication: meaning developed according to the things that proposed them, meaning inferred through interactions, and meaning changed within its interpretive process. Humans are said to form meanings as a result of their own experiences (Aksan, et al, 2009:904).

It is worth adding that these two theories have been criticized by scholars. One of the major criticisms of EA is that it gathers “knowledge of language learning processes by examining the learner’s output (Glottopedia). It is also hard to differentiate errors from mistakes. Classifications of errors are diverse, causes of error are heterogeneous and unreliable; their taxonomies confusing. Only infelicitous are observed at the expense of the grammatical versions. According to (Byram 2004), what is known as universal error might be cross-linguistic errors. In other words, universal error and interference are confusing and hard to distinguish.

Again, one of the major criticisms of SI is that it does not put forward the society picture or theory (Aksan, 903) because it describes society as something that exists only in the minds of the people (Shattery, 2007). It does not seriously take human emotions into consideration; it is interested in limited social structures and does not take into consideration the major social context of interactions and sources of meaning. Equally, it has nothing to do with other social realities produced from other angles, aside from the ones produced by humans in their interpretations.

Be as it may, some aspects of Corder (1974)’s EA and Mead’s SI are adopted for this study.

### 3. Methodology

This is qualitative research; it adopts an ex post facto design. This means that data were not manipulated. The purposive sampling technique was used to gather data from teachers' interactions at meetings; messages from lecturers' WhatsApp groups conferences, seminars, workshops and classrooms. The method of data collection was through participant observation; the researcher gathers data randomly from 17 teachers in different communicative situations; she used notebooks in collecting data (as the teachers make them). Having collected over 30 communicative events (from the communicative events she attended) and jotting notes from them, she later pruned the notes and randomly selected 17 statements. Simple randomization was used in selecting the 17 samples presented for analysis. Data were analysed using Corder (1974)'s ER Theory.

#### 3.1. Data Presentation and Analysis

Five steps are involved in the processing EA; these are (i) collection of samples, (ii) identification of errors, (iii) description of errors, (iv) explanation of errors, and (v) evaluation of errors (Ellis 1994 as cited in Yaghi, 2017). In the analysis of errors, three stages are necessary, error recognition, description and explanations (Corder, 1974). This research adopts Corder's (1974) analysis based on interlingual and its four types of intralingual errors, namely; overgeneralisation, ignorance of the rule on restriction, incomplete application of the rules and false hypothesis,

##### *3.1.2 . Extract from teachers' interactions and conversations in classrooms, a WhatsApp group, workshops, conferences, and formal interactions with others and their analyses*

(1) Let's share the grace

Sentence 1 is a cross-linguistic error; the Mother tongue (MT)'s the transfer of any Nigerian languages (Yoruba, Igbo, Hausa, etc.) is conspicuous noticed in English (the second Language-L2) of this speaker. In addition, the cultural embellishment of the spirit of togetherness prevalent in all Nigerian societies is the conventional symbol that might have necessitated the teacher who utters this representative to be bold enough to do so. Again, the failure of the speaker to crosscheck the grammaticality or otherwise of what the speaker says might also be the factor that informed this statement. Hence, "Grace" is viewed as something that should be shared possible because the speaker might have heard that, "love" is sharable. One can infer that the speaker of Sentence 1 has partial grammatical knowledge of L2 and as such use it in all words.

In addition, Sentence 1 was uttered while the participants in this speech events were standing, the positioning of the interactants further influences the communicative impulse of the statement; hence the seriousness of the reciprocal interaction. Their voices were sonorous which indicated their utmost interest in what they were saying.

The language teacher is expected to master the grammatical system of TL/L2 so as to direct the learner properly. It should also be noted that language is a verbal symbol that is used by the teacher to interact with the audience here. The reciprocal tendency of “Sentence 1” has a replicating effect if it were to be used by the teacher in the classroom, many students would have upheld this teacher as a champion and as such “absolved” completely what he/she has said. Imagine this uttered in the church, (by the teacher who is a pastor) the congregation would have felt that this is the right way to speak).

Considering the replicating damage may cause, the teacher is supposed to learn the grammatical rules of the language taught so as to transfer error-free sentences to the learners and listeners.

