

**TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF THE HEBREW CONCEPT OF שומר: ITS
ENGLISH INTERPRETATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR
ECOLOGICAL STEWARDSHIP IN NIGERIA**

SAMUEL OLUWASEGUN KOLADE
Glorious Vision University, Ogwa

ABSTRACT

The Hebrew term שומר (*shomér*), often rendered “keeper,” “guardian,” or “watchman,” carries profound theological and ethical significance within the Hebrew Bible, encompassing personal, communal, and ecological responsibilities. While scholarship has examined its lexical range, little attention has been given to how the translation nuances influence ecological ethics—particularly within Nigerian Christian contexts facing severe environmental degradation. This study addresses that gap by critically analysing *shomér* in key biblical passages, evaluating English translations (e.g., NIV, ESV, NRSV), and exploring their theological implications for stewardship. The research adopts a qualitative methodology, combining close textual analysis and comparative translation studies. Findings indicate that variations in translation significantly shape theological constructs of stewardship, with some versions emphasizing passive care and others active, relational guardianship. These distinctions have practical implications for framing indigenous Nigerian eco-theologies. The study concludes that a linguistically informed understanding of *shomér* can deepen theological engagement with ecological issues, fostering stewardship models that are both biblically faithful and contextually relevant. The study recommends integrating translation awareness, *shomér*-based stewardship, and interdisciplinary collaboration in theology and environmental practice.

KEYWORDS: שומר(*shomér*), Stewardship, Biblical Translation, Eco-theology, and Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

The Hebrew word שומר(*shomér*), frequently translated as “keeper,” “guardian,” or “watchman,” carries profound theological and ethical dimensions within the biblical corpus. In Israel’s ancient tradition, the concept embodies layered

responsibilities, extending from individual protection to collective safeguarding and, importantly, to the stewardship of land and creation. Within the Hebrew Bible, שׁוֹמֵר (notser, “preserver”) and רֹעֶה (ro’eh, “shepherd”), demonstrating a rich and interconnected semantic field. This intertextual overlap presents a persistent challenge for translators, whose choices in rendering שׁוֹמֵר into English significantly shape theological interpretations and contemporary ecological reflection.

Although much scholarly work has examined the lexical scope of שׁוֹמֵר, relatively little has focused on the critical interplay between translation choices and their implications for ecological ethics. This gap becomes especially relevant in the Nigerian context, where ongoing environmental crises demand theological perspectives that meaningfully integrate scriptural categories with local ecological realities.

The present research sets out to investigate the textual and translational dimensions of שׁוֹמֵר in selected biblical passages, with particular attention to how English versions convey the term and how these renderings bear on the development of a theology of ecological stewardship in Nigeria. The study aims at exploring the semantic breadth and contextual deployment of שׁוֹמֵר across the Hebrew Bible. It also evaluates the accuracy and theological resonance of its translation in major English Bibles (e.g., NIV, ESV, NRSV) and reflects on how such insights can inform an indigenous ecological ethic that engages Nigeria’s pressing socio-environmental concerns.

Methodologically, the study applies a qualitative framework, combining close reading of the Hebrew text with comparative translation analysis and hermeneutical reflection. Core passages containing שׁוֹמֵר will be studied alongside their English renderings to reveal the translational tendencies and theological emphases embedded in these versions. Engagement with theological and ecological literature will further enable dialogue between biblical insight and contemporary stewardship practice.

The scope of the study is limited to biblical usages of שׁוֹמֵר and their English translations, considered in light of their ecological significance. Contextually, the research is anchored in Nigeria, where issues such as deforestation, soil depletion, and loss of biodiversity underscore the urgency of integrating biblical stewardship into ecological praxis. In doing so, the study contributes to translation studies and eco-theology by demonstrating how linguistic nuance shapes theological discourse and environmental responsibility. This will ultimately equip Nigerian churches,

theologians, and activists with a biblically grounded and contextually resonant vision of stewardship that unites scriptural heritage with ecological action.

TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF שומר SHOMER

The Hebrew root שׁמַר (*sh-m-r*) essentially conveys the ideas of “keeping,” “guarding,” “watching,” and “preserving.” From this root comes the noun שׁוֹמֵר (*shomer*), commonly translated as “keeper,” “watchman,” “guardian,” or “caretaker” (Brown, Driver, & Briggs, 1907). Within the Hebrew Bible, this term is used in diverse contexts that express both tangible roles and more abstract, moral responsibilities.

