

The Demands of a Changing Society: English in Education in Kenya Today

Angelina N. Kioko and Margaret J. Muthwii

*Department of English and Linguistics, Kenyatta University, PO Box 43844,
Nairobi, Kenya*

English plays a key role in Kenya's educational system, not only as an important subject but especially as the medium of instruction. It has been claimed that the model and the norm of the English used in Kenya, apart from pidgin varieties, is the British Standard variety and in particular, Received Pronunciation (RP) (Schmied, 1990; Zuengler, 1982). Is this indeed the case? If not, what are the actual norms of correctness and appropriateness with regard to pronunciation, grammar, semantics, or pragmatics within the Kenyan community? There exists a discrepancy between the theoretical norm and the actual language behaviour, what challenges does this state of affairs present to an education system that relies heavily on the use of the English language? In examining these issues the paper adopts a historical perspective and discusses the factors that indicate the presence of a discrepancy between a theoretical norm and the actual language behaviour and then explores the consequences of such a situation. It also considers the valuable lessons that could be learnt, firstly from local creative writers' adaptation to the sociolinguistic/sociocultural reality, secondly from the move towards the democratisation and Africanisation of education in Kenya's history, and thirdly from what is happening in other non-native English contexts.

Language in education in Kenya has faced and still faces many challenges. The issues often revolve around the place and development of the local indigenous languages (see Kioko, 2000; Mbaabu, 1996; Ryanga, 2000); the need and means to strengthen Kiswahili as it is the national language (see Mazrui & Mazrui, 1995; Mbaabu, 1996; Musau, 1999, 2000); and concerns about the usefulness of the English language, its effective teaching and/or its falling standards (Abdulaziz, 1982; Angogo & Hancock, 1980; Kembo-Sure, 1994; Nyamasyo, 1992, 1994).

Sometimes the problems have had to do with the competition that the languages have had in the nation and especially in the education system due to the fact that each language was, and still is, associated with a certain social meaning (Mbaabu, 1996; Muthwii, 1994a; Whiteley, 1974). For example, English, introduced early in Kenya's colonial history, played a significant role in the growth of nationalism (Crampton, 1986; Whiteley, 1974), a role which it no longer enjoys. It also played and still plays a key role in the country's legal, economic and educational systems. In the school system, it is not only one of the most important subjects in the curriculum but is itself the medium of instruction.

The roots of this significant function of English can be traced back to Kenya's colonial period when it was instrumental to an individual's access to white collar jobs, European thought, and other privileges (Mazrui, 1992; Whiteley, 1974). English was a language with a lot of prestige and power and the British model was unquestionably the one used in Kenya. Kenyans learnt it from the native speakers and unlike Kiswahili, English in Kenya, as in all non-native contexts, was/is largely a taught language, conveyed through formal education. The issue

of how it is taught and acquired is, therefore, very important but this must be looked at in the light of the fact that it is also now a second language.

This paper looks at crucial changes that have occurred with regard to issues of language acquisition and use in Kenya in the last several decades and the challenges that these changes pose for educators and linguists today. It evaluates the discrepancies that exist between theoretical norms and actual language behaviour, especially as it affects the English language. Drawing from the sociolinguistic reality in Kenya today, various solutions to the significant problems facing language in education are suggested.

English in Kenya

The three main challenges facing language in education right from the start of the colonial period were: (1) what language was to be used as the medium of instruction; (2) at what level in the educational system was this language to be introduced; and (3) who were qualified to teach this language. It is important to trace how these issues have been handled historically and how their solutions have had bearing on other challenges that have come up with regard to language in education.

As concerns the question of which language was to be used as the medium of instruction, there were three competitors in the pre-colonial and early colonial period: the vernaculars, Kiswahili, or English (Mbaabu, 1996; Whiteley, 1974). One of the principles guiding the favoured language in education at this time was that 'the language best known by a child on his entry into school life was the most effective medium of instruction' (Gorman, 1974: 104; Mbaabu, 1996). This was especially the view of many missionaries, who were initially the first and only agents concerned with the education of Africans. The missionaries, therefore, favoured the use of the vernacular languages as media of instruction in primary education and embarked on translating the Bible and other Christian literature into the local languages. At this stage English was used mainly by the British missionaries, government administrators, and settlers living and ruling in the colony (Muthwii, 1994a: 17). As Mazrui (1992:7) says, English was 'the language of the rulers before it could gradually develop into the language of the people'.