### (2) Raise up your hands

Sentence 2 is first of all an interlingual error caused by a false hypothesis; the contextual application of it renders the sentence ungrammatical. The phrase, “raise up” means agitate, vex, disturb, shake up, and stir-up (Thesaurus). It is equally an idiomatic expression that means, “to lift oneself up, to get up or begin to get up”. It is therefore an intralingual error, a violation of the right use of words in the right contexts. Here, interactions in a face-to-face situation in a bit to changing the dispositions of the listeners. The suitable word for Sentence 2 is “raise” or “put up” your hand.

This indicates that the listeners do not also understand the right contextual interpretation of Sentence 2 and as such responded accordingly.

This was said with a low tone which indicates the teacher was not very serious about what he actually wanted to do with the decision he wanted to take from the result he seemingly expected. If this were to be uttered in a classroom where the teacher wanted to know whether or not, students understand what he/she teaches and he/she sincerely means it, the tone will have been high and emphatic.

### (3) So therefore, I don't admit it.

So and therefore are coordinating conjunctions with the same meaning. It is, therefore, ungrammatical to use the two words side by side. Placing them side-by-side results in redundancy. “so”. This is a blatant violation of the rule of grammar prevalent in the second language of the teacher; a typical example of an intralingual error.

The combination of two similar words (in a typical Nigerian context) indicates the speaker's intention to emphasise his/her points. The emphatic and loud nature of the utterance of Sentence 2 shows that the teacher does not understand its tautology.

### (4) Prof. Adedun and I, not I and Prof. Adedun will be there.

This is an intralingual error; the teacher is not familiar with the ordering of words in English and as such depends on the knowledge of most Nigerian indigenous languages, which allows “I and

you” and not “You and I”. This is a reverse in English where “Prof. Adedun and I” is the correct version. The significant symbol, self-pointed- gesture, and the prominence of the utterance by the speaker in Sentence 4 display the speaker’s ignorance of the erroneous nature of the phrase.

(5) They explain that they attended night vigil.

Here, both interlingual and intralingual errors were uttered by the speaker while giving a report on students’ inactivity in her class during a College Board Meeting. She was standing and facing the audience while talking. One of the conventional symbol is the seeming truth that enveloped the atmosphere as the teacher was speaking. Again, the ungrammaticality caused by the mixture of both past and present tenses (explain and attended) and the use of tautology (night vigil) in Sentence 5 shows that the teacher’s error is unintentional and this confirms Chomsky’s (19 ) disposition.

(6) You live in Lagos.

Sentence 6 is an interlingual error stemmed from a direct transfer of the elements of L1 (any Nigerian English) to L2 (English Language). The speaker intends to ask a question and not make a statement. The omission of the question mark (?), the word, “Do” and the falling intonation used to render it very confusing. If this were uttered to a stranger, one wonders how the speaker would have known where the listener lives. Again, if it were a statement, what then is the need, when the speaker has already known where the listener lives? This, therefore, makes Sentence 6 very difficult for a non-native Nigerian to understand that the teacher is actually asking a question rather than making a statement. The question should have been constructed as “Do you live in Lagos?”

(7) Quite a beautiful photographs

This is an example of an agreement error. The article “a” does not collocate/ concord with the plural object, “photographs” in the elliptical representative 7 (elliptical because it does not contain a verb). This is total neglect by the teacher to proofread what he sent to the platform.

(8) Can be able to help you.

These are both intra- and inter-lingual errors. In English, it is a grammatical error, the use of tautology. The word, “can” is the same as “be able”; therefore, their collocation indicates ungrammaticality. In Nigerian English usage, where the interlingual error occurs, it is a transfer of the emphatic display of one’s expressive linguistics elements of L1 to L2 through the multiplicity of words. In so doing, the native speaker of any Nigerian language would have felt that the listener has got enough words to make he or her react. This is in support of the viewpoints of the IS which believes that we create our environments through our symbols; and

“that facts are based on and directed symbols” (Aksan, et al 2009: 902); in this case, linguistics symbols.

(9) Dr you have being nice

Sentence 11 is an error caused by false concepts hypothesized and partial application of the rule of grammar. Here, the teacher uses “being” instead of “been”. This can be interpreted as an error caused by spoonerism because society does not expect teachers to make this kind of error. If this were to be spoken, it could have been deduced that the speaker is ignorant of the rule that restricts him to do so.

(10) If the send in 3 people, that does not mean that it is okay.

This is an intralingual error (a lexical error); misuse of a definite article “the” for the plural pronoun, “they”. By so doing, the whole statement is difficult to understand. Again, the sentence is ambiguous as the interpretation of the word, “it” is confusing.