The semantic field of שׁוֹמֵר spans a wide range—from very practical duties, such as a sentinel posted to defend a city (Nehemiah 4:9) or a shepherd protecting sheep (Psalm 23:1), to theological applications such as God being portrayed as Israel’s divine “keeper” (Psalm 121:5) or humanity charged with the task of “keeping” the land and covenant (Genesis 2:15). This range reveals a complex understanding of stewardship, uniting themes of vigilance, responsibility, and care (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990).

Several passages demonstrate the importance of this term. Genesis 2:15 introduces humanity’s responsibility in Eden: God commands Adam to “work” and “keep (שמר)” the garden. The verse stresses cultivation coupled with protective care, laying a biblical foundation for ecological ethics (Kearney, 2007). In Psalm 121:5, God Himself is named as the שׁוֹמֵר, “the LORD is your keeper,” presenting divine guardianship as a model for human stewardship (Tigay, 1996). Nehemiah 4:9 reveals a communal application: the people “set a guard (שמר) day and night” while praying, embodying both vigilance and divine dependence (Smith, 1993). Proverbs 27:23 extends this to economic and ethical responsibility, urging careful oversight of flocks—an agrarian metaphor for attentive, sustainable care (Sweeney, 2005). Finally, Isaiah 62:6 employs the plural שׁוֹמְרִים, describing watchmen on Jerusalem’s walls who persist in prayer and prophetic witness, highlighting moral and spiritual guardianship (Brueggemann, 1998).

The broader biblical vocabulary reinforces and enriches this theme. The word נֹצֵר (*notser*), often rendered “preserver” or “protector,” emphasizes ongoing preservation. In Psalm 16:5, God is addressed as the one who “preserves” life (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990). The related term רוֹעֶה (*ro’eh*), “shepherd,” carries pastoral connotations of nurture, guidance, and care, famously captured in Psalm 23

(Alter, 2007). Likewise, the verb תִּצַּח (tzafah), “to watch” or “to keep lookout,” parallels שׂוֹמֵר in the role of a sentinel, especially in texts such as Ezekiel 3:17 and Nehemiah 4:9 (Gray, 1979). Taken together, these words form a rich theological lexicon of guardianship that integrates community protection, covenant faithfulness, and ecological care (Wright, 2004). Among them, however, *shomer* most fully embodies the dimension of protective stewardship over creation.

English translations render שׂוֹמֵר with notable variation. Versions like the ESV and NASB employ a formal equivalence approach, preserving terms such as “keeper,” “guardian,” and “watchman.” This maintains lexical closeness to the Hebrew root and allows readers to perceive its broad range (Liddell & Scott, 1996). By contrast, dynamic equivalence translations such as the NIV or NLT often prefer context-driven alternatives, seeking readability and relevance rather than strict lexical fidelity.

These translation choices significantly influence theological emphasis. The word “keeper,” for instance, highlights continuity and custodianship, echoing Genesis 2:15’s call to sustained care of creation. “Watchman,” however, conveys vigilance and readiness against danger, aligning with Isaiah 62:6’s image of prophetic guardianship (Waltke & O’Connor, 1990). The term “guardian” tends to suggest moral and legal accountability, while “protector” underscores active defence and intervention (Alter, 2007). Meanwhile, renderings such as “caretaker” or “preserver” underscore sustainability and ecological responsibility (Bauckham, 2010). Each nuance subtly shapes the way stewardship and responsibility are understood in theology.

Consequently, translation decisions affect how communities interpret humanity’s ecological vocation. Renderings that stress stewardship nurture an ethic of care and sustainable practice, whereas those that emphasize vigilance inspire a defensive posture against threats like pollution or land degradation (Brueggemann, 1998; Conradie, 2006). Some translations, by drawing attention to preservation and ongoing sustenance, connect biblical guardianship with modern ecological priorities such as biodiversity protection and sustainability (Bauckham, 2010).

In the Nigerian setting, where ecological crises such as deforestation, soil erosion, and desertification threaten livelihoods, these translational nuances are far from academic. They shape how Scripture is invoked in ecological ethics and faith-based advocacy. A deeper appreciation of the semantic and theological depth of שׂוֹמֵר can thus equip Nigerian Christians, theologians, and activists with a biblically grounded, context-sensitive framework for creation care (Ako, 2009).

