

REPUBLIQUE DU CAMEROUN

Paix – Travail – Patrie

UNIVERSITE DE YAOUNDE I
ECOLE NORMALE SUPERIEURE
DEPARTEMENT DE ANGLAIS



REPUBLIC OF CAMEROUN

Peace – Work – Fatherland

UNIVERSITY OF YAOUNDE I
HIGHER TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

AN INVESTIGATION ON THE MASTERY OF RP BY STUDENTS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARDS CamE

A Dissertation Submitted to the Higher Teacher Training College (ENS) Yaounde in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of a Postgraduate Teacher's
Diploma (DIPES II) in English Studies

Par :

MAXIME MERCIER FOPA
Licencié de Lettres bilingues

Sous la direction
AMBE MFORTEH
Associate Lecturer

Année Académique
2015-2016





AVERTISSEMENT

Ce document est le fruit d'un long travail approuvé par le jury de soutenance et mis à disposition de l'ensemble de la communauté universitaire de Yaoundé I. Il est soumis à la propriété intellectuelle de l'auteur. Ceci implique une obligation de citation et de référencement lors de l'utilisation de ce document.

D'autre part, toute contrefaçon, plagiat, reproduction illicite encourt une poursuite pénale.

Contact : biblio.centrale.uyi@gmail.com

WARNING

This document is the fruit of an intense hard work defended and accepted before a jury and made available to the entire University of Yaounde I community. All intellectual property rights are reserved to the author. This implies proper citation and referencing when using this document.

On the other hand, any unlawful act, plagiarism, unauthorized duplication will lead to Penal pursuits.

Contact: biblio.centrale.uyi@gmail.com

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my father David Fopah and to my mother Justine Manto.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has come to this stage thanks to the contribution of many people, to whom I wish to express my gratitude. I feel very indebted to my supervisor, Professor Ambe Mforteh, for all he did in terms of assistance and guidance.

My gratitude equally goes to the lecturers who taught and molded me during my study. My due respect goes to Prof Simo Bobda (The Head of the Department of English) as well as to Prof Aloysius Ngefac, Dr Divine Neba and Dr David Kusi who helped, in one way or the other, to shape my intellectual background and for material support.

I sincerely thank Etube Ewane, Azong Terence, Nchamba Bernice, Etoga Marthe, and Tcheuto Flora for their assistance throughout the research process.

I also express my profound gratitude to my trainer during the internship, Jacqueline Yufenyuy for the proof-reading of my dissertation and academic guidance.

Finally, my gratitude goes to my lovely family members for their moral and financial support. I have not also forgotten all my friends and classmates who have stood beside me through this period, with their nice words and supports.

ABSTRACT

This study was out to investigate the mastery of Received Pronunciation (henceforth RP) by students and English Language teachers and their attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English (henceforth CamE) in Cameroonian schools. The study was conducted with the hypothesis that both students and teachers don't master RP and they have controversial attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English in schools; teachers have negative attitudes towards the teaching of CamE because they believe that the language that will be useful to students is the SBE since it is the language used for international communication. Students on the other hand have positive attitudes towards the adoption of CamE in schools because they find it easier than SBE especially at the level of phonology and also because it reflects their sociocultural and linguistic realities. A Word List Style (henceforth WLS) and a questionnaire was administered to forty University students and secondary school teachers who made up the population of the study. It generally aimed at accessing their level of mastery of RP and eliciting their attitudes towards the teaching of RP in Cameroon. As far as data collection with the help of a WLS was concerned, a list of twenty English words was designed following the WLS and presented to informants for them to pronounce. Their pronunciation were tape-recorded for subsequent analysis. The percentages of Standard British English (henceforth SBE) and CamE forms were therefore distinguished. The questionnaires were used to obtain the students and teachers attitudes towards the use of CamE and SBE. The findings revealed that, students as well as teachers don't master RP as it was hypothesised. This can be justified by the fact that only an average of 7.7% of the students could pronounce the twenty words with the RP accent. Teachers on the other hand showed better results considering the fact that they had an average of 33.8% success as far as the pronunciation of those sample words were concerned. But these results are still below expectations since they are considered as professionals of English. Our findings equally revealed that both teachers and students have positive attitudes towards the teaching of RP in classroom. The results therefore contradicted the hypothesis formulated from the outset to a certain extend. It was stated that students have positive attitudes towards the teaching of CamE this was proven wrong in the course of our investigation because only 40% of our informants were in favour of CamE accent. As far as teachers were concerned, the hypothesis was confirmed since up to 67.5% of the informants were in favour of SBE as the variety to encourage in our language classrooms.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude avait pour but d'étudier la maîtrise de l'Anglais dite Standard par les étudiants et les enseignants d'Anglais et leurs opinions à l'égard de l'enseignement de l'Anglais Camerounais dans les établissements Camerounais. Cette étude avait comme hypothèse que les étudiants et les enseignants ne maîtrisent pas la variété d'anglais dite standard et ont des opinions divergentes à l'encontre de l'enseignement de l'Anglais dite Standard dans les écoles. Les enseignants ont des comportements négatifs en ce qui concerne l'enseignement de la variété Camerounaise parce qu'ils croient que la langue qui sera utile pour les apprenants est le SBE étant donné que c'est la dite langue qui est utilisée pour les communications internationales. Au contraire, les élèves ont une opinion positive sur l'adoption de la variété camerounaise dans l'enseignement parce qu'ils trouvent cette variété plus facile comparée à la variété Standard surtout au niveau de la phonologie et aussi parce que celle-ci reflète les réalités linguistiques et socioculturelles. Une liste de mots et un questionnaire ont été établis pour quarante étudiants et enseignants du secondaire qui ont constitué la population cible de notre étude. À l'aide de la liste de mots, les différentes formes de prononciation de nos informateurs ont été enregistrées et classées sous deux rubriques différentes. Les questionnaires ont été utilisés pour recueillir l'opinion des étudiants et les enseignants sur l'enseignement de la variété dite Standard ou Camerounaise. Les résultats ont révélé que les enseignants et les élèves ne maîtrisent pas la variété dite Standard comme nous l'avions présentée au niveau de l'hypothèse. Ceci se justifie par le fait que seulement une moyenne de 7.7% des élèves pouvait prononcer les vingt mots avec l'accent Standard. D'autre part, les enseignants ont eu une performance nettement mieux avec une moyenne de 33.8 % en ce qui concerne la prononciation de ces mots. Néanmoins, ces résultats ont été en dessous de nos attentes étant donné qu'ils sont considérés comme des maîtres d'Anglais. Nos recherches ont également montré que les enseignants et les élèves ont des opinions positives envers l'enseignement de la variété dite Standard dans les salles de classe. Ce résultat a donc contredit sur un point notre hypothèse formulée au départ. Il était mentionné que les élèves ont des opinions positives en ce qui concerne l'enseignement de l'Anglais Camerounais mais au cours de nos recherches ceci s'est avéré être faux vu que seulement 40% de nos informateurs étaient en faveur de l'Anglais Camerounais. En ce qui concerne les enseignants notre hypothèse a été confirmée puisque 67.5% de nos informateurs étaient en faveur du fait que la variété standard devrait être encouragée dans nos salles de classes.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
RÉSUMÉ.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER ONE: THEORITICAL FRAMEWORKS AND LITERATURE REVIEW	4
1.0 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Theoretical Frameworks.....	4
1.1.1 World Englishes Framework.....	4
1.1.2 Error Analysis Framework.....	5
1.2 Review of Literature.....	6
1.2.1 The Concept of Attitude.....	6
1.2.2 The Concept of New Englishes.....	8
1.2.3 ELT in Postcolonial Contexts.....	11
1.2.4 Sociolinguistic concerns in New English context RP vs CamE.....	14
1.2.5 Factors affecting the choice of which standard to teach in postcolonial context. ...	17
1.2.6 Identification of Cameroon English.....	18
1.2.7 Cameroon English Phonology.....	19
1.2.7.1 Vocalic features in Cameroon English.....	19
1.2.7.1.1 Monophthongs.....	19
1.2.7.1.2 Diphthongs.....	21
1.2.7.1.3 Triphthongs.....	21
1.2.7.2 Consonantal features of Cameroon English.....	22
1.2.7.2.1 Voicing.....	22
1.2.7.2.2 Clustering.....	23
1.2.7.2.3 Spelling pronunciation.....	23

1.2.8 Gaps and contribution.....	24
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	25
2.0 Introduction	25
2.1 The Research Design:.....	25
2.1.1 Area of the Study	25
2.1.2 Population of the Study	25
2.1.2.1 The Teachers.....	25
2.1.2.2 The Students	27
2.1.3 Research Instruments.....	29
2.2 Method of Data Collection.....	29
2.3 Method of Data analysis.....	29
2.4 Difficulties Encountered	30
2.5 Difficulties Encountered	30
CHAPTER THREE: PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	31
3.0 Introduction	31
3.1 Analysis of teachers' and students' mastery of RP	31
3.1.1 Analysis of students' mastery of RP.....	31
3.1.1.1 Monophthongs	32
3.1.1.2 Diphthongs.....	34
3.1.1.3 Triphthongs.....	35
3.1.2 Analysis of teachers' mastery of RP.....	35
3.1.2.1 Monophthongs.....	36
3.1.2.2 Diphthongs.....	38
3.1.2.3 Triphthongs.....	39
3.2 Analysis of Teachers' Attitudes	39
3.2.1 Variety of English used by teachers in Cameroon	39
3.2.2 Attitudes toward the use of Cameroon English.....	40
3.2.3 Teachers' attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent	41
3.2.3.2 Justification of teachers' disdain of those who speak Cameroon English:.....	42
3.2.4 Teachers' view on which variety of English to be promoted in classroom.....	43

3.2.4.1 Justification by teachers for the choice of RP in ELT.....	44
3.2.4.2 Justification by teachers for the choice of CamE	44
3.3.1 Classification of informants according to the pronunciation they adopt while speaking the English Language.	46
3.3.1.1 Justification for CamE	47
3.3.1.2 Justification for RP	47
3.3.2 Attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their CamE Pronunciation	48
3.3.3 Variety of English to be promoted in ELT	49
3.4 Conclusion.....	49
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS AND THE SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS	50
4.0 Introduction	50
4.1 Discussion of the Major Findings	50
4.2 Sociolinguistic implications	55
4.3 Pedagogic implications	56
4.4 Conclusion.....	56
GENERAL CONCLUSION	57
REFERENCES BIBLIOGRAPHIQUES.....	59
APPENDICES	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table One: classification of informants according to sex.....	26
Table Two: classification of informants according to sex	27
Table Three: classification of informants according to their linguistic backgrounds.....	28
Table Four: Classification of informants according to the language they use frequently	28
Table Five: Realisation of the central vowel [ə].....	32
Table Six: Realisation of the short vowel [ɪ], the central vowel [ʌ] and spelling pronunciation in CamE	33
Table Seven: Realisation of the short vowel [ɜ]	33
Table Eight: Realisation of RP diphthongs.....	34
Table Nine: Realisation of RP triphthongs	35
Table Ten: Realisation of the central vowel [ə].....	36
Table eleven: Realisation of the short vowel [ɪ], the central vowel [ʌ] and spelling pronunciation in CamE.....	36
Table Twelve: Realisation of the long vowel [ɜ]	37
Table Thirteen: Realisation of RP diphthongs.....	38
Table Fourteen: Realisation of RP triphthongs.....	39
Table Fifteen: Variety of English used by teachers in class	40
Table Sixteen: attitudes of teachers towards the use of CamE.....	40
Table Seventeen: Admiration for Cameroon English.....	42
Table Eighteen: Justification for their admiration	42
Table Nineteen: Justification for negative attitudes.....	42
Table Twenty: Teachers' view on which variety of English to be promoted in classroom.....	43
Table Twenty One: Justification of RP as a choice	44
Table Twenty Two: Justification by teachers for the choice of CamE.....	45
Table Twenty Three: Justification for teachers who promote the two varieties.....	45

Table Twenty Four: Classification of informants according to the pronunciation they adopt while speaking the English Language.....	46
Table Twenty Five: Justification for CamE	47
Table Twenty Six: Justification for RP.....	48
Table Twenty Seven: Attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their CamE Pronunciation	48
Table Twenty Eight: Accent to be promoted in ELT	49

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CamE: Cameroon English

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

RP: Received Pronunciation

SBE: Standard British English

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SLL: second Language Learning

WLS: Word List Styl

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Imperialism had as secondary effect the propagation of European languages. Through colonialism, Europeans implanted their languages in many African countries and these languages were promoted to the detriment of African indigenous languages. After independence, these languages became the official languages of many countries such as Ghana, Nigeria, Algeria, Kenya and Cameroon. Among these European languages was the English Language. This language became the official language of many former British colonies and was used by the educated elites and became the language of instruction in schools. The English language witnessed a series of transformations to suit the socio political, linguistic, cultural and economic realities of the countries in which they were used hence we witnessed the development of different varieties of English such as Cameroon English, Nigerian English, Ghanaian English different from the SBE; the question which many scholars keep asking themselves is: Which variety should be promoted in countries which don't have English as their native language?. In many African countries in general and in Cameroon in particular, this question has been at the order of the day. Some people think that the variety of English to be promoted is the SBE because it is the number one world language and not our indigenous varieties which are still seen as dialects. There are other sets of scholars who think that the variety of English to be promoted is our native variety because they reflect our social realities and culture. Kachru (1986) is categorically asserting that "no member of the outer circle speaks RP" he observes that "even if he could he would lack the mannerism distinct of a native speaker". Also, the impossibility of members of the outer circle to speak RP lies in the fact that there is nobody to teach them the correct forms considering the fact that nobody masters them. Ngefac (2011) qualifies the teaching of SBE as a situation where a blind person is leading another blind person. He argues with concrete facts that the promotion of SBE pronunciation to the detriment of educated Cameroon English will never yield the desired results

The level of language proficiency in Cameroon has instigated many researchers to conduct researches on which variety of English to be promoted be it the native model or Cameroonian English see (Ngefac 2010 and 2011, Anchimbe 2007, etc) However, the above mentioned reality stands as a challenge to the linguistic policy of the country, which stresses the promotion of RP in the educated milieu, despite the Quasi impossibility to teach this native accent successfully. This work therefore, investigates the mastery of RP by students and teachers and their attitudes towards CamE pronunciation in ELT.