As the colonial government became more involved in education, the question as to whether English should be taught or used as a medium of education in the African schools became a big challenge to the then educators. This was in consonance with the social meaning English was acquiring. To many of the settlers, keeping English from the Africans was a way of retaining cheap labour with the argument that 'English should not be taught to people destined to till the land' (Crampton, 1986). Thus, this was an effective way of holding the African down to a subordinate position socially, economically and politically. This position was, however, not uniformly accepted and as early as 1909 there was a general acceptance that English should be introduced in the African schools. With this, the major challenge concerned the level and extent to which the language was to be introduced (Whiteley, 1974).

Various committees and commissions sat to consider this challenge at various stages of the development of the Kenyan education system (Gorman, 1974;

Mbaabu, 1996). They adopted a position whereby the local language of a school's catchment area would be used on the commencement of primary education. English could be introduced later on when the pupils had reached an approved standard of proficiency in their native language. Nevertheless, English could only be taught if recognised teachers of English were available. Different schools used different media of instruction at that time. There being no unified Kenya Preliminary Examination at the conclusion of primary education, this situation presented a problem to the education system. It was difficult to adopt a common syllabus because different languages were used as media of instruction.

1945–1962

The changes following the end of the Second World War made it clear that the Africans would be needing more English than was being provided. First, the colonial administration needed more Africans to take clerical and skilled workers' jobs for which the use of English was a prerequisite. Second, the political awakening during this period made the Africans press for more English at an earlier stage in education because they needed English to participate in the Legislative Council. English became a political imperative.

Events between 1945 and 1962 saw the spread of the use of English as a medium of instruction in teacher training colleges and in primary schools. According to Gorman (1974: 437) the number of English medium classes rose from 14 in 1962 to 290 in 1963. The main challenge facing language in education at this time was in providing an adequate supply of trained teachers for schools in all areas to ensure that the learners were exposed to enough English for use in other subject areas. To counter this, the period saw the introduction of a team of supervisors and advisers who provided close supervision and continuous in-service courses for the teachers. A very important aspect here is that the issue of contact with the native-speaker models was a reality and so the teachers and learners had a realistic target in learning and teaching English. Another significant factor affecting the acquisition and use of English was that the language was associated with an individual's social, political and economic success and therefore the learners were highly motivated. Competence in this imperial language became an important avenue of upward social mobility for Africans (Mazrui, 1992).

Independence

The rapid expansion in education continued after Kenya attained her independence in 1963 and though teacher training colleges increased, the presence of the English native-speaker model receded to the background with the departure of many native speakers. The rapid expansion meant that the availability of qualified teachers of English was a big challenge for a long time. Many learners aspired to speak English to the level of their African teachers. Notably, while English was taught with the permission of the Education Department in pre-independence Kenya and untrained teachers were assessed and approved on native-speaker criteria, the situation changed after independence. By this time, teachers on the spot who could speak English, whether trained or not, taught English and used it in the teaching of other subjects. In most cases, the trained teachers themselves had been taught and trained by non-native speakers

of English and their English was not necessarily modelled on the native-speaker variety.

The attainment of independence also stripped English of some of the prestige it had enjoyed during the colonial period. There was more tolerance of non-native usage of English, as seen in the success story of the African independent schools (Whiteley, 1974). The aspiration to speak like the British began to be associated with a colonial hangover and, therefore, was stigmatised. However, the internal norms of correctness and appropriateness with regard to pronunciation, grammar, or semantics, theoretically remained the British norm. It is partly this lack of concordance between practice and attitudes towards English on the one hand, and the British norm and its demands on the other hand, that has had undesirable consequences for the use of the English language in education in Kenya today. And it is to this we turn in the next section where we address the relationship between native English and the varieties that have developed in Kenya and how this affects current concerns of language in education. This is an issue that has hardly been considered critically by linguists and educators in respect of the Kenyan situation (Schmied, 1990).