IMPLICATIONS FOR ECOLOGICAL STEWARDSHIP IN NIGERIA

The Hebrew notion of שומר(shomér)—commonly translated as “keeper,” “guardian,” or “watchman”—speaks powerfully to Nigeria’s contemporary ecological situation. The country currently grapples with widespread environmental problems such as deforestation, soil depletion, desert encroachment, and loss of biodiversity (Ako, 2009; Kadafa, 2012). Interpreting שומר as a mandate for active stewardship provides a biblical rationale for Nigerians, particularly Christian communities, to embrace responsible ecological practices. This model of guardianship emphasizes not only protective vigilance but also intentional care, renewal, and restoration of the natural order (Bauckham, 2010).

From a theological perspective, שומר reflects the covenantal trust God places in humanity to manage creation faithfully. This responsibility is defined by accountability, care, and reverence for the integrity of the created world (Kearney, 2007; Brueggemann, 1998). In Nigeria, where ecological breakdown undermines both livelihoods and social cohesion, this vision challenges destructive exploitation of resources and instead calls for sustainable patterns of use that honour creation while promoting human flourishing (Conradie, 2006).

As a guiding framework, שומר offers practical insights for addressing Nigeria’s environmental crises. The country’s rapid deforestation—driven by commercial logging, farming expansion, and urbanization—ranks among the most severe globally (Kadafa, 2012). The ethic of stewardship embedded in שומר calls for deliberate conservation policies, community-led reforestation initiatives, and ecologically sensitive land-use systems that can restore balance to degraded ecosystems.

The northern regions of Nigeria, where desertification and land degradation jeopardize food security and spark conflicts over shrinking resources, illustrate another critical application (Ikelegbe, 2005). Rooting responses in the שומר principle encourages soil restoration projects, sustainable farming methods, and fairer land tenure practices—efforts that embody eco-justice and promote resilience (Ako, 2009).

Equally pressing is the issue of biodiversity loss, linked to habitat destruction and pollution (Orogun, 2010). The guardianship dimension of שומר underscores the responsibility to safeguard ecosystems, conserve endangered species, and cultivate public awareness of creation’s intrinsic worth. When integrated into national policy,

theological education, and grassroots advocacy, this biblical vision can inspire a spirituality of ecological care. Such spirituality motivates long-term commitments to environmental renewal and sustainable development (Bauckham, 2010; Conradie, 2006).

A closer analysis of שׁוֹמֵר and its translations reveals its layered meaning as “keeper,” “guardian,” “watchman,” or “caretaker.” Each rendering captures different facets of stewardship, from protective oversight to nurturing responsibility. The choice of translation—whether literal, dynamic, or theologically interpretive—inevitably shapes how readers perceive ecological obligation. Subtle shifts in wording highlight either defensive vigilance or active, sustaining care, both of which are necessary for a full theological vision of creation stewardship.

Key theological insights drawn from the term include divine order, accountability, covenant responsibility, and humanity’s relational bond with the natural world. שׁוֹמֵר articulates a divinely conferred duty to protect creation as a sacred trust, mirroring God’s sustaining role. This responsibility is not merely utilitarian but deeply ethical, intertwining ecological care with justice and covenant faithfulness. The balance implied by שׁוֹמֵר—protection alongside nurture, vigilance alongside preservation—mirrors the equilibrium required for healthy ecosystems.

In Nigeria, where environmental decline takes the form of deforestation, desertification, pollution, and species loss, שׁוֹמֵר provides a theological foundation for eco-ethical reflection and action. Its broad stewardship vision resonates with both indigenous values and Christian ecological sensibilities, presenting a scriptural mandate for holistic engagement that unites spiritual, social, and ecological concerns. This framework empowers churches, theologians, and policymakers to frame environmental responsibility as an extension of covenantal faithfulness and social justice. By fully embracing the rich meaning of שׁוֹמֵר, Nigerian eco-theology can respond with theological depth and ethical urgency to the ecological crises of our time.

For this reason, translators are called to strategies that preserve the full semantic range of שׁוֹמֵר, reflecting its diverse shades of meaning as both protective guardianship and nurturing care. Similarly, theologians must engage closely with the biblical languages and with present ecological realities to craft eco-theological frameworks that speak credibly to contemporary crises. Within churches, environmental advocates can draw on such theological insights to mobilize initiatives that are both culturally grounded and spiritually compelling.