The following questions were designed to guide this investigation:

1. Do students and teachers master RP?
2. What are the attitudes of English Language teachers towards Cameroon English?
3. What are the attitudes of English Language students towards Cameroon English?
4. Does their attitudes influence the level of English Language proficiency in
Cameroonian schools?

The study was based on the hypothesis that both students and teachers don't master RP and they have controversial attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English in schools; teachers have negative attitudes towards the teaching of CamE because they believe that the language that will be useful to students is the SBE because it is the language used for international communication and not CamE. Students on the other hand have positive attitudes towards the adoption of CamE in schools because they find it easier than SBE especially at the level of phonology and also because it reflects their sociocultural and linguistic realities.

There are many reasons which motivated us to undertake this research. First, the rapid increase in number of literate and illiterate people who use CamE on daily bases in and out of classroom situations arose our attention to see which variety of English should be brought in our classroom. Second, the difficulties faced by both the teachers and students in teaching and learning SBE respectively made us investigate if they will not prefer another variety of English relatively easier than the former one. Also, emphasis are laid on accessing the knowledge of teachers and learners on RP and never on their attitudes toward that language or if they will want to adopt another variety. Third, since attitudes changes as time passes by, previous research have been carried out on attitudes of Cameroon towards SBE and CamE so there was need for us to investigate current attitudes of students and teachers toward the teaching of CamE in Cameroonian English classrooms.

This study based on the mastery of RP by students and teachers and their attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English is likely to be significant in many ways. Firstly, this study investigate whether or not the level of proficiency in Cameroonian school is not as a result of the inability of language teachers to teach the correct form of SBE to learners or it is the inability of the students to master the native model? Secondly, it is out to assess the degree of motivation of teacher and students toward the implementation of CamE to the detriment of SBE in Cameroonian system of education. Lastly, this study is out to attempt to narrow the gap

between SBE and CamE and to show that Cameroon English is an independent variety of English having its own rules reflecting the sociocultural and linguistic realities of its country.

As for the scope, the work is limited to investigating the mastery of RP by university students and secondary school teachers and their attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English pronunciation. Under this work, we are going to examine the role that attitudes play in the success of CamE in our Cameroonian society; if positive attitudes will lead to the success of the implementation of Cameroon English in our Cameroonian system of education.

This work has a well-defined structure. It has four chapters, in addition to the General Introduction and General Conclusion. The General Introduction gives a brief background to the study and exposes the research problem, research questions and hypothesis. It also provides us with the motivation, significance, scope and structure of the study. Chapter one discusses the theoretical framework and literature review; as far as the theoretical frameworks is concerned, Kachru's (1985) World Englishes model and Error Analysis theory will be used. For the review of literature, previous works on attitudes, Cameroon English, Standard British English and ELT in post-colonial contexts shall be reviewed. Chapter Two brings out the methodology used in carrying out the investigation; it presents the research tools used for data collection, describes how they were used and presents the target population. Chapter Three presents the data collected, analyses and interprets the target population. Chapter Four discusses the major findings and examines their sociolinguistic and pedagogic implications. The work closes with the General conclusion which discusses the implication of the study and gives recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER ONE

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORKS AND LITERATURE REVIEW

1.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the theoretical frameworks used and the review of literature related to this investigation. The theoretical framework used in this investigation is the World Englishes model developed by Kachru in 1985. As for the review of literature previous research on attitudes, CamE, SBE, ELT in postcolonial context shall be reviewed.

1.1 Theoretical Frameworks

As earlier mentioned above, this research topic shall be carried out within the World Englishes Framework designed by Kachru in 1985 in his publication “World Englishes and Applied linguistics and the error analysis framework.

1.1.1 World Englishes Framework

This framework sees different varieties of English as autonomous and independent languages and not as deviations from the standard form or traditional native English. The concept of World Englishes and Standard English has been an area of great debate between Quirk (1981 and 1990) and Kachru (1985 and 1992). According to Quirk, World Englishes are deviations and interference varieties and teachers of English in this context should use the prescribed norms of English instead of relying on this deviated forms. In response to him, Kachru (1985) on the other hand claimed that such norms as speech acts and register were irrelevant to the sociolinguistic realities in which members of the outer circle use English.

The spread of English across the world has instigated many researchers to carry out researches on the different forms and functions of the language. See (platt et al 1984, Kachru 1985-1986 and 1992, Simo Bobda 1994, Nguéfac 2008, 2010, 2011 among others) this can be clearly captured in Schneider quoted in Nguéfac (2010)

Its pull and attractiveness are immense. From Barbados to Australia, From Kenya to Hong Kong a traveler will today get along with English but he or she will also realize that the Englishes encountered are quite different from each other pronounced with varying accents, pronounced with varying accents, employing local words opaque to an outsider, and even, on closer inspection, constructing sentences with certain words in slightly different ways. What is perhaps even more interesting is that our virtual traveler will encounter native speakers of English not only in Canada and New Zealand where this would be expected, but also in Nigeria and Singapore and in many other parts of the world in which English is not an ancestral language (Schneider 2007:2)

The spread of English round the world is increasing at a geometric rate. 80% of English users in the world are non-native speakers (Crystal 1997). Kachru (1985) suggests that native

speakers of English had become a minority since the early 1970s. People use English for international communication. With regard to the wide spread of English language, Kachru proposed a concentric model of world English, representing the type of spread, the patterns of acquisition and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages; (Kachru, 1985:12) This model specifies the following circles in greater detail.

(a) The inner circle: In the inner circle countries, English is the primary majority language of the country. Typical countries include the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. There are about 320-380 million English users in these countries, accounting for about 20-28% of the total English users (Crystal, 2003).

(b) The outer circle: In the outer circle countries, the spread of English is largely a result of colonization by English speaking nations. As a consequence of British colonization, English was institutionalized in the multilingual contexts in the 19th century. The imposition of English nevertheless provides a united second language for intra-national communication in the multilingual countries such as Singapore, India, or the Philippines. It is in these outer circle countries that varieties of English, including standard, pidgin, and creole, emerged and developed as the local language (Crystal, 1997; Kachru, 1985). There are about 300-500 million English users in this circle, constituting about 26% of the total English users (Crystal, 2003).

(c) The expanding circle: In the expanding circle countries, English serves mainly as the language for international communication. English is widely studied as a foreign language, such as in the European countries, China, Japan, or Taiwan. The spread of English in this circle is largely caused by the recognition of the importance of English as an international language. Crystal (1997) noticed that nowadays many expanding circle countries have more English-speaking bilinguals than the countries in the outer circle. There are no locally generated varieties of English, as the language is not commonly used for local communication. There are about 500-1000 million English users in this circle, which covers almost half of English users (Crystal, 2003).

1.1.2 Error Analysis Framework

Error Analysis framework was developed by Corder in 1967 as a response to contrastive analysis. According to contrastive analysis, the errors produced by a learner of a second language are as a result of the transfers he does from his first language. According to them, Errors are

considered undesirable and fatal to proper language learning. Contrary to Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis advocates that second language learners errors are natural and inevitable, it is seen as an important an integral part of the language learning process. Crystal (1987) perceives Error Analysis as a technique of identifying, classifying and systematically interpreting the unacceptable forms produced by some group of people learning a foreign language, using any of the principles and procedures provided by linguists.

One major contribution of Error Analysis in the field of SLL is its recognition of the non-interference errors in the process of SLA. Brown (1987) observes that one of the major distinction between Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis is that the latter examines errors whatever their source. Consequently, Error Analysis overshadows Contrastive Analysis as a better in understanding second language learners errors and hence the process of SLA.

As any other theory in SLA, Error Analysis has its shortcomings. This theory lays too much emphasis on learners' errors. In ELT too much insistence on learners' errors will frustrate the learner since his good utterances will not be noticed and this will lead to a total loss in motivation. Another short coming of Error Analysis is that it will make the learner become a monitor overuser. By so doing, the students will hardly use the language for verbal communication which is the primary function of the language.

Error Analysis is relevant to this study because the investigation is concerned with features that deviate from RP. It is worth noting that despite the plurality of English in Cameroon, ELT goals remain oriented towards SBE in their pronunciation of linguistic items. This implies that any deviation from RP is seen as an error.

1.2 Review of Literature

Under this rubric, previous works on attitude, Cameroon English, SBE and English language teaching shall be reviewed.

1.2.1 The Concept of Attitude

Attitude is one of the key predominant factors for success in language learning. This explains why many researches have been carried out researches to bring in more light as far as the relationship between language and attitude is concerned. Researchers in the fields of psychology and education, especially language learning, consider several definitions of attitude which mention different meanings from different contexts and perspectives (Alhmali, 2007). Based on the theory of planned behavior, Montano and Kasprzyk (2008, p. 71) state,

Attitude is determined by the individual's beliefs about outcomes or attributes of performing the behavior (behavioral beliefs), weighed by evaluations of those outcomes or attributes. Thus, a person who holds strong beliefs that positively valued outcomes will result from performing the behavior will have a positive attitude toward the behavior. Conversely, a person who holds strong beliefs that negatively valued outcomes will result from the behavior will have a negative attitude.

With regards to the concept of attitudes Baker (1988) points out different characteristics, including the following

- Attitudes are cognitive (refer to thought) and affective (referring to feeling to feeling and emotions)
- Attitudes are dimensional, that is, they vary degree of favorability and unfavorability
- Attitudes predispose a person to act in a particular way but the relationship between attitudes and action is not a strong one
- Attitudes are learnt; not inherent or genetically endowed
- Attitudes tend to persist but they can be modified by experience

Gardner (1985) also points out that attitude is an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about the referent. "Attitude is thus linked to a person's values and beliefs and promotes or discourages the choices made in all realms of activity, whether academic or informal." Gardner's argument led Wenden (1991) to present a comprehensive definition of the attitude concept. He classified the term "attitude" into three interrelated components namely, cognitive, affective and behavioral. The cognitive component involves the beliefs, thoughts or viewpoints about the object of the attitude. The affective component refers to the individual's feelings and emotions towards an object, whether he/she likes or dislikes. The behavioral component involves the tendency to adopt particular learning behaviors. Attitude is determined by the individual's beliefs about outcomes or attributes of performing the behavior (behavioral beliefs), weighted by evaluations of those outcomes or attributes. Thus, a person who holds strong beliefs that positively valued outcomes will result from performing the behavior will have a positive attitude toward the behavior. Conversely, a person who holds strong beliefs that negatively valued outcomes will result from the behavior will have a negative attitude.

Our main concern here is the relationship between attitudes and language learning. According Gardner and Lambert (1972) the ability of the students to master a second language is not only influenced by the mental competence or, language skills, but also on the students' attitudes and perceptions towards the target language. They also advocated that attitude concept

could enhance the process of language learning, influencing the nature of student's behaviors and beliefs towards the other language, its culture and community, and this will identify their tendency to acquire that language. In 1992, Baker proposed a comprehensive theoretical model, focusing on the importance of conducting attitudinal research in the field of language learning. Baker (1992, p. 9) states that, "In the life of a language, attitudes to that language appear to be important in language restoration, preservation, decay or death." Recently, De Bot et al. (2005) assert that language teachers, researchers and students should acknowledge that high motivation and positive attitude of students facilitate second language learning. Thus, if a learner does not have the interest and tendency in acquiring the target language to communicate with others, this learner will possess a negative attitude and will not be motivated and enthusiastic in language learning. Therefore, learners' attitudes could incorporate in language learning because it may influence their performance in acquiring the target language.

1.2.2 The Concept of New Englishes.

The English Language is today the number one language because of his spread across the world. The result has been the emergence of numerous new varieties which are markedly distinct from one another and from the Mother Tongue English because of the sociolinguistic and cultural realities of each nation (see platt et al 1984, Kachru 1985, 1986 and 1992, Simo Bobda 1994, David Crystal 2003, Ngefac 2008a among others).

"New Englishes" are second-language varieties of English which have been spreading vigorously in many countries of the world, mostly in postcolonial contexts and primarily in Asia and Africa. In many cases, they are institutionalised as (co-)official languages widely used or even dominant in formal and public domains. They also tend to be nativised, i.e. characterised by distinctive features on the levels of lexis, pronunciation of grammar, many of which can be accounted for as products of contact with indigenous languages. Essentially, the New Englishes are products of prolonged contact between English-speaking settlers who came to new lands in colonial history and the indigenous populations resident there who were forced to adjust somehow; they have emerged, in a characteristic fashion, through the increasing contact and mutual accommodation between these groups (Schneider, 2007).