Origins of the English problem

Since most of the teachers at the introduction of English to Kenya were either native speakers or individuals thoroughly trained by native speakers, Kenyan learners had access to native English and its norms. Standards of English could still be imposed because learners were few, the teaching of the language was controlled and the motivation to learn the 'English of the English' was very high. The model then had no serious competitor (Mbaabu, 1996; Whiteley, 1974).

Several decades later virtually all of these conditions have tremendously changed. Given the continued use of English in Kenya, its spread, the changed conditions of acquisition, and the strengthened position of Kiswahili in education, a legitimate question to ask is whether the British standard of English is still the model today. What model do learners approximate to when learning and using English? How useful is it for Kenyans to continue holding the official position that the English taught and assessed in schools is the British standard? To answer these questions we would need to look at two important factors that shed light on the complex issues of English in use in non-native contexts such as Kenya.

Firstly, linguists have shown that due to the great spread of English, there exist several different varieties of the language in the world, especially in areas once colonised by native speakers of English. These varieties are not only different from one another but also different from the standard varieties found in native-English-speaking communities (Bamgbose, 1982; Coelho, 1997; Kachru, 1986, 1994, 1997; Zuengler, 1982). In these contexts English is used alongside the other local languages, often as an important second language with an official role. Of necessity, these language contact situations result in the exoglossic language being influenced by its linguistic and socio-cultural environment (Kachru, 1994; Zuengler, 1982). This process is commonly referred to as nativisation and/or acculturation (Kachru, 1987). English is made to communicate the sociocultural experiences of the people and is no longer seen as a foreign language but as one of the languages in the repertoire of the multilingual speak-

ers. Consequently, the English language in these contexts acquires certain structural features that make it different from native English at all linguistic levels.

With specific reference to the Kenyan situation, for example, Zuengler (1982: 115) says that 'there are certain formal aspects of English which distinguish the Kenyan English from standard native speaker varieties of English'. For identification and description of these features, see the works of Angogo and Hancock (1980); Bailey and Görlach (1982); Hocking (1974); Kembo-Sure, 1996; Muthwii (1994b); Muthwii and Lodge (1995); Ogutu (1993) and Zuengler (1982). The features discussed in these works as indicators of Kenyan English cut across the first-language backgrounds of its users. They also constitute some of the features which Kachru (1985: 17) identifies as being 'formally and contextually deviant from the norms of the users of the inner circle'. Moreover, some of the innovations, adaptations, or deviations in these varieties of English are not haphazard. They are aspects of a more general phenomenon that has been taking place with regard to the interaction of English and other languages and cultures in non-native contexts and situations (Bailey & Görlach, 1982; Kachru, 1986; Zuengler, 1982). Significantly, these linguistic features are observable in the language of the teachers, the media, and some of the literary texts used in schools.

Secondly, claims based on sociolinguistic research have shown that the actual model(s) that speakers of English use in non-native contexts are not the British or American ones (Bailey & Görlach, 1982; Bamgbose, 1982; Bokamba, 1994; Kachru, 1982, 1986; McArthur, 1994). This must also be true of the Kenyan situation for the following reasons:

- (1) There are very few native models of English available in the school system.
- (2) The identity of the English that the majority of Kenyans are exposed to is that used in Kenya by Kenyans (most Kenyans are not meaningfully conversant with native English).
- (3) The English used in the media, especially in radio and television provides a mixed 'English-speaking environment'. The native speakers in the popular imported television programs 'exemplify not a single exonormative variety of English but a whole range such as American, Scottish, Irish, North of England and Australian' (Platt *et al.*, 1984: 169). Several of these varieties are significantly different from one another.