CONCLUSION

The Hebrew term שומר (*shomér*) profoundly shapes theological and ecological understanding. Nuanced translation reveals stewardship as vigilant, responsible, and sustainable care for creation, while reductionist renderings obscure this vision. Further comparative and interdisciplinary research—especially within Nigerian contexts—can deepen insight into biblical guardianship and strengthen covenantal commitment to faithful earth-keeping

REFERENCES

- Ako, R. (2009). "Nigeria's Land Use Act: An Anti-Thesis to Environmental Justice." *Journal of African Law* 53(2): 289–304.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021855309990054>
- Alter, R. (2011). *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bauckham, R. (2010). *Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C.A. (2005). *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Conradie, E.M. (2006). *Christianity and Ecological Theology: Resources for Further Research*. Stellenbosch: SUN Press.
- Eze, C.C., and Eze, C.N. (2012). "Sustainable Land Management in Nigeria: Policy Issues and Challenges." *Journal of Environmental Management and Safety* 3, no. 1, 17–29.
- Gray, J. (1970). *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press.
- Ikelegbe, A.O. (2005). "The Economy of Conflict in the Oil-Rich Niger Delta Region of Nigeria." *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 14, no. 2, 208–234.
- Kadafa, A.A. (2012). "Environmental Impacts of Deforestation in the Niger Delta." *African Research Review* 6, no. 3, 1–15.
- Kearney, P.D. (2015). *The Biblical Hebrew Verbal System: A Grammatical and Exegetical Study*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- McKeown, J. (2008). *Genesis*. Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Moltmann, J. (1985). *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation*. London: SCM Press.

- Orogun, P.S. (2010). "Environmental Degradation, Livelihood and Conflicts: A Focus on the Niger Delta." *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 10, no. 2, 31–56.
- Pinker, S. (2014). *The Sense of Style: The Thinking Person's Guide to Writing in the 21st Century*. New York: Viking.
- Smith, M.S. (2010). *The Priestly Vision of Genesis I*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sweeney, M.A. (2012). *Tanak: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Tigay, J.H. (1996). *Deuteronomy*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Waltke, B.K., and O'Connor, M. (1990). *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Westermann, C. (1984). *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- White, L. Jr. (1967). "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155, no. 3767, 1203–1207. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.155.3767.1203>
- Wright, C.J.H. (2004). *Old Testament Ethics for the People of God*. Downers Grove: IVP Academic.
- Zakovitch, Y. (2012). *Inner-Biblical Interpretation*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Zerbe, G. (2018). *Doing Biblical Ethics in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Zuck, R.B. (1991). *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE COMPETENCE AND PERFORMANCE OF SPOKEN ENGLISH OF SELECTED NIGERIAN SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH

JACOB JONATHAN

Isa Mustapha Agwai Polytechnic, Lafia

AND

ONOJA ANDREW

University of Jos

ABSTRACT

This paper is an investigation into the spoken English in Nigeria, focusing on the distinctions between competence and performance among Nigerian speakers of English. Research findings of several studies have it that there are individual non-native English speakers with impeccable ability to communicate in written English and are admired internationally without a matching ability in spoken English. This paper sets out to examine the spoken English of fifty (50) randomly selected educated Nigerian speakers of English through a structured questionnaire (SQ). Mixed methods comprising a quantitative method for data collection and a descriptive method for data analysis were adopted to form a decision on the data collected. The principal findings, among others, reveal that Nigerians' spoken English can be analysed through the lenses of both competence and performance. The paper considers the implications of these findings for language policy, education, and intelligibility in communication. It advocates for a more nuanced understanding of spoken English in Nigeria, emphasizing the need for pedagogical approaches that will balance the skills of literacy and those of oracy. This will, by so doing, address the interplay between competence and performance in spoken English among Nigerian users of English

KEYWORDS: Spoken English, Competence, Performance, and Perspective.

INTRODUCTION

The English language in Nigeria is acquired or learned as a second language, whether in childhood or adulthood. Proficiency is the main target of every learner of

a second language. Language proficiency in second language learning has received attention among linguists over the years. The two concepts language scholars have explored in assessing language proficiency are competence and performance. From the body of literature, right from Chomsky's theory of Language competence and performance to recent publications, it is obvious that one cannot discuss a learner's level of mastery of a second language without diving into these earlier-mentioned concepts. These two terms, though closely related, can be delineated as will soon be done in the work to show where a second language learner has chosen to major in the process of learning a language, whether formally or informally.