(11) Candidate are been given time to fill their forms.

This is an intralingual error, a violation of the rule of grammar. There is no agreement between the subject and the verb. Again, the word, “been” is infelicitous in this context. It should have been, “being,” to make it felicitous. The teacher sent this on the platform so it becomes different to identify the significant symbols that should have influenced the linguistic elements.

(12) I want to round up by saying a big thank you.

The phrase “round up” is erroneously used here. This means to collect, wrangle, disperse, drive or arrest. Semantically, the teacher in question does not understand the difference between “round off” ( to conclude, end) and “round up,” ( to arrest or assemble) and as such, since he/she thinks that his/her speech is coming to an end, he/she feels that round up is correct. It is both interlingual and intralingual. Should we quantify “thanks” as “big” or “small?” This is a cross-lingual element from any Nigerian L1 to L2. With Sentence 12 said loudly, the speaker is confident that what he said was correct.

(13) The supervisors has final say that students are not serious.

This is an intralingual error, the plural subject, “supervisors” do not agree with the verb, “has”. Again, it is assumed that any teacher who makes this error is done out of his/her rush speeches; if not, it is a serious issue. What then is the grammatical inheritance that students will receive from their teachers? If this were uttered at a fast rate, it is an indication that the teacher would have corrected it later; but if it is used in a normal tone, it is an indication that it is indeed an error.

(14) Anything politics enter into is evil.

Sentence 16 is very ambiguous; “anything” used here is not clear. Politics is said to have entered into something. If “Politics enters” what then is it entering into? The context of use makes it infelicitous; this could have been accepted in literary writings. The idea of considering “politics” as “evil” is overgeneralization. The rashness of the voice entails the strong aversion of the speaker to politics.

(15) Can we fix it next week; our attention will be decided.

This is a lexical error, caused by the “misselection” of the word, “decided” and the wrong placement of it. Considering the surrounding words, the right word would have been “divided”. The transmission of Sentence 15 through a WhatsApp platform significantly allow one to infer that the speaker did not read it before she sent it to the platform ; in other words, if she had read it , there is a possibility that the error would have be converted to a self-corrected mistake.

(16) We pray for our “shancellor” for God to see them through.

This is a mispronunciation; the voiceless palatal affricate, /tʃ/ at the initial position of the word “chancellor” possess a pronunciation threat to most Yoruba speaker of English language and as such they substituted it with /s/, a voiceless alveolar fricative , prevalent in their MT. Again, the voiced and voiceless dental fricative / ð, θ / in the words “them” and “through” do not exist in Yoruba language, so, many Yoruba speakers of English substitute it with the voiced and voiceless alveolar plosive /d, t/, the ones available in their MT. The confidentiality of the speaker indicates a potential significant symbol that informed one to deduce that the speaker’s assumed right pronunciation is indeed an error.

#### 4. Summary of Findings

The analyses of teachers’ language I have done above revealed that it is not only the learners that commit errors but some teachers do so too. Their communicative events are observed to contain both interlingual errors and intralingual errors that originate from the unabated transfer of their L1 to L2 and in the course of communicating with the students and others. This confirms Richards & Rodgers (2001)’s observations that where there are similarities between L1 and L2, there will be no record of mistakes but where the reverse occurs errors are likely to be committed. Many teachers understand and use language and communicative skills well, but some are not familiar with them nor use them effectively. This is caused by the dissimilarities of their L1 and L2.

Nigerian teachers’ errors are inherent and emanate from some Nigerian expressive errors. Also, most errors committed by teachers are grammatical errors, phonological errors and lexical errors.

Most teacher's errors can be avoided, minimized and self-corrected if they thoroughly listen to their spoken communication and proofread what they post. Some teachers' errors are mistakes, caused by rushed speeches, 'misselection" and "mispositioning" of linguistic lexical items. Teachers' error have multifarious effects that are endemic and infectious.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Language teachers and teachers' language are indispensable tools in all fields of human endeavour. Teachers are very important professionals in the world. In Nigeria, every teacher uses English to teach (even in the teaching of other languages). Teachers' linguistic, paralinguistic and communicative skills are capable of building or destroying the students and others, depending on how they are applied in different contexts. A teacher is not only expected to understand these skills but apply them effectively in every communicative event. Language teachers are to be very conscious of the language they use; since their language has transferable effects. If it is believed that every teacher is a language teacher because students and other teachers' admirers consider them as audio-visuals and emulative machines for the learning and usage of languages.