For these reasons, and the historical factors cited above, it is our contention that the model that Kenyans actually approximate to is that of Kenyan users of English, especially that of the teachers and the media who are in the main non-native. This is the variety that Kenyans are in touch with and not the Standard British variety as is claimed in Schmied (1990) and Zuengler (1982). (Of course, the variety used by educated speakers in Kenya ultimately has some resemblance to British English since British forms prevail over other native varieties in Kenya.) As Kachru (1987:222) argues, the consequence of ignoring a fact such as this brings undesirable 'educational, psychological, and other results of the elusive attempts to curb diversity in English, and to provide an exocentric (British or American) model in the classrooms of the multilingual world'.

The Challenge

The assumptions behind the official position that the English taught in Kenyan schools is the Standard British variety are that the Kenyan teachers, even at primary school level, are capable of teaching this model effectively and that Kenyans view deviations in their use of English as *errors* (that is, acquisitional deficiencies). These assumptions distort many facts about the forms and functions of English in Kenya and raise educational concerns. For example, (1) how does this theoretical position fit in with the influence of the (non-native) teaching staff and their educational backgrounds, the intranational uses of English, and the rapid expansion and development of education in Kenya? (2) do Kenyans actually see the deviations in their variety of English as errors or are they seen, for example, as symbols of sociolinguistic messages such as 'I will use English as a tool for my culture, identity, and conventions' (Kachru, 1987: 218)?

These concerns are of significance today because they have consequences to all those involved in education. Situations like the one we have in Kenya, whereby there is a discrepancy between the assumed norms and the actual language behaviour (especially in the school system) pose various challenges to those involved in language education.

Teachers

The fact that the language teacher is a non-native speaker who has been taught and trained by non-native users of English makes the task of teaching the British Standard variety, especially speech skills, a very difficult one; indeed a nightmare. For example, in the Kenya Institute of Education's Handbook (1987) the English secondary school teacher is instructed and expected to provide the students with skills for distinguishing the pronunciation of particular English vowels. A list of 20 Received Pronunciation (RP) vowels is provided and the teacher is informed that 'the confusion of vowels occurs with practically all the ethnic groups... The teacher should watch out [...]'. The methods suggested for teaching pronunciation assume that the teacher is (or can be) a speaker of the model variety of English and is therefore, capable of 'watching out'. Most teachers faced with this impossible task leave out the pronunciation drill exercises to the disadvantage of the student.

Apart from such inherent difficulties in the teaching of English, the English teacher gets blamed for the falling standards. As Platt and Weber (1984: 161) say, the teacher is in a dilemma:

Those doing research into the New English tell the teacher that a variety or several varieties of a New English exists. The teacher knows that the New English exists because s/he uses it. However, the teacher is often told by the authorities that it must not exist, that it is up to him or her to 'teach it away', and that it is his/her fault that it is still there.

Bamgbose expresses the same dilemma when he says that 'the teaching and examinations concentrate on drilling and testing out of existence forms of speech that even the teachers will use freely when they do not have their textbooks open before them' (Bamgbose, 1982:99). Consequently, the teacher cannot act as a model of the variety s/he is teaching and so ends up prescribing 'do what I say

but not what I do'. If a local norm were recognised and adopted in education, the teachers of English would act as models of this variety and thus the structures taught would be reinforced in and outside the classroom.

Another significant challenge to the English teacher in the Kenyan education system is that it is the teacher's responsibility to work out ways of harmonising the teaching of English and literature in the integrated approach to the teaching of English. Local creative writers make use of aspects of a local variety of English (see Kachru, 1994, Zuengler, 1982). They write out of an African experience where the English language has interfaced with African languages and cultures producing change and adaptation. The change is due to contact with languages, while adaptation is in terms of acculturation (Kachru, 1994: 13). The English-language textbooks used for instruction in Kenya, however, have not seriously come to terms with this sociolinguistic reality but continue presenting the Standard British norm. If the literary materials are to act as a basis for teaching language skills as required in the English-language curriculum, then the teacher has a difficult task harmonising the differing linguistic structures inherent in them.