The term "World Englishes" will be used, as Jenkins (2006) proposed, to cover new Englishes in Africa and Asia, which are considered as Outer Circle by Kachru. The spread of English is clearly mentioned in platt's (1984) declaration "English has become the most important international language and is the most commonly taught second language in the world". The speed at which English has spread across the world instigated many scholars to

find if the different varieties spoken across the world are nothing else but deviations from native Englishes; at this level different scholars share different points of views. World Englishes and Standard English was originally hotly debated by Quirk (1985, 1990) and Kachru (1985, 1991). Quirk (1990), in his discussion of Englishes in various contexts especially in the Outer-Circle countries, suggested that these varieties of English be just interference varieties and teachers of English were advised to focus on native norms and native like performance and stressed the need to uphold one common standard in the use of English not only in the Inner Circle countries but also in others. He also pointed out that a common standard of use for written as well as spoken English was necessary to regulate the use of English in different contexts. He suggested this possibly for the fear that the language (English) would divide up into unintelligible varieties or different forms, which would result in its losing the function of international communication. In response to him, Kachru (1985), on the other hand, claims that such norms as speech acts and registers were irrelevant to the sociolinguistic reality in which members of the Outer Circle use English. However, he did not mention that what he said might also be relevant to English as a Lingua Franca and the use of English in the Expanding Circle. Kachru also believed that acknowledging a variety of norms would not lead to a lack of intelligibility among different users of English and in a way, Widdowson (1994) supported Kachru saying that many bilingual users of English acquire the language in educational contexts, which put emphasis on a particular standard and tend to ensure some unifying forms. He asserts that:

The very fact that English is an international language means that no nation can have custody over it. ... It is a matter of considerable pride and satisfaction for native speakers of English that their language is an international means of communication. But the point is that it is only international to the extent that it is not their language. It is not a possession which they lease out to others, while still retaining the freehold. Other people actually own it (Widdowson, 1994, p. 385)

Salman Rushdie (1991) quoted in Crystal (2003) captures the independent nature of World Englishes “The English language ceased to be the sole possession of the English long time ago. Indeed, when even the largest English-speaking nation, the USA, turns out to have only about 20 per cent of the world’s English speakers, it is plain that no one can now claim sole ownership”

The different varieties of English round the world are as a result of the context in which the speakers find themselves and the function they want the variety to perform. Language has three major functions: the first is communication; people use language to communicate with one another, the second is identity; people use language to signal to other people who they are and what group they belong to, the third which is closely related to identity which is culture

people use language to express their culture. Each of the function require a different variety or register.

The spread of English across the world led to the emergence of numerous different varieties and the complexity in differentiating which one is different from the other. As a result, an influential classification has been put forward by Kachru (1985 and 1986). This is the three circles model. He quotes:

The current sociolinguistic profile of English may be viewed in terms of three concentric circles... the inner circle refers to the traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English. The outer circle represents the institutionalized non-native varieties (ESL) in the regions that have passed through extended periods of colonization... The expanding circle includes the regions where the performance varieties of the language are used essentially in (EFL) context”

The Inner Circle refers to countries where English was originally codified as a linguistic base and is primarily used as a Mother Tongue or Native Language (ENL) in every sphere of life. Countries lying in this circle include the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and some of the Caribbean and Australasian territories. The total number of English speakers in the inner-circle countries and territories around the world is estimated to be about 380 million (Crystal, 1997).

Next comes the Outer Circle. English spoken in this circle is often described as English as a second language (ESL), which means that people use English alongside their mother tongue as a Second Language to officially communicate in several domains or carry out various institutionalised functions (Kirkpatrick, 2007). English used by people in this circle has a long history and developed from colonial periods. The Outer Circle comprises countries like India, Malaysia, Singapore, The Philippines, Nigeria, etc. These countries were once colonized by either the British Empire or the United States (Kirkpatrick, 2007). The versions of English spoken by around 500 million in these countries are often referred to as “New Englishes”, “Nativised Englishes”, “Institutionalized Englishes” or “Indigenised Englishes” (Kachru, 1992).

The third and largest circle is called the Expanding Circle. Broadly speaking, this circle refers to the use of English as a foreign or additional language (EFL) in countries that do not have the history of colonisation by any English native-speaking countries (Kachru, 1992). That is to say, English, in this circle, has no official role to function within domestic institutions. Countries like Thailand, China, Japan, the Russian Federation, Denmark or France are grouped in the Expanding Circle.

1.2.3 ELT in Postcolonial Contexts

As earlier mentioned, after the departure of European colonisers from their colonies, they left behind them their different languages among which we have English. English in many former British colonies became the official language and language of instruction in schools. The English left behind by the colonial masters was appropriated and was being used as indigenized Englishes which reflected the sociolinguistic and cultural background of the users. However, the question whether the indigenized variety should be taught in classroom remains a highly debatable issue.

The implementation of English language in secondary schools was received with mixed feelings. See (Quirk, Kachru, Platt, Atechi, Ngefac among others) there are the purists and the pragmatics. The purists are those who advocate for the use of Standard British English. According to them, the new varieties are deviations from the standard form; there is no intelligibility and users of such varieties of English can't claim that they speak English see Quirk (1985 and 1990)

The pragmatics on the other hand are those who see different varieties of English as independent and intelligible varieties. According to them, these varieties should be brought in classrooms since they reflect the ecology and culture of the speakers. They will use terms that are proper to their culture and palpable to them. See kachru. (1985, 1986, 1991 etc.)

The teachers' dilemma in postcolonial context lies on which standard to be taught in classroom. Platt (1984) quotes:

A: ... the heretical tenet I feel must take exception to is the idea that it is best, in country where English is not spoken natively but is widely used as medium of instruction, to set local variety of English as ultimate model to be imitated by those learning the language.

B: it is obvious that in the Third World Countries the choice of function and models of English has to be determine on pragmatic bases, keeping in view the local conditions and needs. It will therefore, be appropriate that the native speakers of English abandon the attitude of linguistic chauvinism and replace it with an attitude of linguistic tolerance. The strength of the English language is in presenting the English in its Americanness in its British variety. Let us therefore appreciate and encourage the Third World varieties of English too.

This is the teachers' dilemma; teachers from their own findings know that different varieties of English exist and they are aware of the fact that they use them. However, the teachers is often told by the authorities that it *must not exist* and it is up to him or her to "teach it away" and that it is his or her fault that it is still there! (Platt 1984)

The problem of which standard to be taught in class remains a highly debatable issue in postcolonial countries and in Cameroon in particular. As Atechi (2004) holds, there are purists who strongly believe that the implementation of new varieties in classrooms will obviously lead to intelligibility failure among users of English around the world.

Contrarily to the purists, the pragmatics see the teaching of SBE as an unrealistic goal. Ngefac (2011) qualifies the teaching of SBE as a situation where a blind person is leading another blind person. He argues with concrete facts that the promotion of SBE pronunciation to the detriment of educated Cameroon English will never yield the desired results because as Kachru (1986) quotes: “no member of the outer circle speaks RP” he observes that “even if he could he would lack the mannerism distinct of a native speaker”. This is because Cameroon English has so much deviated from the SBE that it cannot be ignored. The differentiating features occur at various levels of grammatical structure, they also occur at the level phonology realisation and semantic interpretation. This is a legitimate claim because most teachers do not really master SBE especially at the level of pronunciation. So it will be a mere disaster if they have to teach what they do not master. With evidence collected from the field, the author therefore calls for the standardisation of the local varieties of English since it is what many teachers consciously or unconsciously use.

In his previous research, Ngefac (2010) investigated CamE accent and its pedagogic implications. In the course of his investigation, he notices that Cameroon English features are significantly different from those of the SBE and notes even though Cameroonians insist on the use of the native varieties of English, their utterances are still full of characteristics of Cameroonian English. The domination of local features in their speeches is a clear testimony that CamE exist and the ambition of willing to attain an accrolectal form of English is just a futile course. He notices that in the production of educated Cameroonians as pedagogic inspectors and teachers, were some traits of mesolectal features which could be standardised and used in classrooms. Most of his informants produced hypercorrect features and the author notes that “the existence of hypercorrect features in the speech of some informants suggests that, they believe it is more prestigious to utter pronunciation features that are different from mainstream Cameroon English” but what they turn to forget is that these forms are neither Cameroon English forms nor those of any Traditional Native English. This means that ELT in our Cameroonian context based on norms of SBE is not yielding the desired results as most learners are caught up between the two varieties. As remedy to this situation the author is of the opinion that basilectal features should be identified and discouraged while mesolectal

features should be encouraged and standardised since it is the variety that one needs to go through formal system of education to master it.

It is in this same light that he (Ngefacs) continues. In postcolonial countries as Cameroon what should be taught in classrooms is the SBE. However, as the author says there is marked difference between what should be taught and what teachers produce. Ngefacs (2011) captures this with an experience he had from the field to assess students teachers involved in their teaching practice. He observes that, in the course of a Drilling exercise, the teacher in the course of teaching pronunciation and stress patterns to students stressed the word “*semester” on the first syllable which is rather a Cameroonian pronunciation instead of “se*mester” the British form of the pronunciation. The dilemma that teachers and learners face lies much as the level of pronunciation because they have already twisted the language in their own way. Pouokam 6363(2015)

According to Atechi (2004:27) the fight against Cameroon English is a futile one; he sees the acceptance of non-native English in ELT rather as “a way to facilitate the process of codification, which will guarantee fairly stable non-native standards that can help in the process of looking for solutions to the intelligibility problems raised.” However, Simo Bobda (1994:25) wonders how much deviation to be tolerated. In this same light, Atechi (ibid) holds that, although the results show that CamE is suitable for teaching in the country, coupled with recommendations, made by eminent scholars on the topic, he suspect that the native norms will continue to hold sway in non-native settings for some time. Drawing from CamE, he posits that NNEs need codification and radical change of attitudes towards them. This standpoint is motivated by the fact that the textbooks and other didactic materials used in Cameroon at the moment are still based on NE norm. Thus, it will be needless to prescribe a variety where there is no extensive literature describing its grammar, phonology, structure and usage. As platt (1984) holds “teachers cannot teach in a vacuum. They do not want a model that may be suggested to them but which is nothing more than a vague outline. They need textbooks, readers, syllabuses based on the local standard”

The adaptation of the Standard British English to suit the socio-linguistic and cultural realities of post-colonial countries has given birth to such varieties as “Nigerian English, Ghanaian English, and Singaporean English” Though most works have described and used the term “Cameroon Standard English, Ngefacs (2010), however, notes that “it is not yet what should be included in, and excluded from, what can be called Cameroon Standard English” This raises another serious issue as far as ELT in most post-colonial setting is concerned

because most researchers advocates that the teaching of the local variety in the classroom still faces the problem of what to teach. However, the main problem is situated at the phonological level. Simo Bobda (1994) quoting Tiffen (1974:23) reports that “while there are precise norms for lexis and syntax in West African Educational Council School Certificate English Language Syllabus, there seems to be no indication as to the target oral English”. This is because the target of speech in most of these context is to test the candidates’ ability to speak and understand English. The teacher in the postcolonial context has the latitude to teach or assess the variety of English he wants, given that no consensus has been reached so far as what will constitute ELT, especially at the level of pronunciation. Considering the teachers are the ones to decide which variety of English to promote in their classroom, according to their competence, they are bound to bring in their own biases. Simo Bobda (ibid:23) is of the opinion that the assessment of English in postcolonial settings sometimes depends on the teachers examiner’s degree of approximation of the native model but also on their attitudes towards that local variety of English as a whole.

In a nutshell, English language teaching in postcolonial contexts has received a lot of attention and criticism with regards to what has to be taught and variety to be as medium of instruction. This is because language is a vital medium of understanding in classroom settings. However, the question of which variety to be promoted in classrooms still remains a highly debatable issue.

1.2.4 Sociolinguistic concerns in New English context RP vs CamE

The linguistic situation of postcolonial countries is one that is characterised by the co-existence of RP and their local variety of English. As a result of these situation, there is always the need to choose a language to the detriment of another. The view of which language to be chosen is argued between the “purist” and the “pragmatist”. However, there is a third group also known as the “peacemakers” or the “in between”. The debate on the intelligibility and autonomy of new varieties of English is an ancient one. According to Quirk (1986:6) the new englishes are unintelligible and more attention should be given to British English since it is a “single monochrome standard that looks as good on papers as in sounds on speech.” Quirk’s idea is not only to dismiss the New Englishes, but American English as well has been transported and transplanted in many parts of the world including Britain which is said to be the origin of the Queen’s language.

Contrarily to what Quirk says, Schneider (2007) says the language has been “adopted” and transplanted in different multilingual contexts. According to Kachru (1986), anybody who

does not favour the emergence, acceptability and promotion of New Englishes as unprecedented and argues that the acceptability of locally acquired norms is a practical and democratic attempt to give every speaker of English irrespective of his or her context an equal say in language. In his 1986 work, he demonstrates that as a result of indigenisation and acculturation process, they are now a new set of native speakers known as functional speakers and he contrast them with genitive native speakers.