Although English is indeed a difficult language, (and sometimes very confusing in its application), a second and foreign language, a language of education, a compulsory subject at all levels, the language of politics, aviation, etc. in Nigeria, these are not enough reasons for teachers of English to allow their communicative situations to be replete with errors. All language teachers should learn the rule of grammar, morphology, semantics and other communicative skills that will allow them to relate effectively with students and others. They should also learn the simplest day-to-day interaction norms to avoid overt grammatical, paralinguistic and communicative blunders. Infelicities at all levels should be avoided by the teachers so that the students and the society can be helped to know how to speak too.

All teachers, (whether language teachers or not) should learn to listen attentively and consciously to himself/herself while interacting, they should critically edit and proofread written essays before posting to platforms or publishing them. It is believed that if the aforementioned precautions are taken into consideration, the ungrammaticality and other communicative infelicities may be minimized or avoided.

## References

- AbiSamra, N., 2003. An analysis of errors in Arabic speakers' English writings. *Investigating writing problems among Palestinian students studying English as a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation*, p.5.
- Abisamra, Nada. *An analysis of errors in Arabic speakers' English writings*. 2003.  
<http://www.pearsonlongman.com/ae/fogadv/SR/.../writingu23.html> ( 10 May 2022)
- Adeleke , Foluso Florence, Adesua, Veronica Olubunmi & Jimola Folasade Esther.

- Communication skills and its influence on teachers' effectiveness. Universal Journal of Educational Research.* 10 (3): 240 –245, 2022.
- Adepoju, Babatunji. An Analysis of Grapho-phonological infelicities in the Nigerian Political Discourse. *Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Lagos*
- Abrusan, Martin. *Semantic anomaly, pragmatic infelicity and ungrammaticality*, 2019. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 5 (1), 329 --351, 2019.
- Aksan, Nilgun, Kisac, Buket, Aydin, Mufit, & Demirbuken, Sumeyra. *Symbolic Interaction theory. Procedia: Social and Behavioral Science*, 1, 902 – 904, 2009.
- Al-Khreshah, Mohammad Hamad. *A review study of error analysis theory. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 2, 49-59, 2016.
- Al-Mounla, Ibrahim. *Direct negative feedback: The eternal dilemma. Proceedings of the second national conference, Language Centre, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat*, 27-28, 2002.
- Bambaeeroo, Fatemeh & Shokrpour, Nasrin. The impact of the teachers' non-verbal communication on success in teaching , *J Adv Med Educ*, 5(2): 49–50, 2017.
- Bataineh, Ruba Fahmi. Jordanian undergraduate EFL students' errors in the use of the definite article. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7, 2005. [http://www.asian-efjournal.com/march\\_05\\_rfb\\_php](http://www.asian-efjournal.com/march_05_rfb_php) (7 July 2022)
- Brown, H. David, 4 th edn, *Principles of language teaching and learning. White Plains*. New York: Longman, 2000.
- Brown, E. David , & Hammer, David. Conceptual change in Physics .In *International handbook of research on conceptual change*. Routledge. 155-182, 2008.
- Byram, Michael. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Language Teaching and Learning*. London, New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Carter, Michael, J. and Fuller, Celene. Symbolic Interactionism. *Sociopedia. Isa*. 1 –17, 2015. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Carter-10/publication/303056565\\_Symbolic\\_Interactionism/links/57364c7e08ae9ace840af382/Symbolic-Interactionism.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Michael-Carter-10/publication/303056565_Symbolic_Interactionism/links/57364c7e08ae9ace840af382/Symbolic-Interactionism.pdf) ( 10 July 2022)
- Chelli, Saliha. Interlingual or Intralingual errors in the use of prepositions and articles : the case of first-year students of English in Biskra University, 2013.
- Crossman, Ashley. What is Symbolic Interactionism. *ThoughtCo*, 2020. <https://www.thoughtco.com/symbolic-interaction-theory-3026633> (18 July 2022)
- Choudhury, Anindya Syam. Classroom roles of English language teachers: the traditional and the innovative. *Contemporary online language education journal*, 1, 33 – 40, 2011.
- Corder, Stephen. Pit. Error Analysis.in J.P.B. Allen and S.P Corder (ed), *Techniques in Applied Linguistics.:The Edinburg course in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Dulay, Heidi C. and Burt, Marina K. Goofician: An indication of children's second language learning strategies. *Language learning*, 22 (2) 235–251, 1972. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/i1467-1770.1972.tb00085.x> (26 July 2022)
- Glottopedia Discovery Linguistics. (n.d). Error analysis. [http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Error\\_analysis](http://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Error_analysis) ( 10 July 2022)
- James, Carl. *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. New York : Longman, 1998.
- James, Carl. Cross-linguistic awareness: A new Role for Contrastive Analysis.