Students

For the student, there is almost no model of the target variety and so it is very difficult to attain the required proficiency. The expectations laid on the student are unrealistic, not only because there is no real contact with the 'accepted' model for the majority of them, but also because there is very little reinforcement of the target variety (British norm) outside the classroom. As Bokamba (1994: 247) says, 'it has now long been recognised in both first language and sociolinguistic research that individuals learn and master the variety of language spoken in their speech community'. Examinations based entirely on the native-speaker norms, therefore, are bound to be an unfair assessment of the students' ability. They give rise to great pressure on the student and contributes to a desperation that can be inferred, for example, from the Kenya National Examinations Council's (KNEC) comments on student performance in national examinations. In their report on the performance of English language covering the years 1992/93, the KNEC raises several questions, namely;

Can it be that our candidates, despite the work we put in, can never perform any better than this in their written work? Is it lack of training or simply the inability or incapacity of our candidates? Is it possible to have a similar cohort of candidates, year in year out, irrespective of improved teaching or change of teachers? (KNEC, 1994:1)

Looking at these questions, one wonders whether the problem is not related to the fact that some of the structures tested are not part of the repertoire of either the language teachers or the intranational uses of English in Kenya. In these circumstances, how is the student expected to pass the language examination when it is based on items which nobody around him or her uses?

The second challenge has to do with the effects of attitudes held by error analysts. Many features of the English used in Kenya have been analysed as errors (see Hocking, 1974; Njoroge, 1987; Njoroge, 1996; Nyamasyo, 1992). To a large extent, what authors like these have done is to bias Kenyans against the

English they speak. Their views teach the Kenyan elite how to stigmatise the 'incorrect' forms. According to Angogo and Hancock (1980), if this is done deprecatingly for long enough one begins to accept it as part of the nature of things. However, as Ogutu (1993) observes, it is almost impossible to drill a speech community out of its established language habits. Furthermore, such efforts would be based on the abstract assumption that the L2 learner has an inherent desire to achieve natural L1 proficiency in the target language. This, according to Bokamba (1994: 248), is an assumption unwarranted by facts. In addition, the act of forcing a people to view their variety of language as inferior to another causes some of them to undergo a psychological crisis that has to do with self-worth and identity (Kachru, 1982, 1994).

In Kenya, therefore, students and teachers alike are exposed to a major paradox in the integrated English course syllabus. On the one hand, there is the teaching of literary works that show creativity especially in using nativised English, but on the other hand there is the teaching of an English-language component that is not officially allowed to bear a relationship with the actual language-use behaviour. Most students find themselves utterly lost in the confusing world of what are regarded as innovations, deviations and mistakes (errors). Because of the demands of such a challenge, some students will need a lot of help to attain acceptable standards while others will find it overwhelming and simply give up trying.

Policy makers

The KNEC's questions, quoted above, are not isolated. There has been a general outcry about the high cost and inefficiency within the educational system (Republic of Kenya, 1999). Since 1995 policy makers in Kenya have indicated the urgency to review certain issues that have posed challenges in education in general. In the *Daily Nation* (1 August 1996) for example, the then Minister for Education, Mr Kamotho, was reported to have said that the Government was working on a comprehensive master plan that would give direction and scope to the development of education and training. This was to include 'Reviewing the Education Act to reflect prevailing changes'. Donor communities supported this review because it would make the Kenyan school curriculum more focused, purposeful and less expensive. The Koech Commission, whose report is contained in the Republic of Kenya (1999), did extensive work collecting and collating information on how to improve the education system. Given the contradictions and problems that Kenya has had with regard to the language of instruction in schools, one would have expected that the language issue would feature prominently in the review.

Unfortunately, the Republic of Kenya (1999) review report does not address the language issue except to advocate the status quo. As we have argued above, the presence of a local variety of English in Kenya is a reality. When the policy makers and language planners insist on an exoglossic norm this poses great challenges to the teacher and the student alike. Some of the wastage in education can definitely be blamed on the language situation in the country, since the medium of instruction has a great impact on success in other subject areas. We feel strongly, therefore, that the issue of the model of English to be used in Kenyan

schools is one of the areas in which the Kenyan Educational Act needs to reflect 'prevailing changes'.