The third school of thoughts are the “peacemakers” or “the in between”. According to them, they are aware of the fact that the English Language has gone a series of transformation and has been indigenised to suit the milieu of each nation and at the same time, they equally encourage the standardisation of the form that is intelligible. Schmied (1991) advocates that like every other thing borrowed from the west such as the legal system, money, economy education etc. the language is equally borrowed from the west, so it cannot be spoken as it is spoken in Britain and the united states, but at the same time, he argues that the language constitution constitutes a single family which needs mutual understanding and intelligibility to be able to live together.

According to the purist, Cameroon English is a deviation that should not be encouraged. Simo Bobda (1994) reports the case of a Cameroonian who insisted that:

One cannot say that it is a pleasure to hear a reporter pronounce the word “feature” as “future” and yet this happens on the radio as well as on TV. We cannot keep insisting on our own Cameroonian accent when talking about English. After all, the language is not ours” (Simo Bobda 1993:438, after Cameroon Tribune August 8, 1989; N°938).

Kouam (2015) investigated the correlation between some sociolinguistic variables and Standard British English stress pattern of words from Romance languages and his findings revealed that in Cameroon, a teacher of English or a highly educated person is not likely to approximate the SBE stress pattern of English words from Romance languages significantly better than other English users. His claim was justified by the fact that the percentage success for the approximation SBE stress pattern was: 23.3% for teachers, 22% for non-teachers of English, 11.5% for Form 5 students, 17.5% for Level One students and 18.25% for Masters One. Basing ourselves on this percentages, we see than the gap existing between all speakers of English in Cameroon is really a mean one.

Pouokam (2015) investigated the attitudes of students and English Language teachers towards the teaching of RP in Cameroon. His findings revealed that students and English language teachers in their majority were in favour of the teaching of RP in Cameroon schools.

In as much as 75% of the students were in favour of the British accent for ELT, only 25% were for Cameroon English accent. As far as the teachers were concerned, 45% of the teachers were in favour of the use of SBE for ELT Cameroon while 37.5% had a strong case for the use CameE for ELT. The remaining 17.5% of the informants had a neutral attitude towards the use of SBE in Cameroonians classrooms.

Banyuy (2014) investigated the attitudes of Cameroonians towards RP and Cameroon English accent. Her findings showed that there is no significant gap between the attitudes of professionals of English who supported to promote RP, and the attitudes of non-professionals of English Language towards RP and Cameroon English accent. But however, majority of her professionals of English were in favour of the SBE accent since they were up to 75% and those who were in favour of the Cameroonian accent were 65%. Thus, the question of which English to bring into classrooms still remains a highly debatable issue.

As far as the pragmatics are concerned, the earlier we put aside the SBE, the better it will be for English language teaching in the Cameroonian context. Mbangwana (1987) quoted in Simo Bobda (1994) notes that many Cameroonians are shocked when they see their counterparts struggling to sound like native speakers of English. Mbangwana (1987:421) further observes that some Cameroonians who insisted on sounding like Britons are sometimes ridiculed rather than admired. For them, “what matters is how someone handles the language... not how much tongue twisted or rolling he can perform” The author concludes that many Cameroonians are now proud of Cameroon English.

Ngefac (2011) qualifies the teaching of SBE in Cameroon as a situation where a blind person is leading another. He argues that the promotion of Standard British English accent to the detriment of the educated Cameroon English will never yield the expected results; in this light, teaching English Pronunciation may be an unrealistic goal. This is because Cameroon English has so much deviated from SBE that it has become quite distant from what obtains in Britain. This is a legitimate claim because most teachers do not really master SBE, especially at the level of pronunciation so, it will really be fallacious if they really have to teach what they have very little mastery of. With empirical evidence collected from the field, the author shows that the promotion of SBE has failed. He therefore calls for the standardisation of Cam English and its use in the classroom. The author concludes by saying that Cameroon Standard English should be used in classrooms; by standard here he means the one which guarantees intelligibility and the one which each and every one needs to go through formal system of

education before mastering it not the one that each individual can pick up in an informal context.

1.2.5 Factors affecting the choice of which standard to teach in postcolonial context.

Many factors accounts for the choice of which standard to teach in postcolonial context. By the choice of standard here we mean why the government chose SBE instead of the local variety of English that reflect their culture.

Firstly, the prescribed variety of English to be taught in classrooms in postcolonial countries is the SBE. The government make this choice because it is systematic and intelligible. It is the mother English of all the other varieties of English. It has all the prescribed norms of a language; it has a syllabus, dictionaries, textbooks etc. in the contrary, local varieties are much more oral than written. According to the purist, teachers cannot teach in a vacuum. They need a model that they will aspire to. As Platt (1984) suggests, new nations should bring in systematicity in their language. According to him, teachers cannot teach in a vacuum they do not need a model that may be suggested to them but which is nothing more than vague outline. They need textbooks, readers, syllabuses, etc based on local standards, but above all they need systematicity. In this same light, the author continues by saying that the only way to show that a language feature is not an idiosyncratic learner's error but part of the language system of a New English is to prove, statistically (a) that it is used frequently and systematically by its speakers and (b) that they know how to use it where and to whom.

Secondly, SBE is favored to the detriment of Local varieties because of instrumental reasons. They use the SBE because they are aware of the benefits associated to it. It is the language used for international communication. To have a stable job be it at the national or at the international level one need to have a mastery of SBE and not of the local variety of English. If that was not the case maybe things would have been different. Anchimbe (2007) highlights the point by saying that Cameroonians learn Standard British English passionately because they are likely to reap considerable benefits from it. Contrarily to others, Cameroonians who chose their local variety do that for affective reasons. This is why, Atechi (2004) asserts that Cameroonians think their localised pronunciation is more realistic than trying to imitate the native model, and speaking with a Cameroonian flavor is maintaining their national identity, which will be loss if they sound like native speakers.

Also, Cameroonians chose the SBE because they are afraid of the inferiority complex. In our postcolonial societies those who use their local accent in public are frequently looked down by the educated class. As such many people turn out to approximate the SBE.

1.2.6 Identification of Cameroon English

There are different varieties of English spoken in Cameroon and among these Varieties there is need for one to be called Cameroon English and this issue has been at the center of debates as far the English Language in Cameroon is concerned.

The appellation Cameroon English, Cameroon Educated English has been used by researchers such as Mesanga (1983) Simo Bobda (1983, 1986) Mbangwana (1987) is meant to contrast four main type of English: Pidgin English, the speech of uneducated Cameroonians, the speech of francophone Cameroonians and the speech of handful of Cameroonians which have been so influenced by other varieties of RP, American English, etc.

According to Kouega, (1999) since he does not agree with the others, he identifies four major types constituting a continuum. Pidgin English, Pidginised English, General Cameroon English and Educated Cameroon English. He classifies the use of these varieties of English according to social level. According to him, Pidgin English has an unofficial status and has no prestige since it is the language of the illiterates. Secondly, he points out Pidginised English used by job seekers, especially primary and secondary school dropouts. According to him these people have a little mastery of English but their knowledge of English diminishes as time goes by. The third variety of English spoken in Cameroon as mentioned by Kouega is General Cameroon English, generally associated with secondary school learners who eventually get employed as civil servants. They use English in their daily interaction and activities. The fourth variety can be seen as representative of Cameroon Standard English, as it shares a lot of similarities with the major tongue variety of Cameroon English. It is spoken by the elite of the country who have gone through university.

Atechi (2004) dismisses Kouega's classification. According to him, there is no difference between Pidgin and Pidginised English. And continues with the claim that for him what should be considered as Cameroon English should be the educated variety. That is why he mentions that CamE is the variety "used by researchers and representative of Cameroon English as a non-native variety of English"

Like Atechi (2004), Ngefac (2008b) Cameroon English is the variety spoken by majority of English speaking Cameroonians. Ngefac (2007) subsequently highlights that

“Cameroon English pronunciation features that need to be standardised should be those that speakers need to work hard through formal schooling to be able to utter”.

1.2.7 Cameroon English Phonology

As earlier mentioned above, the English spoken by Cameroonians has attained a degree of autonomy especially at the level of pronunciation. Cameroon English has deviated from Standard British English in many aspects but this deviation is mostly witnessed at the level of pronunciation since this variety of English has acquired specific features caused by the sociopolitical and ecological realities of the country. Some major works on Cameroon English phonology include (1983), Mbangwana (1987), Kouega (1991 and 2013), Simo Bobda(1994), Simo Bobda and Mbangwana (1993) and Ngefac(2008a). These works have adequately described CamE Phonology, stressing its main similarities and differences with SBE

1.2.7.1 Vocalic features in Cameroon English

Even though Cameroon English has deviated from Standard British English, they still have many things in common considering the fact that CamE is a variety of English derived from Standard British English. They share many characteristics at the level of sounds. Under this heading “vocalic features”, we are going to analyse the different process involving English in the speech of informants and this analysis takes into considerations monophthongs, diphthongs and triphthongs.

1.2.7.1.1 Monophthongs

Unlike RP vowels which comprises 12 monophthongs [ɪ, ɛ, æ, ɒ, ʌ, ʊ, i:, u:, ɔ: ə, ɜ: ɑ:] which can be grouped according to various parameters, tongue height, tongue area raised, lip rounding and vowel length, Cameroon English monophthongs as Simo Bobda (1994) mentions comprises seven monophthongs [i, e, a, o, u, ɛ, ɔ] where there is occasionally the schwa[ə] used by the few educated class of Cameroonians. According to Kouega (2013), The RP long vowels [i, ɑ:, u, ɜ:, ɔ] are systematically replaced by a number of short vowel. For example, the RP long vowel [ɜ:] is replaced by [ɛ and ɔ]. Examples of such cases include:

Words	RP	CamE
Learn	[lɜn]	[lɛn]
Early	[ɜli]	[ɛli]
Service	[sɜvɪs]	[sɛvɪs]
Circle	[sɜkl]	[sɛkul]

Work	[wɜ:k]	[wɔ:k]
Church	[tʃɜ:tʃ]	[tʃɔ:tʃ]
Courteous	[kɜ:tiəs]	[kɔ:tiəs]

As Kouega (2013) asserts,

“When one looks carefully at this variability, one discovers that orthography is the underlying factor; actually spelling pronunciation is the cause of variability in Cameroun English as most words in this variety of English are pronounced in a way that reflects their spelling”

According to Kouega (2013), the long vowel [i:] is usually pronounced in such a way that it is not different from its short [ɪ]. In fact, very few Cameroonians contrast the [i:] in “seat” and [ɪ] in “sit”. Similarly, [ɑ:] as in “cart” and [æ] as in cat. This is as a result of the reduction of RP long sounds to short ones in Cameroon English. One effect of this phenomenon is the occurrence of new homophones. For example, unlike in RP, the following pair of words are pronounced alike in CamE “feel” and “fill” [fi:l], [pæk] for pack and park etc.

Short vowels are pronounced in such a way that reflects the spelling of words in which they occur. The front vowel [ɪ] is replaced by [e]

Words	RP	CamE
Storage	[stɔ:ri:dʒ]	[stɔ:retʃ]
Budget	[bʌdʒɪt]	[bɔ:dʒɛd]

The central vowel [ʌ] is never realized, it is systematically replaced by [ɔ] and [ɑu].

Words	RP	CamE
Such	[sʌtʃ]	[sɔ:tʃ]
Country	[kʌntri]	[kauntri]

The most complex of all those vowels is the schwa [ə]. It is replaced by the sounds [ɛ, ɪ, i, u, ɔ, ɑ] as in the words flexible, documents, attend, labour, today.

Words	RP	CamE
Flexible	[flɛksəbl]	[flɛksɪbl]
Document	[dɔ:kjʊmənt]	[dɔ:kumɛnt]
Attend	[ətend]	[atend]
Labour	[leɪbə]	[lebo]

Today	[tədeɪ]	[tude]
Parliament	[pɑləmənt]	[pɑliamənt]

1.2.7.1.2 Diphthongs

The English language comprises 8 diphthongs and According to Messanga (1983) RP diphthongs are restructured in CamE through the monophthongisation and occurrence of foreign diphthongs.

As far as the monophthongisation of diphthongs are concerned, he notes that RP [əʊ] and [eə] are rendered in CamE as [o] and [ɛ] respectively. Kouega (1991) also notices that the RP diphthongs [eɪ] tend to be reduced systematically to its initial member [e]. Mesanga (1983), Simo Bobda (1994) and Kouega (2013) conclude by attesting the existence in Cameroon English of diphthongs which are completely foreign to RP. These examples shall be clearly presented below.

Words	RP	CamE
Know	[nəʊ]	[no]
Chairman	[tʃɛəmən]	[tʃɛman]
Eight	[eɪt]	[et]

Diphthongs in CamE	RP	CamE
[ia] their	[ðeə]	[dia]
[uɔ] poor	[pʊə]	[puɔ]
[iɛ] fear	[fiə]	[fiɛ]
[ua] gradually	[grædjʊli]	[graduali]

1.2.7.1.3 Triphthongs

Kouega (1991) and Simo Bobda (1994) reveal that triphthongs are inexistent in CamE. It is in this same light that Kouega (2013) mentions that, symbolically, a triphthong may be regarded as a VVV structure functioning as a single phoneme. In Cameroon English, triphthongs are never realized; while the initial and final V elements remain vowels, the central V element is always realised as a consonant, giving triphthongs a VCV structure. This central C element is usually a glide, either /j/ or /w/, leading to the following realisations:

Words	RP	CamE
Player	[pleɪə]	[pleja]
Riot	[raɪət]	[rajət]
Desire	[dɪzaɪə]	[dɪzaja]
Sour	[saʊə]	[sawa]
Flower	[flaʊə]	[flawa]

1.2.7.2 Consonantal features of Cameroon English

Under the heading “Consonantal Features” is grouped the processes involving English consonants in the speech of many Cameroonians. This analysis takes up into consideration voicing, clustering, and spelling pronunciation which shall be analysed below.