This paper focuses on the oral aspect of English in second language acquisition in Nigeria. This is necessary because there are several Nigerians who are academically sound when it comes to writing, but cannot match such competence with their speaking ability in the same English. This is true because the spoken aspect of English is the most neglected in second language learning in Nigeria. It is therefore not surprising for some average, educated Nigerian users of English to attain a high standard of grammatical accuracy in the language and master all the technicalities of composition writing, but he or she cannot often appropriately speak the same language with a reasonable degree of confidence.

In his view, Banjo explains why we have "individuals with an impeccable ability to communicate in written English and be understood, even admired internationally, without a matching ability in spoken English" (71). Udofot points out that what gave birth to this is the fact that emphasis is on "the skills of literacy more than those of oracy" (35). Babalola adds: A language one cannot speak with good understanding cannot be read or written with good understanding as well. Listening becomes useless when the spoken words are misunderstood. Life becomes frustrating when you have an idea that cannot be correctly articulated (9). He also says that "Error in speech is transferred into writing" (9). Udofot equally notes that "A remarkable feature of spoken English in Nigeria is that it often falls short of the user's ability in written English" (*The Intonation* 35). It is in view of the above that this paper investigates the factors influencing spoken English skills, exploring the relationship between competence (knowledge of the language) and performance (actual use of the language) in various social and educational settings.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The proficiency of Nigerians in spoken English could be assessed through several factors, which are not actually the primary concern of this paper. To an

extent, the global rating of Nigerians' spoken English has received a pass mark. This is because many Nigerians have demonstrated good proficiency in spoken English, particularly in formal and informal contexts. In other words, many Nigerians are fluent in spoken English, a strong command of the language due to its status as an official language and medium of instruction in schools. But there are still several educated Nigerians who the above cannot attest to because, with their level of education, their spoken English is rated as below average.

The thrust of this study, however, is to investigate whether the spoken English of Nigerians is based on competence or performance. This is necessary because researchers have raised concerns over the challenges associated with the spoken English of Nigerians. But adequate work is yet to be done to investigate whether Nigerians' spoken English is based on competence or performance. Therefore, this paper takes a different approach in investigating the subject matter. It is hoped that the concept of competence and performance in relation to the spoken aspect of English by Nigerians will receive better attention in this study against this background.

THE AIM, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The broad aim of this study is to examine the competence and performance of the spoken English of Nigerians. This will be achieved through the following objectives:

- i. Ascertain whether the spoken English of Nigerians is based on competence or performance
- ii. To examine whether competence in written English matches that of spoken English
- iii. To identify possible difficulties faced by Nigerians in their spoken English.

The following are the questions this research intends to answer in relation to the objectives:

- i. What is the spoken English of Nigerians based on competence or performance?
- ii. What is the level of competence of the spoken English of Nigerians compared to their written form?
- iii. What are the possible difficulties faced by Nigerians in their spoken English?

This study is limited to the spoken aspect of English of Nigerians. The source of data is principally from the structured questionnaire. Efforts were not made to conduct an oral test using the respondents due to a lack of time and other challenges faced by the researchers.

CONCEPTUAL LITERATURE REVIEW

The Spoken English

Spoken language is arguably the most important activity that distinguishes humans from non-human species. One important characteristic of the linguistic approach towards the study of language generally is that it is not connected merely with the written language but also (and usually with greater emphasis) with the spoken. People usually place greater prominence on written communication than the spoken form of the language, especially English. But contrary to this popular opinion, Gimson arguably observes that “We are apt to forget that the written form is originally an attempt at reflecting the spoken language and that the latter precedes the former” (4). It is in view of this that he further states that “...written English is often an inadequate and misleading representation of the spoken language today” (4). Indeed, in many languages today, so parallel are the two forms, spoken and written, that the written may be responsible for a change in pronunciation or may at least tend to impose restraints on the spoken form.

This is quite true of many non-native users of English, where their spoken English often falls short of their ability in written English. Udofot attributes the problem to the kind of educational system in Nigeria that has emphasized, in her words, “the skills of literacy more than those of oracy” (35). Most often, the result of this kind of educational system has produced, as noted by Banjo, “in many cases individuals with an impeccable ability to communicate in written English and be understood, even admired internationally without a matching ability in spoken English” (71).

Palmer, in his intensive study on semantics, argues that the spoken form of language must be given priority over the written form (154). He states four reasons why the spoken language should be given more basic attention than the written, thus:

- i. The human race had speech long before it had writing, and there are still many languages that have no written forms.
- ii. The child learns to speak long before he learns to write.