New Direction

An important thesis in this paper is that one of the main issues that has created the discrepancy in language in education in Kenya is that the teachers and learners of English have very little or no contact at all with the supposed Standard British English. Local creative writers have adopted aspects of a local variety of English and their works are already in use in schools. Policy makers and education planners, therefore, need to provide a new direction in the area of language in education to ensure that there is harmony in the types of input presented to the learners. There are four possible ways of dealing with the situation:

- (1) Import native teachers and teacher supervisors, who would not only be a reference for the teacher and the student but would act as agents of continuing education for the Kenyan English teacher.
- (2) Regularly send some of the English teachers for short courses in native-speaker environments.
- (3) Educators and linguists together with native speakers of the British Standard English could team up to study the way English is used in Kenya and come up with more books on *common errors* which would guide the teachers and learners of English.

Clearly, these three proposals would be geared towards bringing the British Standard variety closer to the teachers and learners. However, apart from the cost factors, such measures in themselves would create moves that are not in line with other innovations in the democratisation and Africanisation of education in Kenya's history (Kembo-Sure, 1996; Mbaabu, 1996; Whiteley, 1974).

A fourth and more realistic and prudent move would be to accept the sociolinguistic reality of English in Kenya and work out a new direction for its use in the education system. Valuable lessons could be learnt from the following English-language users who have accepted and incorporated features of nativised English in their particular pursuits. Their practice could provide bearing to the needed change in language education.

English world-wide

The world of literature in non-native contexts of English, such as Singapore, India, Kenya and Nigeria, is the first group of users of English to consider. In these contexts, 'English has developed nativized literary traditions in different genres, as the novel, short story, poetry and essay' (Kachru, 1985: 13). These literary works take into account the functions of English in the particular diverse pluralistic context and make use of features which mark it off from the native speakers' varieties. Some of the features include direct lexical transfer, semantic shifts, syntactic shifts and a wide use of contextual units, such as riddles, proverbs, songs and so on, which embed the language in the sociocultural situations (Zuengler, 1982). These local creative writings have been accepted as part of the national writings of the country, and in fact they have been incorporated into the mainstream literary teaching materials in the education system. Such moves to

reconcile exonormative and endonormative features with regard to the use of English in creative writing, therefore, provide a clear direction for changes in language education.

Secondly, some of the practices of the KNEC can also be emulated in the use of English in education. Though the KNEC makes definite efforts to reinforce the British Standard variety, there is a realisation and acknowledgment that students are exposed to aspects of language use that are not necessarily 'errors' but which are not part of British Standard English. In this spirit, they provide examiners with a list of 'acceptable' expressions which are said to be part of educated East African English. Despite the fact that this list is not given to teachers to form part of their instructions content in schools, its presence shows that KNEC realises that the sociolinguistic reality of learners calls for the acceptance of forms that are not part of the native speakers' variety. This move, though limited in nature, is in consonance with the already established arguments that some of the deviant grammatical structures could be accepted as part of a Kenyan norm on the grounds of common language behaviour of the educated (see Bokamba, 1994; Muthwii, 1994b; Ogutu, 1993; Schmied, 1990; Zuengler, 1982). If the policy makers/planners and educators recognised and expanded this move, they would be in the right direction in resolving the problems created by the discrepancy between the theoretical norm and the actual language behaviour.

The direction towards change is also evident in observing what has happened, and is happening, in other non-native English contexts, such as Singapore, India, Nigeria and Sri Lanka, where 'local educated varieties are becoming increasingly recognised and accepted locally as standard varieties in their own right, despite some local ambivalence' (Kachru, 1985: 31). For instance, according to Richards (1982:155) a relatively stable local variety of English has evolved in Singapore and has replaced the colonial linguistic model as norm for much that is communicated in English. Educators and linguists in such nations, therefore, have realised the immense seriousness in the question of a model of English which is seen not only in terms of general intranational usage but also for pedagogic purposes (Kachru, 1987, 1994; Kachru, 1993; McArthur, 1994; Platt *et al.*, 1984: 167–169).