1.2.7.2.1 Voicing

English consonants are grouped according to the activities that take place in the glottis into two broad categories, i.e., voiced consonants like [b, d, g] and voiceless consonants like [p, t, k]. All RP voiced and voiceless consonants do exist in CamE, but their distribution is slightly different: Voiceless consonants are occasionally voiced while voiced consonants are occasionally devoiced.

One instance of devoicing is observed in words such as “tab”, “head”, and “cabbage”, which end up with voiced consonants but in CamE are replaced by their voiceless counterparts. These slight differences in voicing at the end of words can equally be witnessed at the level of the realisation of the “S” morpheme to indicate plurality and “ED” to indicate the participle of the verb. These instances will be clearly illustrated with the examples below.

Words	RP	CamE
Tab	[tæb]	[tap]
Head	[hed]	[hɛt]
Cabbage	[kæbɪdʒ]	[kabetʃ]
Teachers	[titʃəz]	[titʃas]
Pages	[peɪdʒɪz]	[petʃɪs]
Wanted	[wɒntɪd]	[wantɛt]
Attended	[ətɛndɪd]	[atendɛt]

In CamE, devoicing never occurs in initial position and it is rare in medial position. The cases identified in medial position usually involve the consonant pairs [s, z] and [ʃ, ʒ]. The alveolar fricative consonants [s, z] in medial position are occasionally mixed up, with the

voiceless [s] occurring where the voiced [z] is expected and vice versa as this two sets in the examples below.

Words	RP	CamE
Missile	[mɪsaɪl]	[mɪzɑɪl]
Nursery	[nɜːsəri]	[nɜːzəri]
Position	[pəzɪʃn]	[pɒsɪʃn]
Measure	[meɪʒə]	[meɪʒə]
Leisure	[leɪʒə]	[leɪʒə]

1.2.7.2.2 Clustering

Kouega (2013) notes that most RP consonant clusters are realised as expected when they occur in initial position. There are a few clusters which, in medial position, are articulated differently in the two varieties. One of them is the cluster /ks/, the voiced counterpart of which is /gz/, both being represented orthographically by the consonant letter -X- as in “exile” and “exam”. Usually, the voiced member /gz/ is used where its voiceless counterpart /ks/ is expected. This can be illustrated by the following cases.

Words	RP	CamE
Exile	[eksɑɪl]	[egzɑɪl]
Maximum	[mæksməm]	[magzɪməm]
Exodus	[eksədəs]	[egzɒdəs]
Flexible	[fleksɪbl]	[flegzɪbəl]

1.2.7.2.3 Spelling pronunciation

As noted above, this process causes words to be pronounced as they are spelt. The letters “TH” are systematically pronounced [t, d] with the voiceless alveolar [t] replacing the voiceless interdental [θ] and the voiced alveolar [d] replacing the voiced interdental [ð] in initial and medial positions. A few illustrations include the following

Words	RP	CamE
Think	[θɪŋk]	[tɪŋk]
Lengthy	[lɛnθɪ]	[lɛntɪ]
There	[ðɛə]	[dɛ]
Together	[təgeðə]	[tugɛdə]

Apart from the above consonants, there are many other consonant and vowel letters which are pronounced as their spelling suggests. This shall be clearly presented in the examples below.

Words	RP	CamE
Fasten	[fa:sən]	[fastən]
Bombing	[bɒmɪŋ]	[bɒmbɪn]
Tortoise	[tɔ:təs]	[tɔ:tɔis]
Tomb	[tʊm]	[tɔm]
Primordial	[praɪmɔdiəl]	[primɔdial]

1.2.8 Gaps and contribution

The present work fills an important research gap as far as Cameroon English is concerned. After a keen look at the review of literature, we observed that many research studies have extensively described the segmental features of Cameroon English (e.g. Masanga 1983, Mbangwana 1987, Kouega 1991 and 2013, Simo Bobda and Mbangwana 1993, and Simo Bobda 1994) but few of this works have gone on the field to evaluate the students' and teachers' level of mastery of this language. Also, as far as attitudes towards CamE are concerned, the few works on Cameroonians' attitudes towards English are very scares. The few that exist e.g. (Mbangwana 1987, Ngefac 2010 and Pouokam 2015) were targeted towards evaluating Cameroonians' attitudes towards RP and not towards CamE. And more to that their works did not establish the relationship between the mastery of RP by students and teachers and their attitudes towards CamE or RP

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

2.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methodology used in conducting our research. It lays emphasis on the research design, the difficulties encountered in the course of data collection, and the method used for the analysis of the data obtained.

2.1 The Research Design:

A research design is an established pattern which specifies how data relating to a given situation should be collected and analysed. It gives an idea on how a scientific investigation should be carried out. Thus, our research design considers the area of the study, the population of the study and the various research instruments used in the investigation.

2.1.1 Area of the Study

This research was carried out in the urban cities of Buea and Yaounde. These cities were chosen because of two main reasons; the city of Buea was chosen because of the high presence of Anglophone learners of English who have English as their first language and their current use of the language make them have a mastery of many varieties of the language. The city of Yaounde was equally chosen because of the facility to get in contact with the second group of informants who are the language teachers. Specifically, the informants from Buea were Level two students of the English Department of the University of Buea and informants from Yaounde were teachers from Government Bilingual High School Yaounde and Government Bilingual High School Nkol-Eton and ENS Yaounde

2.1.2 Population of the Study

The informants for this study included both students and teachers selected from the above mentioned schools. As far as teachers were concerned, two criteria were taken into consideration in the course of collecting Data. A distinction was made between teachers who have been on the field for at least three years and teacher trainees (student teachers from the Higher Teacher Training College (ENS) Yaounde). As for the students, our choice was made on those learning the English Language as a Second Language (ESL learners) because of their knowledge of the existence of different varieties of English.

2.1.2.1 The Teachers

The first group of informants were English language teachers. 40 teachers were chosen for data collection among whom there were 20 teacher trainees from Higher Teacher Training

College (ENS) Yaounde and 20 teachers who have been on the field for at least three years. The place of teachers in this study is very determining because the success of any of the two varieties depends on them. They are the ones teaching the language to students so the students turn to look at them as models and copy what they do. Their opinions in the study will have a pedagogic implication for English Language teaching in Cameroon because if they turn to adopt a positive attitude towards the use of Cameroon English to the detriment of RP, it will imply that Cameroon English is gaining grounds in our system of education as such, language policy in our system of education should be reconsidered.

As earlier mentioned, teachers chosen for this study were student teachers from Higher Teacher Training College, Yaounde; but still at that level, a distinction was made among those student teachers. Student teachers who were chosen were those who had been for teaching practice considering the fact that they had been in contact with students and know the needs of those students as far the language aspect is concerned. The other category was composed of teachers who had been on the field for at least three years. These teachers had much more experience compared to student teachers. They have been with students for many years and can accurately evaluate the learners' level of language proficiency. The table below classifies the informants according to their sex.

Table One: Classification of informants according to sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentages
Male	15	37.5%
Female	25	62.5%
Total	40	100%

The table above shows that informants under study were both male and female. However, from the table, we can notice that majority of the informants were female. This can be explained by the presence of many female learners in language classes from the high school to the university level. Next, we will look at the various attitudes of informants toward the use of Cameroon English in Cameroonian schools as clearly defined in the scope of our work.

2.1.2.2 The Students

As far as student informants were concerned, 40 students were retained for our study. They were all Level Two students of the English Department of the University of Buea. We decided to choose only Anglophone learners of English because of their mastery of the language compared to Francophone learners of English. A first test was conducted in the urban city of Yaounde with Francophone learners of English and there, we noticed that those learners had difficulties in distinguishing Cameroon English from Standard British English even just at the level of pronunciation. So, we decided to choose only Anglophone learners at the University level considering the fact that they have been studying English Language for considerable numbers of years. With their mastery of the language, they will be able to give their point of view on the language used in the classroom by their teachers. The informants chosen were from both sexes and different linguistic backgrounds. The table below presents the percentage of both male and female informants.

Table Two: Classification of informants according to sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Male	16	40
Female	24	60
Total	40	100

From the above table, we observed that the number of female informants were more than male informants. This is seen as 24 of the informants were female giving 60% while only 16 were male giving 40% of the total number of percentages. The presence of such a high number of female informant can be explained by the fact that the informants came from an arts class precisely English Modern letters which in Cameroon is mainly dominated by female learners.

Also, since Cameroon is a multilingual country with two official languages governing the system, Anglophones are distinguished from Francophones due to this system. There was thus a need for us to classify the learners according to their linguistic backgrounds because their attitudes toward a given variety of the language can be influenced by their linguistic backgrounds. The table below clearly shows the classification of the informants according to their linguistic backgrounds.

Table Three: Classification of informants according to their linguistic backgrounds

Linguistic background	Frequency	Percentage
Anglophone	33	82.5
Francophone	7	17.5
Total	40	100

From the above table, we noticed that the majority of the informants were Anglophones since up to 82.5% accepted to come from either the south or northwest region of Cameroon. The remaining 17.5% came from the Francophone regions of Cameroon. This is but a normal phenomenon considering the fact that the research was carried out in the southwest region of Cameroon; a region dominated by Anglophone learners from Anglophone backgrounds. Informants from this region was chosen because of their exposure to the English Language in their daily communications. The low percentage of Francophone learners was not quite surprising because in Cameroon it is very difficult to see Francophones settling in Anglophone zones because of their cultural differences.

Before carrying out our investigation on students' attitudes towards the use of CamE in ELT, there was need for us to first of all know the language our informants frequently use for their daily communication. As earlier mentioned, we decided to choose students under the English Department because we knew that they have as first language the English Language thus, they could accurately give their point of view on which variety to be adopted in ELT. The table below gives detail information about the languages frequently used by our informants.

Table Four: Classification of informants according to the language they use frequently

Language	Frequency	percentage
French	4	10
English	32	80
Pidgin English	2	5
Mother tongue	2	5
Total	40	100

The table above confirms our claims considering the fact that up to 80% of our informants use the English Language on daily basis. This is a normal phenomenon for students under the English Department because they come from Anglophone homes where from childbirth they are confronted to the English Language. On the other hand, 10% of our informants used French on daily basis and this can be justified by the fact that, French is one of the official languages in Cameroon. The remaining 10% of our informants used Pidgin English and their Mother tongue for their daily communications.

2.1.3 Research Instruments

The data collection process was done through the use of a questionnaire and World List Style. A questionnaire was designed for teachers and a different one for students. This questionnaires were aimed at accessing the students and teachers attitudes towards CamE in ELT. A list of twenty English words were equally used for students and teachers to pronounce and their pronunciations were recorded and further analysed. A tape recorder and a laptop were used by the investigator to record informants' pronunciation. It should be noted that for this study, informants were expected to target Standard British English in their speech; this explains why a WLS elaborated by Labov (1966) was chosen over Phonological style such As minimal pairs and the reading list style.

2.2 Method of Data Collection

A tape recorder was used to record the pronunciation of 20 linguistic variables by voluntary informants. The process of data collection was done in two different settings: students' data was collected in the basketball court of the University of Buea which is well known for its calmness. As far as the teachers-informants were concerned, their pronunciation of the linguistic variables were recorded in the staffrooms of GBHS Nkol-Eton and Yaounde. Also, after the tape recording of the chosen linguistic variables, questionnaires were distributed to the same informants and they were given thirty minutes to answer the questions on them.

2.3 Method of Data analysis

Data analysis followed a specific process. The various realisations of the different linguistic items by the informants were listened carefully and were classified either under CamE or SBE depending on the accent they adopted. The frequencies of the various renditions for the two varieties (SBE and CamE) and their corresponding percentages were equally calculated. The mean of features for each variety was calculated in order to have the overall percentages of its approximation by each category of informants. To calculate the mean for

each variety, the sum of percentages was divided by the total number of linguistic items (20). As far as the data collection with the use of questionnaires was concerned, the informants' answers were organised in tables. In this light, the frequency of each of those responses were converted into percentages. In order to calculate the percentage of each item got from the informants, we used the percentage count procedure, that is, the frequency of responses to the particular question (Z%), was got from the division of the number of responses to the question (Q) per the total number of scores (T) and the quotient was multiplied by one hundred.

$$\Rightarrow \frac{Q}{T} \times 100 = Z\%$$

2.4 Difficulties Encountered

The data collection process for this study was not always smooth. Some difficulties were encountered at various levels.

The first problem occurred at the level of obtaining the required number of teachers. The reason is that secondary schools have an average of fifteen English language teachers who don't come to school the same days so the investigator had to go to different schools several times in order to meet the required number of teachers.

Another difficulty occurred at the level of filling in the questionnaires. Some students either cancelled so much or left a series of questions unanswered. This posed a problem, considering the researcher had to disqualify some copies and go back to find new informants.