- iii. Speech plays a far greater role in our lives than writing. We spend far more time speaking than writing or reading.
- iv. Written language can be largely converted into speech without loss. But the converse is not true. If we write down what is said, we lose a great deal.

From the above points, one will agree with Palmer that the spoken language has far more striking characteristics that cannot be easily shown in the written form. In particular, the spoken language has prosodic and paralinguistic features which are primarily handled under intonation and stress. Palmer further argues that “concentration on the written language has misled grammarians; they have often failed to see that the spoken language is different from the written and have, misleadingly, attempted to describe the spoken language in terms appropriate to the written” (155).

Also stressing the need for the speaking skills to be learnt seriously and adequately perfected, Babalola states that “Error in speech is transferred into writing” (9). He further asserts that “A language one cannot speak with good understanding cannot be read nor written with good understanding as well. Listening becomes useless when the spoken words are not understood. Life becomes frustrating when you have an idea that cannot be correctly articulated” (9).

English as a Second Language in Nigeria

Second language refers to a language that is learned or acquired after the individual has already acquired their first or native language. The term “second language” is often used in contrast to “first language” or “native language”. While the first language is acquired naturally as a child’s primary means of communication and forms of identity, a second language is learned later in life, typically during adolescence or adulthood. This implies that the term “second language” is used to mean a language that is learned after the first or native language is relatively established. In their view, the second language may refer to a second, third, fourth, or even twentieth language. On the other hand, the NTI manual, *Introduction to English as a Second Language* states that the term ‘second language’ is used to refer to a language that is learned extensively in addition to the first language (3). In other words, we use the term second language to describe the language a bilingual or a multilingual person acquires and uses extensively after their first language.

Today, in many parts of the world, the English language is used as a second language. This is exactly the situation in Nigeria, India, Kenya, Ghana, Singapore, Sierra-Leone, among others. Where English is used as a second language, it develops

its own peculiar characteristics different from those of English as a first language. Such characteristics manifest in the areas of pronunciation, lexis, and semantics, and to some extent grammar (syntax). Researchers have established that learning or acquiring English as a second language in Nigeria has always been laden with challenges. One of such is fluency in speaking the language. It is in view of this that mastering the language as native speakers has been an uphill task for many Nigerians. This view is strongly stressed by Fasanmi that native speakers of English believe that a second language can never attain the native speakers' proficiency (4).

Competence and Performance

Competence

Chomsky, in his elaborate study on the competence and performance of a language user, states that competence consists of the knowledge of language that the language user, in principle, has. He further explains that competence is a factor that refers to a speaker's knowledge of their language and is an attribute of the individual. This implies that the general concept of internalization of the rules that govern a language fit into the language user's competence, while the usage of these rules can be referred to as performance. The question is, where do we then place the spoken English of the educated Nigerians based on the above distinction or delineation of the two concepts made?

Performance

Chomsky delineates performance from competence by stating that performance is the result of the psychological process that employs this knowledge (in producing or interpreting language utterances. He further sees performance as the actual use and realization of language or application of language, the actual process of speaking. However, Chomsky dismissed performance as an imperfect manifestation of competence and is not worthy of being incorporated into a 'serious discipline'. If what Chomsky said is something to go by, what then will be the implications of this for this study?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Population

The design adopted for use is a mixed method comprising a quantitative method for data collection and a descriptive method for data analysis. Data for the study were collected from fifty (50) respondents through a structured questionnaire

using random sampling techniques. The respondents are made up of educated Nigerians with an ND/NCE as the least qualification. They are also of different academic and professional disciplines. Their demographic spread covers about ten (10) states in Nigeria. This is necessary because the problem of spoken English among Nigerians is not limited to a particular profession, discipline, academic cadre, or even state. It is a national issue. The responses of the respondents in the questionnaire were reduced to figures and tables and scored accordingly using simple percentages for easy statistical interpretation and analysis. The said scoring formula employed is mathematically expressed as:

$$\text{Scoring formula} = \frac{\text{No of Respondents}}{\text{Total of Respondents} \times 100}$$

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Personal Data of Respondents

Variable	Sub-Group	Frequency (over 50)	Percentage (%)
Academic Qualification	NCE/ND	15	30
	Degree	22	44
	Masters	12	24
	PhD	1	2
		Total 50	Total 100
Academic Discipline	Arts/Humanities	15	30
	Science	17	34
	Bus. & Mgt.	10	20
	Others	8	16
		Total 50	Total 100
Profession	Teaching	19	38
	Civil Servants	15	30
	Students	6	12
	Others	10	20
		Total 50	Total 100