These recommendations of a new direction for language in education in Kenya, however, have one main shortcoming. There is no extensive description of Kenyan English (at all linguistic levels) that could be formalised and thereby used in the curriculum. The provision of such a description poses an immediate challenge to linguists and language educators in Kenya because teachers cannot teach in a vacuum. In Platt *et al.*'s words, teachers

do not want a model that may be suggested to them but which is nothing more than a vague outline. They ... need *systematicity*. They need some kind of model to which they can refer, a model which tells them what to regard as a 'learner's mistake' and what to consider as a legitimate feature of the educated variety of the New English. Such a model, although it is by no means impossible, is a big undertaking ... It would involve a thorough and systematic analysis of the speech and writing of a large and representative group of educated speakers. It would also involve large scale acceptability

testing similar to what has been carried out on more established varieties. (Platt & Weber, 1984: 167)

The move towards the new direction, therefore, would not be without challenge. (There are two ongoing researches by scholars at the Department of English and Linguistics, Kenyatta University, namely, Njoroge's doctoral study, and Muthwii and Kioko's research on Kenyan English which when completed will be a useful contribution to efforts in this area.)

Another problem that would have to be faced in Kenya is how to deal with the concerns of users of English who see the formal adoption of a non-native variety as contributing to language decay, careless usage, or loss of intelligibility among its users across cultures (for a discussion of these reactions see Bamgbose, 1982; Kachru, 1985, 1987; Quirk & Widdowson, 1985). While these concerns may be a nightmare for the purist, it is prudent for an informed educator to consider them in the light of the significant role played by the models that the learners imitate and reproduce. As Bokamba (1994: 249) says, the students' performance in English in all structural aspects (i.e. phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic) is constrained by the models they have and the norms of the communities in which they live and learn the language.

Conclusion

With so much that has changed over the years in the geography of language in education in Kenya, the intranational uses of English cannot be ignored in educational policy and planning. In this paper we have discussed the challenges facing language in education and have looked at various solutions, arguing that a move that accommodates the sociolinguistic reality is the most practical and lasting solution, albeit with its own inherent challenges. When a people's language attitudes, opinions and behaviour are taken into account, language planning and implementation in education is better achieved because systematic discrepancies between language norms and actual language-use practices are discovered. The internal norms of linguistic correctness and appropriateness could then be carefully incorporated in the education process, thus making language in education more relevant and dynamic. It is time in Kenya, therefore, that serious debate and research is done with a view to formally adopting for use in the education system the nativised Kenyan educated variety of English instead of imposing the external varieties with their standards and norms on students.

Correspondence

Any correspondence should be directed to Dr Angelina N. Kioko, Department of English and Linguistics, Kenyatta University, PO Box 42844, Nairobi, Kenya.

References

- Abdulaziz, M. (1982) Patterns of language acquisition and use in Kenya: Rural-urban differences. *International Journal of Society and Language* 34, 95–120.
- Angogo, R. and Hancock, I. (1980) English in Africa: Emerging standards or diverging regionalisms? *English World-Wide* 1, 67–96.
- Bailey, R. and Görlach, M. (1982) *English as a World Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bamgbose, A. (1982) Standard Nigerian English: Issues of identification. In B.B. Kachru