The third difficulty arose because of noise. The data collection process was hindered to an extent by the noise made some students. This led the investigator to stop the recording from time to time in order to stop noise. Also, the investigator had to record the speech of more than forty students mindful of the fact that some recording will be completely hampered by noise and consequently, will be of no use.

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has described the research design, the method of data analysis and the difficulties encountered in the course of collecting data. The next chapter presents and analyses the data collection from the field.

CHAPTER THREE

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected from the field and attempts an analysis and interpretation of the findings. This analysis will be done based on the research questions designed and presented at the level of the General Introduction and questionnaires and WLS distributed to our informants which were both students and teachers. In this regard, the focus will be precisely on evaluating the mastery of RP by teachers and university students and bring out the controversy that exist between their mastery of RP and their attitudes towards Cameroon English Pronunciation. In this light, our data will be presented and interpreted in three different ways; firstly, we will evaluate the mastery of RP by teachers and university students which shall be done thanks to their recorded pronunciations, secondly, we shall analyse the teachers attitudes towards Cameroon English pronunciation and thirdly, we are going to analyse the students' attitudes towards Cameroon English pronunciation. The data will be presented quantitatively on tables, taking into account the frequency of appearances, and their corresponding percentages.

3.1 Analysis of teachers' and students' mastery of RP

As clearly defined in the scope of our work, part of our research consisted in investigating the mastery of RP by university students and secondary school teachers. This investigation was carried out by the use of a WLS. Students and teachers were asked to pronounce the words on the list and their pronunciation patterns were recorded and analysed with the help of a tape recorder and a laptop. Our choice of words was based on sounds which according to kouega (1991 and 2013) Cameroonians had difficulties in pronouncing; and it is worth noting that we limited ourselves to English vowels and spelling pronunciation. The informants' speech were equally classified under three main rubric: monophthongs, diphthongs and triphthongs

3.1.1 Analysis of students' mastery of RP

A total number of forty students were chosen from the English Department of the University of Buea and a list of twenty words was submitted to them which they were expected to pronounce. Their speech revealed a variety of features which were classified either under Cameroon English or under Standard British English.

3.1.1.1 Monophthongs

As far as the monophthongs were concerned, emphasis were laid on [ɜ, ə, ʌ and ɪ]. With the sound [ə] our finding revealed that very few Cameroonians could successively use the schwa where necessary and this confirmed Simo Bobda's (1994) claims that only few educated Cameroonians use the schwa in their speech. In the course of our research, we noticed that our informants as predicted by Kouega (1991) replaced the schwa by [ɛ, ia, i u, ɔ, ɑ]. A picture of this articulation is presented in the table below.

Table Five: Realisation of the central vowel [ə]

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Purpose	[pɜpəs]			12	30%
			[pɔpɔs]		28	70%
2	Courteous	[kɜtiəs]			5	12.5%
			[kɔtiəs]		35	87.5%
3	Attend	[ətend]			3	7.5%
			[atend]		37	92.5%
4	Today	[tədəi]			00	00%
			[tude]		10	25%
				[tudei]	30	75%
5	Parliament	pɑləmənt]			00	00%
			[parliamənt]		40	100%

From the table above, we realised that the monophthong [ə] poses a serious problem to Cameroonians. This can be justified by the fact that only an average of 10% of our informants could give the SBE pronunciation of the words having the schwa. The remaining majority of 75% gave but the Cameroonian pronunciation of those words. In the course of our investigation, two things caught our attention: first, it was noticed that as far as the pronunciation of the words “parliament” and “today” was concerned, not even a single student got the SBE pronunciation. Second, the will to approximate RP by students made them develop deviant forms which were neither RP nor CamE. This was noticed with the word “today”. 75% of our informants pronounced the word “today” in such a way that it was recorded as a variant from both recognised CamE and SBE.

The short vowel [ɪ] and the central vowel [ʌ] are usually pronounced in a way that reflects the spelling of the words in which they occur. The short front vowel [ɪ] is replaced by [e and ɛ] in many words including “storage” and “budget”. The central vowel [ʌ] which is never realized, is systematically replaced by [ɔ].

Table Six: Realisation of the short vowel [ɪ], the central vowel [ʌ] and spelling pronunciation in CamE

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Country	[kʌntri]			00	00%
			[kauntri]		40	100%
2	Labour	[leɪbə]			2	5%
			[lebɔ]		40	100%
3	Budget	[bʌdʒɪt]			00	00%
			[bɔdʒɛd]		40	100%
4	Storage	[stɔrɪdʒ]			00	00%
			[stɔretʃ]		40	100%
5	enough	[ɪnʌf]			00	00%
			[ɛnɔf]		40	100%

As the table above shows, an average of 99% of our informants produced the CamE pronunciation of the above words and only an average of 1% produced the RP forms of these words. This can be justified by the fact that these students pronounce according to the way these words are spelled.

Kouega (2013) reveals that considering the fact that vowel length is never realised in CamE, Cameroonian speakers turn to reduce the RP long vowels to short vowels. This is the case with the vowel [ɜ] which is replaced by [ɔ] as seen in the table below.

Table Seven: Realisation of the short vowel [ɜ]

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Worship	[wɜʃɪp]			12	30%

			[wəʃɪp]		28	70%
2	Learn	[lɜn]			30	75%
			[lɛn]		10	25%
3	Circle	[sɜkl]			10	25%
			[sɛkl]		10	25%
				[saɪkl]	20	50%

As the table above shows, the pronunciation pattern at this level was better than those of the previous ones because majority of our informant could successively pronounce the words “learn, circle and purpose”. This can be justified by the fact that an average of 43.3% of our informants gave the RP form of these words; an average of 40% of our informants gave the CamE forms of these words. As for the previous case (see table 4), the will to approximate SBE made students to come up with a new form of pronunciation for “circle” [saɪkl] which is neither RP nor recognised CamE.

3.1.1.2 Diphthongs

As far as diphthongs are concerned, according to Masanga (1983) RP diphthongs are restructured in CamE through monophthongisation and occurrence of foreign diphthongs. Also, speakers turn to pronounce the words as they are spelled and this make them produce forms which are different from those of the SBE. The next table gives a picture of the way informants articulated these words

Table Eight: Realisation of RP diphthongs

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Fatal	[fɛɪtəl]			10	25%
			[fatal]		30	75%
2	Tortoise	[tɔtəs]			2	5%
			[tɔtɔis]		38	95%
3	Malaria	[mələəriə]			00	00%
			[malɛria]		40	100%
4	Ensure	[ɪnʃuə]			2	5%
			[ɛnʃɔ]		38	100%

The table above shows that 95% of our informants transformed the diphthongs in “fatal, ensure, malaria and labour” into monophthongs. The remaining average of 5% successively realised the RP diphthongs in their speech. It is equally worth-noting that 100% of our informants gave the CamE pronunciation of the word “malaria” showing that SBE is still a far-fetched phenomenon in Cameroon.

3.1.1.3 Triphthongs

Kouega (1991) and Simo (1994) reveal that triphthong are inexistent in CamE. This claim is very surprising but in the course of our research, we noticed that very few Cameroonians could correctly pronounce words composed of triphthongs structures. The table below gives a clear picture of the way they were pronounced.

Table Nine: Realisation of RP triphthongs

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Desire	[dɪzaiə]			00	00%
			[dɪzaja]		40	100%
2	Player	[pleɪə]			00	00%
			[pleja]		40	100%
3	Lower	[ləʊə]			00	00%
			[lowa]		40	100%

The above table shows that this assertion was true considering the fact that not even a single student gave the RP form of the words “ desire, player and lower” under this rubric, CamE pronunciation had a 100% success despite the students efforts to approximate SBE.

3.1.2 Analysis of teachers’ mastery of RP

Our second group of informants were secondary school teachers who have been teaching for at least five years and student-teachers from the Higher Teachers Training College Yaounde. This group of informants produced more satisfactory results as far as the realisation of RP was concerned considering the fact that they have been studying the language and have been in contact with it for considerable numbers of years.

3.1.2.1 Monophthongs.

Table Ten: Realisation of the central vowel [ə]

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Purpose	[pəpəs]			28	70%
			[pəpəs]		12	30%
2	Courteous	[kɜːtɪəs]			9	22.5%
			[kɜːtɪəs]		31	77.5%
3	Attend	[ətend]			11	17.5%
			[atend]		29	72.5%
4	Today	[tədeɪ]			00	00%
			[tudeɪ]		22	55%
				[tudeɪ]	18	45%
5	Parliament	pəˈlɪmənt]			00	00%
			[pəˈliəmɛnt]		40	100%

From, the above table, this group of informants had an average of 24% success as far as the realisation of the sound [ə] was concerned in the words “purpose, courteous, attend, today and parliament”. An average of 67% of our informants gave the Cameroonian pronunciation of these sounds. Better still, under this rubric, two things caught our attention. The first thing was that as far as the words “today and parliament” was concerned, not even a single informant gave their SBE pronunciation. Secondly, there is the case of certain informants who struggled to approximate RP thus, leading to the creation of new forms of pronunciation; this experience was witnessed with the word “today”.

Table Eleven: Realisation of the short vowel [ɪ], the central vowel [ʌ] and spelling pronunciation in CamE

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Country	[kʌntri]			20	50%
			[kauntri]		20	50%
2	Labour	[leɪbə]			5	12.5%

			[lebo]		35	87.5%
3	Budget	[bʌdʒɪt]			3	7.5%
			[bɒdʒɛd]		37	92.5%
4	Storage	[stɔːrɪdʒ]			35	87.5%
			[stɔretʃ]		5	12.5%
5	enough	[ɪnʌf]			21	52.5%
			[ɛnɒf]		7	17.5%
				[ɪnɒf]	12	30%

The analysis presented in the table above reveals that an average of 73.5% of our informants pronounced the words “country, labour, budget, storage and enough” with the Cameroonian accents whereas only an average of 20% of our informants could successively produce the SBE pronunciation of these words. As for the previous case, 30% of our informants pronounced the word “enough” in such a way that it was neither RP nor recognised CamE. Again, this new form of pronunciation was recorded as a variant. According to Kouega (2013) Cameroonians face difficulties in pronouncing these words because they pronounce the words the way it are spelled.

Kouega (2013) reveals that considering the fact that vowel length is never realised in CamE, Cameroonian speakers turn to reduce the RP long vowels to short vowels. This is the case with the vowel [ɜ] which is replaced by [ɔ] as seen in the table below.

Table Twelve: Realisation of the long vowel [ɜ]

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Worship	[wɜʃɪp]			28	70%
			[wɔʃɪp]		12	30%
2	Learn	[lɜn]			37	92.5%
			[lɛn]		3	7.5%
3	Circle	[sɜkl]			5	12.5%
			[sɛkl]		19	47.5%
				[saɪkl]	16	40%

The table above shows that, as far as the sound [ɜ] was concerned, professionals of English showed more satisfactory results. An average of 60% of our informants could successively pronounce the words “purpose, learn and circle” with the RP accent. An average of 28.3% pronounced these words with the Cameroonian accent. As it was the case with students, we equally saw 40% of our informants pronouncing the “circle” as [saɪkl] which is neither RP nor recognised CamE.

3.1.2.2 Diphthongs

As far as diphthongs are concerned, according to Masanga (1983) RP diphthongs are restructured in CamE through monophthongisation and occurrence of foreign diphthongs. Also, speakers turn to pronounce the words as they are spelled and this make them produce forms which are different from those of the SBE. The next table gives a picture of the way informants articulated these words

Table Thirteen: Realisation of RP diphthongs

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Fatal	[fɛɪtəl]			23	57.5%
			[fatal]		17	42.5%
2	Tortoise	[tɔtəs]			5	12.5%
			[tɔtɔis]		35	87.5%
3	Malaria	[mələəriə]			2	5%
			[malɛria]		38	95%
4	Ensure	[ɪnʃuə]			9	22.5%
			[ɛnʃɔ]		31	77.5%

The table above shows that even English language teachers have the tendency of monophthongising diphthongs. This explains why they had an average of 75.6% of the words “fatal, labour, malaria and ensure” pronounced with the Cameroonian accent. Only an average of 24.4% of our informants could successively give the SBE pronunciation of these words.

3.1.2.3 Triphthongs

Table Fourteen: Realisation of RP triphthongs

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Frequency	Percentage
1	Desire	[dɪzaiə]			22	55%
			[dɪzaja]		18	45%
2	Player	[pleɪə]			29	72.5%
			[pleja]		11	27.5%
3	Lower	[ləʊə]			9	22.5%
			[lowa]		31	77.5%

The above table reveals very interesting results. Kouega (1991) and Simo Bobda (1994) reveal that triphthongs are inexistent in CamE. This claim was proven right because the average 56.5% of our informants who pronounced the words “desire, player and lower” with the Cameroonian accent did that by replacing the [i] and [u] by the corresponding glides [j] and [w]. Better still, an average 42.5% of our informants could pronounce this words with the CamE accent.

3.2 Analysis of Teachers’ Attitudes

This section presents the various attitudes of teachers towards the use of Cameroon English in Cameroonian classrooms. As earlier mentioned, teachers who were considered for this study were both students from the Higher Teacher Training College, Yaounde who had undergone teaching practice and consequently, have first had information on what obtains in classrooms. The other set of teachers were those who have been teaching on the field for at least five years. This second category of teachers were chosen because of their experience and their long contact with the students. Another peculiarity about our informants is their sex. Our informants were from both sexes.