State	Nasarawa	25	50
	Benue	5	10
	Plateau	4	8
	Bauchi	3	6
	Kogi	5	10
	Others	8	16
		Total 50	Total 100

The above data in Table 1 are very significant to this study because they enable us to know whether the respondents have the necessary qualifications, exposure, and training required to provide the needed information in this research. The demography of the respondents is equally needed to show the level of the geographical spread of the respondents. Under academic qualification, most of the respondents 44% are first degree holders. With this, many of them would have encountered the teaching or training on spoken English during their education. On the other hand, the respondents with NCE/ND are of a significant number too, 30%. Still on the qualification of the respondents, 12 persons, 24% have Master's degrees in various disciplines, and only one person has a PhD, giving a fairly balanced stratified population for this research.

From the table above, two other considerations for the selection of the respondents are academic and professional disciplines. The data surprisingly shows that most of the respondents are teachers of various levels of formal learning. 30% of the respondents are civil servants, the rest are either students or are involved in other forms of work. On the other hand, under academic specialization, the statistics reveal that 34% are from the sciences, 30% are of the arts/humanities, business & management 20% while the rest belong to other disciplines outside the mentioned ones. The demographic distribution from the table indicates that the respondents are from over ten (10) states in Nigeria. It is important to note that this background information of the respondents is relevant to the overall findings of this study because it will help in establishing that the identified research problem is restricted.

Table 2: Respondents' Response on Level of Exposure and Practice of Spoken English

Questions	Options	Frequency (over 50)	Percentage	Total
4a. Have you at any point taken a course in spoken/oral English	Yes No	26 24	52 48	100
4b. Which of these have you formally studied	Eng. Sounds Alphabets Both	7 13 30	14 26 60	100
5. What is your level of proficiency in spoken English	Beginner Intermediate Advance	5 30 15	10 60 30	100
6. What specific challenge do you face when speaking English	Pronunciation Grammar Vocabulary Confidence Intonation Understanding Native speakers	16 8 9 5 5 7	32 16 18 10 10 14	100
7. How often do you find yourself mistaking grammatical errors even when you know the correct forms.	Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never	4 30 14 2	8 60 28 4	100
8. What factor(s) is responsible for poor performance in spoken English	Anxiety Lack of practice Influence of NL Limited voc./phrases Others	7 8 15 16 4	14 16 30 32 8	100
9. Which of these uses of English will you rate yourself as being more competent	Spoken Written	15 35	30 70	100

10. Would you say your spoken English sounds the same as the native speakers	Yes	14	28	100
	No	36	72	
11. Do you believe that many Nigerians often make errors in spoken English rather than the written form?	Yes	44	88	100
	No	6	12	
12. In the course of speaking English, do you experience mother tongue/accents?	Yes	32	64	100
	No	18	36	

Table 2 shows that all the options in each of the questions had a certain number of respondents, no matter how insignificant the number may be. This confirms the fact that all the questions generated and options attached to them are relevant to the subject matter of this research. For instance, in question 4, most of the respondents (52%) admitted that they had formal teaching/training in spoken English. Some right from primary school level, some at secondary school, while others at the tertiary level of their education. It is important to note that because of the significance of spoken English, it is being taught at all levels of our educational system. These data attest to our research question 1, which seeks to know whether the spoken English of Nigerians is based on competence or performance. This therefore establishes that many Nigerians have acquired the knowledge of oral English and are well exposed to the underlying rules of phonology. Hence, their spoken English is based on competence and not mere performance.

On the other hand, 48% of the respondents claim they have never been exposed to the teaching/training of spoken English. The researchers believe that either the respondents did not understand this question well enough, or failed to maximize the opportunities they had when in school to be taught. However, their responses here imply that, though they may lack adequate knowledge, their spoken English may likely be based on performance.

In the same vein, the data in the table for question 5 further reveal that 60% of the respondents admitted that they are at the intermediate level of proficiency in spoken English. This agrees with the work of Jowitt and Silas on *Common Errors in English*, that many educated Nigerian users of English cannot be rated beyond

average in their use of English due to 'inadequate grasp of the rules of English grammar being their general cause, but no doubt the interference of African languages also accounts for many of them (vii).