- (ed.) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures* (pp. 99–111). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Coelho, G.M. (1997) Anglo-Indian English: A nativised variety of Indian English. *Language in Society* 26 (4), 561–89.
- Bokamba, E.G. (1994) The fiction of the native speaker in L2 research. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *GURT on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 243–52). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Crampton, D. (1986) Language policy in Kenya. *Rassegna Italiana Linguistica Applicata* 18 (3), 109–22.
- Daily Nation* (1996) Nairobi – Kenya, August 1.
- Gorman, T.P. (1974) The development of language policy in Kenya with particular reference to the educational system. In W.H. Whiteley (ed.) *Language in Kenya*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Hocking, B.D.W. (1974) *All What I Was Taught and Other Mistakes: A Handbook of Common Errors in English*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1982) Models in non-native Englishes. In B.B. Kachru (ed.) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures* (pp. 31–57). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1985) Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (eds) *English in the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1986) *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1987) The spread of English and the sacred linguistic cows. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *GURT on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 207–28). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, Y. (1993) Social meaning and creativity in Indian English speech acts. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *Language, Communication and Social Meaning*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1994) The speaking tree: A medium of plural canons. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *GURT on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 6–22). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Kachru, B.B. (1997) World Englishes and English-using communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 66–87.
- Kembo-Sure, S. (1994) Language attitudes, use and proficiency: A sociolinguistic study of English in Kenya. Unpublished PhD thesis, Moi University.
- Kembo-Sure, S. (1996) Expression of national ethos in a non-native language. *Journal of Third World Studies* 8 (2), 189–208.
- Kioko, A.N. (2000) A case for improved orthography. Paper presented at the First International Conference on African Languages, Maseno University, Kenya, 10–12 May 2000.
- Kenya Institute of Education (1987) *Handbook for Teachers of English in Secondary Schools in Kenya*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- KNEC (Kenya National Examinations Council) (1994) *1991 and 1992 KCSE Examination Report*. Nairobi: Kenya National Examination Council.
- Mazrui, A. (1992) The presidency and language in E. Africa. *Sunday Nation*, July 26, 1992.
- Mazrui, A.A. and Mazrui, A.M. (1995) *Swahili State and Society: The Political Economy of an African Language*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.
- Mbaabu, I. (1996) *Language Policy in East Africa*. Nairobi: Educational Research and Publications.
- McArthur, T. (1994) Organized Babel: English as a global Lingua Franca. In J.E. Alatis (ed.) *GURT on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 233–242). Washington: Georgetown University press.
- Musau, P.M. (1999) Constraints on the acquisition planning of indigenous African languages: The case of Kiswahili in Kenya. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 12 (2), 117–27.
- Musau, P.M. (2000) The development of African languages for modern discourse: The

- case of Kiswahili. Paper presented at the First International Conference on African Languages, Maseno University, Kenya, 10–12 May 2000.
- Muthwii, M.J. (1994a) Kalenjin in Kenya: The socio-phonological interaction of an ethnic language with English and Kiswahili. *Language Forum* 2 (1), 1–48.
- Muthwii, M.J. (1994b) Variability in language use: A study of Kalenjin speakers of English and Kiswahili in Kenya, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, Norwich.
- Muthwii, M.J. and Lodge, K. (1995) Phonological variation in the speech of trilingual Kalenjin speakers in Kenya. *Language Forum* 3, 1–2.
- Njoroge, K. (1987) The acquisition of six morpho-syntactic structures of English by Kenyan children. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- Njoroge, M.C. (1996) Morpho-syntactic errors in the written English of first year undergraduate students in Kenya. Unpublished MA thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Nyamasyo, E.A. (1992) A corpus based study of grammatical and lexical characteristics of the writing of Kenyan pre-university students. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lancaster.
- Nyamasyo, E.A. (1994) An analysis of the spelling errors in the written English of Kenyan pre-university students. *Language, Culture Curriculum* 7 (1), 79–92.
- Ogutu, T.A. (1993) Towards standardisation of the Kenyan variety/varieties of English. In *English Across the Curriculum – the Kenyan Context* (pp. 76–85). Nairobi: British Council.
- Platt, J., Weber, H. and Ho, M.L. (1984) *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Quirk, R. and H.G. Widdowson. (1985) *English in the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Republic of Kenya (1999) *Totally Integrated Quality Education and Training: Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Educational System of Kenya*.
- Richards, J.C. (1982) Singapore English: Rhetorical and communicative styles. In B.B. Kachru (ed.) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures* (pp. 154–67). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press
- Ryanga, C.W. (2000) *National Identity and the Empowerment of Indigenous Languages*. Paper presented at The First International Conference on African Languages, Maseno University, Kenya, 10–12 May 2000.
- Schmied, J. (1990) Accepted language behaviour as a basis for language teaching: A comparison of English in Kenya and Tanzania. In C.M. Rubagumya (ed.) *Language in Education in Africa* (pp. 123–32). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Whiteley, W.H. (ed.) (1974) *Language in Kenya*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Zuengler, J.E. (1982) Kenyan English. In B.B. Kachru (ed.) *The Other Tongue: English Across Cultures* (pp. 112–24). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.