3.2.1 Variety of English used by teachers in Cameroon

The existence of different varieties of English implies that there should be a variety that teachers use in the course of teaching English Language. Based on our observations during the internship, we noticed that teachers on the field in particular did not use the same pronunciation in the course of teaching; thus, there was therefore need for us to investigate on the variety each

teacher uses in his language classroom. The table below presents teachers' view on the variety of English they use in class.

Table Fifteen: Variety of English used by teachers in class

Variety	Frequency	Percentages
CamE	13	32.5
RP	7	17.5
Both	20	50
Total	40	100

The table above shows that language teachers in their majority use both CamE and RP in their classrooms. This is noticed from the fact that 50% of the informants use both RP and CamE in their classrooms. Contrary to our expectations, only 17.5% of our informants attested to be using only RP in their classrooms. English Language teachers are seen as masters of the language as such, we expected to see majority of them attesting that they use exclusively RP in their language classes. The remaining 32.5% attested to be using CamE in their classrooms which is but a normal phenomenon considering the fact that they are exposed to this variety from childbirth.

3.2.2 Attitudes toward the use of Cameroon English

Considering the fast evolution of different varieties of English in general and Cameroon English in particular, there was therefore need for us to investigate on the attitudes of teachers towards Cameroon English. We wanted to know what they think of Cameroon English; is it an independent variety of English that should be held great esteem? Or it is still considered to be an erroneous form of the Standard British English? The responses given by our informants ranged from positive through negative to neutral. The frequency of occurrence of each of this will be presented on the table below

Table Sixteen: attitudes of teachers towards the use of CamE

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGES
Positive	23	57.5
Negative	8	20
Neutral	9	22.5
Total	40	100

From the table above, it is noticed that Cameroon English is fast gaining grounds in Cameroon. This can be justified by the fact that up to 57.5% of our informants were in favour of the current use of Cameroon English in our Cameroonian context and more to that, 22.5% of our informants were indifferent meaning that they tolerate the use of this fast emerging variety. On the contrary, only 20% of our informants were against the use of Cameroon English. Since attitudes change with time, we will stay in alert to see if their attitudes will change.

3.2.3 Teachers' attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent

In the course of our research, there was equally need for us to investigate on how teachers feel when they see a Cameroonian who don't strive to speak SBE but instead make use of his Cameroonian pronunciation pattern. In order to obtain these information, we asked them whether they admire Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent. Their opinions will be presented on the table below.

Table Seventeen: Admiration for Cameroon English

Opinion	Frequency	percentage
YES	23	57.5
NO	17	42.5
Total	40	100

The table above shows that 57.5% of our informants had positive opinions concerning Cameroonians who use Cameroon English in the course of their daily communication and the remaining 42.5% were against the use of Cameroon English. These informants accepted or rejected the use of Cameroon English for some specific reasons which shall be presented below.

3.2.3.1 Justification for teachers' admiration for Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian pronunciation.

The research tool was designed in such a way that informants were not only expected to take a standpoint on their attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain the Cameroonian Pronunciation when speaking the language but to justify their claims. They gave many reasons to support their opinions but it all centered on reasons like: it reflects our culture and identity, it comes naturally, it is an independent variety of English and students understand it better. The frequency of occurrence each reason was calculated and presented on the table below.

Table Eighteen: Justification for their admiration

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
It reflects our culture and identity	10	25
It comes naturally	7	17.5
It is an independent variety	3	7.5
Students understand better	2	5
Total	22	55

From the table above, we notice that majority of our informants who admired Cameroonians who spoke Cameroon English was because according to them it promotes their culture and identity. This can be justified by the fact that up to 25% of the informants held that claim. Secondly, according to 17.5% of the informants, unlike the SBE, CamE comes naturally; you don't need to go through a formal system of education to get the correct pronunciation. 7.5% of the informants held that Cameroon English is an independent variety that should be recognised. The remaining 5% justified their admiration by saying that it is easy for students to quickly grab the notion taught when the teacher uses Cameroon English.

3.2.3.2 Justification of teachers' disdain of those who speak Cameroon English:

Considering the fact that not all the 40 informants had admiration for Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent, this implies that there were others who had negative views towards Cameroonians who don't strive to speak SBE. They advanced reasons such as it is not pleasant to hear, it misleads our students, it is not encouraged in our schools. As for the previous cases, the frequency of occurrence of each reason shall be calculated and presented on the table below.

Table Nineteen: Justification for negative attitudes

Reason	Frequency	Percentages
It is not pleasant to hear	9	22.5
It misleads our students	5	12.5
It is not encouraged in schools	2	5
Total	16	40

From the table above, we notice that 22.5 % of our informants were against Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian pronunciation because it is pleasant to hear. As Simo Bobda (1994) reports the case of a Cameroonian who insisted that

One cannot say that it is a pleasure to hear a reporter pronounce the word “feature” as “future” and yet this happens on radio and as well as on TV. We cannot keep insisting on our own Cameroonian accent when talking about English. After all, the language is not ours” (Simo Bobda 1993:438, after Cameroon Tribune August 8, 1989; N°938)

According to 12.5% of our informants, it misleads our students and the remaining 5% say it is not promoted in schools. In a nutshell, the remaining 17.5% are against Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accents for pedagogic reasons.

3.2.4 Teachers’ view on which variety of English to be promoted in classroom

The issue of which variety of English to be promoted in our classrooms has been a highly debatable issue over many years. It is for these reason that we decided to carry out this investigation. Even though the recommended variety is the SBE, there was still need for us to ask teachers’ opinion whether the teaching of the recommended variety is good and fruitful. In order to attain this objective, we asked teachers make a choice between RP and CamE or if they thought both was the best option. The data analysed shall be presented on the table below.

Table Twenty: Teachers’ view on which variety of English to be promoted in classroom

Variety of English	Frequency	Pronunciation
Cameroon English	6	15
SBE	27	67.5
Both	7	17.5
Total	40	100

The table above presents a very surprising results considering that fact that it shows that teachers still prefer the use of SBE in spite of its short comings to Cameroon English. This is seen as 67.5% of the informants held that SBE should be promoted to the detriment pf CamE in Classrooms. On the other hand, only 15% of the informants opted for the use of CamE in classrooms. The remaining 17.5% opted for the use of both varieties owing to the fact that one can complement the other. As for previous questions, our research tool was designed in such a way that informants justified their standpoints. The reasons for their choices were subdivided, analysed and presented on the tables below.

3.2.4.1 Justification by teachers for the choice of RP in ELT.

As earlier mentioned, 67.5% of our informants opted for RP in ELT this was very surprising because previous question on attitudes about CamE and RP showed that Cameroonians in their majority preferred CamE to SBE but when it came to which one to adopt in ELT they rapidly changed their mind and went in favour of RP. The different reasons they gave were classified under three main headings: to attain international intelligibility, because of their students and because it is a global language. The frequency of occurrence of each of this standpoint was analysed and presented in the subsequent table.

Table Twenty One: Justification of RP as a choice

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
To attain international intelligibility	8	20
Because of our students	6	15
It's the standard and global language	12	30
Total	26	60

From the table above, we can notice that 20% of our informants opted for the use of SBE in ELT because they are in need of a variety which crosses international boundaries. 6% of the informants opted for SBE because of the sake of students. According to them, they need a variety which will favour students in their academic activities. As other informants claim, there is no university abroad which recognises deviant forms of the English Language. The remaining 30% were in favour of SBE because it is a global language.

3.2.4.2 Justification by teachers for the choice of CamE

As earlier mentioned above, only 15% of the informant opted for the use of CamE in ELT. This result was very surprising because our informants had in their majority positive attitudes towards CamE. This result testified our claims that, the fact that our informants had positive attitudes towards CamE doesn't mean that they will be in favour of it in an ELT situation. Those who were in favour of CamE advanced the following reasons to support their claims. The reasons they gave will be presented in the following table.

Table Twenty Two: Justification by teachers for the choice of CamE

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
It reflect our culture and identity	4	10%
It is easier than SBE since it comes naturally	2	5%
Total	6	15%

The table above shows that 10% of our informants were in favour of CamE for patriotic reasons. They wanted a variety which will reflect their socio-political and cultural realities. The remaining 5% of our informants who opted for CamE claimed that this variety is easier than RP since it comes naturally. According to them, students understand CamE better because they have been used to it from childhood.

3.2.4.3 Justification for teachers who promoted the two variety.

Following the way our questionnaire was designed, there was room for those teachers who taught that the two variety could walk in hand. According to some informants, there was no need separating the two variety because it's a delima which has been at the order of the day. So, according to these teachers, the two variety should be promoted. They gave reasons such as there is intelligibility in the two variety and that students should be acquainted to the two variety. The frequency of occurrence of each reason shall be calculated and presented in the table below

Table Twenty Three: Justification for teachers who promote the two varieties

Reasons	Frequency	Percentages
There is intelligibility in both varieties	4	10
Students should be acquainted to both varieties	3	7.5
Total	7	17.5

From the table above, we noticed that 10% of our informants were indifferent to the variety to be adopted in class because according to them, the two variety were intelligible. The remaining 7.5% claimed that there was need for the students to master both varieties because

as an informant claims “it will be embarrassing if you meet your counterpart out Cameroon and both of you cannot communicate in such a way that someone not knowing you will understand that both of you have some cultural links. As Such, there is therefore need for students to master the two varieties of English.

3.3 Analysis of students’ attitudes

Our second group of informants were students. A different questionnaire was equally designed for them. The aim of this questionnaire was to get their own point of view on the use of Cameroon English in ELT. It is worth noting that we decided to take level 2 students of the University of Yaounde I under the English department as our informants for this study. This group of informants were chosen because they have been studying the English Language for considerable number of years and more to that they have a knowledge of different varieties of English and are confronted to them on daily basis. As those of teachers, their points of view will be of great importance considering the fact that they are ones being taught by these teachers. Consequently, if teachers have a particular attitudes towards an accent, it will be reflected in their students.

3.3.1 Classification of informants according to the pronunciation they adopt while speaking the English Language.

Considering the fact that in our Cameroonian context we are confronted to RP and CamE pronunciation, there was need for us to investigate on the variety our informants adopt while speaking the English Language. Previous researches have shown that there are Cameroonians who strive to speak RP whereas there are others who maintain there CamE accent. As a result, we decided to classify our informants according to the pronunciation they think they adopt while speaking the English Language. This classification will be presented in the table below.

Table Twenty Four: Classification of informants according to the pronunciation they adopt while speaking the English Language

Pronunciation	Frequency	Percentage
CamE	18	45
RP	22	55
Total	40	100

The table above shows that the gap between RP and CamE pronunciation is a mean one in our Cameroonian context. On one hand, we see 55% of our informants who adopt RP

while speaking the English Language meanwhile on the other hand we see 45% who adopt the Cam accent while speaking the English Language. This is quite normal because in Cameroon, under the formal system, we are confronted to RP meanwhile under the informal context, we are confronted to CamE.

3.3.1.1 Justification for CamE

Following the way our questionnaire was designed, there was a space provided for the justification of any choice made by an informant. As far as the justification for CamE was concerned, informants advanced reasons such as: it reflects our culture and identity and it is easier since it comes naturally. The frequency of occurrence of each reason was recorded, analysed and presented in the table below.

Table Twenty Five: Justification for CamE

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
It reflects our culture and identity	11	64.7
It is easier and natural	6	35.3
Total	17	100

From the table above, we notice that 64.7% of our informants chose CamE because according to them it reflects their culture and identity. They need in variety in which they will see themselves. The remaining 35.3% chose CamE because according to them it is easier considering the fact that it comes naturally. According to them, you don't need to make any effort to get the correct pronunciation when using CamE.

3.3.1.2 Justification for RP

Informants who chose RP were equally asked to justify their choice. According to their justification, RP was pleasant to hear, it is the mother variety and it is what is encouraged in schools. The table below shows the frequency of occurrence of their justification.

Table Twenty Six: Justification for RP

Justification	Frequency	Percentage
It is pleasant to hear	12	57.2
It is the mother variety	5	24.3
It is good for academic purposes	4	19
Total	21	100

The table above shows that 57.2% of our informants chose RP because it is pleasant to hear. We have one of our informants who confirms that he is amazed when he watches BBC because of the way the journalist articulate and pronounce words. According to 24.3% of our informants, RP is the mother variety and there is no need to adopt deviant forms. 19% of our informant confirm that they prefer RP to CamE for educational purposes. According to them, if you want to excel in your educational career you need to have a good mastery of RP because it is the variety that is recognized all over the globe.

3.3.2 Attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their CamE Pronunciation

Adopting an RP accent while speaking the English Language doesn't mean that you have a negative attitude toward Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian pronunciation while speaking the English Language. As result, we decided to investigate on the attitudes of students towards Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent while the English language. This was of great importance because if a student has a negative attitude towards Cameroonians who speak CamE and coincidentally his English Language teacher maintains his Cameroonian accent in the process of teaching, he will end up never learning the language. The attitudes were classified under the label positive, negative and indifferent. The table below bring in detail information.