It is observable from Table 2, question 5, that 60% of the respondents admitted that they fall into the immediate level of proficiency. The implication of this simply infers that most of the respondents are not above average (perfect, fluent) or below average (poor) in their self-rating of spoken English. Deeper insight into the data has shocking revelations contained in questions 10, 11, and 12 as presented in Table 2 above. 70% of the respondents in question 10 agree that they are more competent in the written form of English than in the oral form. Surprisingly, in question 11, 72% claimed to speak the same as native speakers of English. Whereas the same respondents, 88% concur that they do commit errors more in spoken English than in the written form. One will notice inconsistencies and disparities in their responses to these three questions. But one thing that is obvious here is that it confirms that many Nigerians who speak English are based on performance. The spoken English is the same or near native speakers', yet embedded with errors, and a lack of in-depth knowledge of the language. The last question on Table 2 affirms that mother tongue interference is part of the reasons why many Nigerians who speak English lack proficiency, with 64% accepting this fact.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study investigates the spoken English of Nigerians vis-à-vis competence and performance. As earlier noted, this study elicited data from fifty (50) respondents of different academic disciplines and professions, varying academic qualifications, and different geopolitical areas. From the data presentation and discussion above, the following constitute the principal findings of this research:

1. Nigerian spoken English can be analysed through the lenses of both competence and performance.
2. There are indications from the study that their spoken English is characterized by competence because of their underlying knowledge of the language rules. Also, in the context of spoken English, many Nigerian English speakers often demonstrate a strong understanding of English grammar, vocabulary, and evidence of phonetics and phonological rudiments in the course of their speaking.

3. Another principal finding shows that the spoken English of many Nigerians is based on performance. This is justified by the responses of the respondents that many in real-life situations do not speak out of in-depth knowledge of the technicalities that govern the use of language.
4. Another notable finding in the research reveals that many Nigerians are better and more accurate in the written form of English compared to the spoken form. Some attributed this to being exposed to the rudiments of writing (literacy) more than to speaking (oracy). This is due to our educational system in Nigeria, which places a premium on literacy above oracy.
5. Some of the challenges that several Nigerians are facing with spoken English are partly due to the kind of educational system in place in the country and the lack of practice of speaking.

CONCLUSION

The spoken aspect of English could be based on competence, performance, or both, especially among nonnative speakers of the language. It is in view of this that the primary goal of this study was to investigate whether the spoken English of some educated Nigerians is based on competence or performance. The investigation focused on some educated Nigerians who have a minimum of NCE/ND qualification in different disciplines. Considering their levels of education, the study has confirmed the findings of related earlier reviews that the spoken English of some educated Nigerians is usually characterized by performance because they lack the basic underlying knowledge of the technicalities of spoken English. The paper has also shown that many educated Nigerians are very good and exhibit mastery of English at the written level of using the language but lack such mastery at the spoken level of the same language. This study concludes that the spoken English of many educated Nigerians can be analysed through the lenses of both competence and performance. This implies that for some, their spoken English could be identified with competence, while for others is based on performance skills.

WORKS CITED

- Babalola, J. "Effects of Intonation Variants on the Language of Wider Communication in A Multi-Lingual Environment". *International Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education*, vol.1, no. 3, 2014, pp. 9-14.
- Banjo, A. "The University and the Standardization of the English Language in Nigeria." *West African Journal of Modern Languages*, No. I, 1976, pp. 93-98.

- Chomsky, Noah. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. MIT Press, 1965.
- Fasanmi, Olufunso. "Challenges of Oral English in English as a Second Language (ESL) Learning in Nigeria". *Academic Leadership Journal*, vol. 9, 2, 2011.
- Gimson, Alfred C. *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*. 4th. Ed. Hodder & Stoughton, 1989.
- Jowitt, David and Nnamonu Silas. *Common Errors in English*. Longman, 1985
- National Teachers' Institute. *Introduction to English as a Second Language*, National Open University, 2006.
- Newby, David. "Competence and Performance in Learning and Teaching". Selected Papers from the 19th ISTAL, 2022.
- Palmer, F.R. *Semantics*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Udofot, Inyang. "Stress and Rhythm in the Nigerian Accent of English. A Preliminary Investigation". *English World-Wide*, Vol. 24, No. 2, 2003, pp.201-220.
- . "The Intonation of Nigerian English". *Journal of West African Language*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 2002, pp. 22-35.
- . "The Rhythm of Spoken Nigerian English." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Uyo. 1997.
- . "Patterns of Nigerian English Intonation". *English World-Wide*, Vol. 21, 2000, pp. 63-80.