- Linguine, 1998.
- Johnson Robert. Keith. Developing teachers' language resource. In Richards , J. C. and D. Nunan *Second language Teacher Education..* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Khammash, S. & Roos, C. Why do our students keep making the same mistakes? Proceedings of the second national conference, Language Centre, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, 27-28, 2002.
- Khansir, Ali Akbar. Error Analysis and second language acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2 (5). 1027 –1032, 2012.
- Khatri, J.A.H & Chauhan, Digant. Role of teachers in English language classroom. *Knowledge Consortium of Gujarat (KCG): Journal of Humanities*. 14, 1-6, 2014. [https://www.academia.edu/30925040/Roles\\_of\\_Teachers\\_in\\_English\\_Language\\_Classroom?email\\_work\\_card=thumbnail](https://www.academia.edu/30925040/Roles_of_Teachers_in_English_Language_Classroom?email_work_card=thumbnail) ( 19 July 2022)
- Levensen, Karin Tweddell. Qualifying Online teachers –communicative skills and their impact on e-learning . *Education and Information Technologies* 12, 41 –51, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-006-9025-1> ( 18 July2022)
- Najafi T, Rahmanzade A. The relationship between communication skills and educational effectiveness of teachers of girls in Valiasr Technical College in Tehran. *Journal of media studies*. 8(4): 193–206, 2013.
- Nickerson, Charlotte. *Symbolic interactionism theory & examples*. Simply Psychology, 2021. [www.simplypsychology.org/symbolic-interaction-theory.html](http://www.simplypsychology.org/symbolic-interaction-theory.html) ( 23 July, 2022)
- Nwala, Michael . Alozie . & Obisike, Iheanyi. Osondu. Aspects of the English grammar. Port Harcourt, Obisco, 2014.
- Miller, Alicia. (n.d) Why every teacher is a language teacher. *Whitby blog* <https://www.whitbyschool.org/passionforlearning/why-every-teacher-is-a-language-teacher> ( 26 July 2022)
- Pollard, A., Collins, J., Maddock, M. , Simco, N., Swaffield , S. & Warwick, P (eds) .2005. *Reflective teaching* .London & New York: Continuum.
- Quist-Adade- Charles. *Symbolic Interactionism*. Canada: Vernor Press, 2019.
- Rabiah Sitti. Language as a tool for communication and cultural reality discloser, 2012. <file:///C:/Users/Teacher/Downloads/Language%20as%20a%20Tool%20for%20Communication%20and%20Cultural%20Reality%20Discloser.pdf> ( 19 July 2022)
- Richards, C. Jack & Rodgers, S. Theodore. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. USA: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Rogers, Carl. R. *Carl Rogers on encounter groups*. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Samovar, Larry. A. Porter, Richard. E., McDaniel, Edwin .R, & Roy, Carolyn. S. *Communication between cultures*. USA: Cengage Learning, 2015.
- Selinker, Larry. Interlanguage. *IRAL. International Review of Applied Linguistics*. In *Language Teaching*, 10 (3) 209 –231, 1972. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209> ( 18 July 2022)
- Schachter , Jacqueline. An Error in Error- Analysis. *Language Learning*. 24 (.2). 205- 214, 1974.
- Thesaurus (n.d.) Raise-up synonyms. <https://thesaurus.yourdictionary.com/raise-up> (22 July 2022)

- Van den Branden, K. The role of teachers in task-based language education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 164-181, 2016.
- Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, J. M. (Eds.). *Task-based language teaching: A reader*. Amsterdam. The Netherlands: John Benjamins 50 National University, 2009. <https://www.nu.edu/resources/essential-soft-skills-for-teachers/> (18 July 2022)
- Yaghi, yhab Talal. Review of learner's errors: An error analysis perspective, 1 –15, 2 017.