Table Twenty Seven: Attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their CamE Pronunciation

Attitudes	Frequency	Percentages
Positive	26	65
Negative	13	32.5
Indifferent	1	2.5
Total	40	100

The table above shows that 65% of our informants had positive attitudes towards CamE. This shows that CamE is gaining admiration on the Cameroonian soil. According to them it reflects our culture and identity as well as the socio-political and cultural realities in which we live. 32.5% of our informants had negative attitudes toward Cameroonians who use the Cameroonian pronunciation and only 2.5% were indifferent to the different pronunciation adopted by Cameroonians.

3.3.3 Variety of English to be promoted in ELT

According to the new approach to Language teaching, which is the competency based approach (CBA), the process of teaching should be students centered. It is owing to this perspective that we decided to take into consideration the students opinion on which variety of English to be promoted in classrooms. Their opinions were analysed and presented in the table below.

Table Twenty Eight: Accent to be promoted in ELT

Variety	Frequency	Percentage
CamE	16	40
SBE	24	60
Total	40	100

The analysis presented on the table above reveals that 60 percent of our informants support the fact that SBE is used in our system of education. They are in favour of that variety for particular reasons which shall be analysed in the subsequent lines.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, we presented, analysed and discussed the various findings the informants portrayed towards CamE. The data got was presented in tables and results got showed clearly that the informants in their majority don't master RP and have varied attitudes towards the teaching of CamE in Cameroonian Classrooms.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS AND THE SOCIOLINGUISTICS AND PEDAGOGIC IMPLICATIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents and discusses the major findings of the study. It equally presents their sociolinguistic and pedagogic implications.

4.1 Discussion of the Major Findings

As clearly mentioned in the scope of our work, this research investigated on the mastery of RP by university students and secondary school teachers and their attitudes towards CamE. This analysis revealed very interesting and surprising results which either confirmed or infirmed our hypothesis. As far as the discussion of our major findings is concerned, we will start by discussing the result obtained from the mastery of RP by students.

First, from the students' pronunciations, we realised that RP is still a far-fetched phenomenon in Cameroon. This can be justified by the fact that as far as the monophthong [ə] is concerned, an average of 75% of our students produced but the Cameroonian form of pronunciation of the words "purpose, courteous, attend, today and parliament" and an average of 10% produced the RP form of these words. In the course of our investigation, two things caught our attention: first, it was noticed that as far as the pronunciation of the word "parliament" and "today" was concerned, not even a single student got the SBE pronunciation and second, the will to approximate RP by students made them develop deviant forms which were neither RP nor CamE. This was noticed with the word "today." 75% of our informants pronounced the word "today" in such a way that it was recorded as a variant from both CamE and SBE. This confirms what Simo Bobda (1994:891) says about CamE monophthongs in general and the shwa in particular. According to him, the central vowel [ə] is rare and therefore has the most complex rendering in Cameroon English.

Second, as far as the realisation of the short vowel [ɪ] and the central vowel [ʌ] were concerned, an average of 99% of our informants produced the CamE form of pronunciation and an average of 1% produced the RP forms of these words. This can be justified by the fact that these students pronounce according to the way these words are spelled.

Third, with the realisation of [ɜ] we noticed that majority of our informants replaced [ɜ] by [ɔ]. The pronunciation pattern at this level was better than those of the previous level

because majority of our informant could successively pronounce the words “learn, circle and purpose”. This can be justified by the fact that an average of 43.3% of our informants gave the RP form of these words; an average of 40% of our informants gave the CamE form of these words. As for the previous case (see table 4), the will to approximate SBE made students to come up with a new form of pronunciation for “circle” [saɪkl] which is neither RP nor CamE. Those informants who did not successively produce the RP forms of these words did that because according to Kouega (2013) vowel length is hardly realized in the variety of English spoken in Cameroon. They have the tendency of replacing [ɜ] by [ɛ].

As far as diphthongs are concerned, according to Masanga (1983) RP diphthongs are restructured in CamE through monophthongisation and occurrence of foreign diphthongs. This was demonstrated in the speech of our informants where an average of 95% of our informants transformed the diphthongs in “fatal, ensure, malaria and labour” into monophthongs. The remaining average of 5% successively realised the RP diphthongs in their speech.

Concerning the realisation of triphthongs, Kouega and Simo Bobda’s claim are confirmed. Kouega (1991) and Simo (1994) reveal that triphthongs are inexistent in CamE. This assertion was confirmed in the course of our research considering the fact that not even a single student gave the RP form of the words “ desire, player and lower” under this rubric, CamE pronunciation had a 100% success despite the students efforts to approximate SBE.

Our second group of informants was secondary school teachers who have been teaching for at least five years and student-teachers from the Higher Teacher Training College Yaounde. This group of informants produced more satisfactory results as far as the realisation of RP is concerned considering the fact that they have been studying the language and have been in contact with it for a considerable numbers of years.

First, this group of informants had an average of 24% success as far as the realisation of the sound [ə] was concerned in the words “purpose, courteous, attend, today and parliament”. An average of 67% of our informants gave the Cameroonian pronunciation of these sounds. Better still, under this rubric, two things caught our attention. The first thing was that as far as the words “today and parliament” was concerned, not even a single informant gave their SBE pronunciation. Secondly, there is the case of certain informants who struggled to approximate RP thus, leading to the creation of new forms of pronunciation; this experience was witnessed with the word “today”.

Second, as for the realisation of the short vowel [ɪ] and the central vowel [ʌ] was concerned, an average of 73.5% of our informants pronounced the words “country, labour, budget, storage and enough” with the Cameroonian accents whereas only an average of 20% of our informants could successively produce the SBE pronunciation of these words. As for the previous case, 30% of our informants pronounced the word “enough” in such a way that it was neither RP nor CamE. Again, this new form of pronunciation was recorded as a variant. According to Kouega (2013) Cameroonians face difficulties in pronouncing these words because they pronounce the words the way they are spelled.

As far as the results for the sound [ʒ] was concerned, professionals of English showed more satisfactory results. An average of 60% of our informants could successively pronounce the words “purpose, learn and circle” with the RP accent. An average of 28.3% pronounced these words with the Cameroonian accent. As it was the case with students, we equally saw 40% of our informants pronouncing the “circle” as [saɪkl] which is neither RP nor CamE.

In the course of analysing our data, it was noticed that even English language teachers had the tendency of monophthongising diphthongs. This explains why they had an average of 75.6% of the words “fatal, labour, malaria and ensure” pronounced with the Cameroonian accent. Only an average of 24.4% of our informants could successively give the SBE pronunciation of these words.

The results obtained from words containing RP triphthongs were really interesting. Kouega (1991) and Simo Bobda (1994) reveal that triphthongs are inexistent in CamE. This claim was proven right because the average 56.5% of our informants who pronounced the words “desire, player and lower” with the Cameroonian accent did that by replacing the [i] and [u] by the corresponding glides [j] and [w]. Better still, an average 42.5% of our informants could pronounce these words with the RP accent.

Considering the fact that our investigation was based on two aspects, we are going to discuss in the second aspect the attitudes of these students and teachers toward the use of CamE pronunciation in ELT. Beginning with students, they displayed mixed attitudes towards the teaching of CamE in Classrooms.

First, as much as 65% of our informants have positive attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their CamE pronunciation while speaking the English Language. According to them, it reflects our culture and identity; as well as the socio-political and cultural realities in which we live. About 32.5% of our informants had negative attitudes toward Cameroonians

who use the Cameroonian pronunciation. According to this category of people, maintaining your Cameroonian pronunciation feature is a sign that you are not well educated. Again, they gave reasons such as “it is pleasant to hear.” Finally, only 2.5% of our informants were indifferent to the different pronunciations adopted by Cameroonians. According to them, both varieties were intelligible so no need loving one and hating the other.

Second, our findings equally revealed that 40% of our informants were in favour of the use CamE in ELT. This result shows that CamE is really gaining grounds on the Cameroonian soil. This group of informant backed up their position with numerous reasons, amongst which was patriotism. They equally supported their point with claims such as CamE is easier than SBE since it comes naturally. Up to 60% of our informants maintained that SBE should be taught in Classrooms. They backed up their position with numerous reasons, the major of which was that it is a mother variety. Other reasons were that it is mature and original, spoken worldwide and pleasant to listen to. The fact that up to 40% of our informants were in favour of CamE in ELT shows that CamE is gaining admiration on the Cameroonian soil and is an indication that language policies should be revised in the Cameroonian system of education.

Third, the gap between RP and CamE is subtle because we have up to 45% of our informants who are proud to say that they maintain their CamE pronunciation while speaking the language and they clearly emphasise the point that they are not willing to change their accent. According to them, it is pride to speak in such a way that you can be identified to be belonging to a particular group of people. The remaining 55% of our informants said they adopt RP when speaking the English Language and that they are ready to change their accent completely if they had an opportunity to do that. According to them speaking and writing SBE is a guarantee for a prosperous professional career. Laying on Achimbe (2007) claims, we may say that their positive attitude toward this imported language is justified by the various advantages attached to this language.

The other dimension to this study was to consider teachers’ attitudes towards the implementation of CamE in ELT. The findings equally revealed mixed attitudes at this level.

First, the findings revealed that teachers of English do not use a single variety of English in their classrooms, but a mixture of both Cameroon English accent and SBE pronunciation. In fact, 50% of teachers consulted for the investigation recognized that they use a mixture of both CamE and SBE. This shows teachers inability to achieve the SBE accent that they are expected to teach and promote. An interesting fact revealed by the findings is that up to 32.5% of our

informants attested to use CamE while teaching showing that CamE is an inevitable reality. And only 17.5% attested to be using RP when teaching showing that RP as Simo Bobda (1994) and Ngefac (2011) mention is still a far-fetched phenomenon.

Second, 57.5% of our informants had positive attitudes towards Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accent. They advanced reasons such as it reflects our culture and identity, it comes naturally and it is an independent variety. 42.5% of our informants had negative attitudes towards their counterparts who maintain their CamE pronunciation because according to them, it is not pleasant to hear.

Third, 57.5% of our informants had positive attitudes towards the use of CamE in our Cameroonian society. They opted for this variety for patriotic reasons. 20% of our informants had negative attitudes towards the use of CamE in our society because according to them it is not recognised in any other country than Cameroon. The remaining 22.5% of our informants were indifferent meaning that they accept both varieties. According to them, each variety has its specific role it plays and both varieties are interdependent.

Fourth, 67.5% of our informants were in favour of the use of SBE in ELT. They advanced reasons such as SBE enables international intelligibility, it is good for our students and it is the standard and global language. Only 15% of our informants were in favour of the use of CamE in ELT. This result was very surprising owing to the previous question which was to enquire which variety of the English Language is to be used in our Cameroonian context, we noticed that up to 57.5% of our informants were in favour of CamE; thus, we expected a similar percentage of informants to be in favour of the use of CamE in ELT which was not the case. The fact that up to 67.5% of our informants were in favour of the use of SBE in ELT confirms Ngefac (2011) claims that ELT in Cameroon is a situation where a blind person is leading another. This can be justified by the fact that during our first investigation on the mastery of RP not up to one-quarter of our informants could produce correct RP structures with the sample words given. It is quite pathetic that at the end of the day they end up being in favour of a variety that they themselves don't master. The remaining 17.5% of our informants were in favour of both varieties.

4.2 Sociolinguistic implications

These findings revealed a number of sociolinguistic implications which are discussed below.

First, Cameroonians are still so ignorant of SBE. This means that the objective to implant SBE in Cameroon is not yielding the expected results. This can be justified by the fact that, the gap between the average percentage scored by students and teachers on the pronunciation of words with RP accent is a mean one. Besides, the possibility of attaining such an objective is only likely to decrease as time goes by, given that RP continues to lose ground even in Britain. Crystal (1988 and 2003b) highlights that only 3% of British people continue to speak RP in a pure form and that most other educated people have developed an accent which is a mixture of RP and various regional characteristics.

Second, the exceptionally high percentage obtained for CamE despite the informants efforts to approximate RP shows that CamE accent is wide spread. Considering the fact that CamE accent represents the speakers identity and socio-political and cultural realities, far better than the SBE, it can be successfully and proudly promoted. Moreover, works carried out on the field of intelligibility (e.g. Atechi 2004) have shown that CamE ensures international intelligibility to a good extent.

Third, the fact that more than three-quarter of our informants attested that they prefer CamE to SBE because it comes naturally and one does not need to make any particular efforts to have the correct CamE pronunciation shows that CamE is part of our cultural heritage. Unlike the SBE, CamE is innate to Cameroonians and they speak it without fastidious efforts and this is a clear indication that Cameroonians are inseparable from their indigenised English model of pronunciation. The implication is surely that, there is an urgent need to work hard towards codifying, standardizing, and promoting this variety that Cameroonians know very well.

Fourth, the fact that 57% of our informants were in favour of the use of CamE in our daily communication but changed their minds when it came to adopting it in our system of education equally caught our attention. When the question on which variety of English to be used in ELT was asked, we expected the same number of people who were in favour of CamE to stand again for it, but to our greatest surprise, only 15% of our informants stood for CamE. With these controversial attitudes, we asked ourselves if the teaching of SBE in our schools will ever yield the awaited results.

4.3 Pedagogic implications

This study carries a number of pedagogic implications considering the fact that the investigation had teachers and students as informants.

First, the fact that English Language teachers could not achieve an average of 25% of SBE features despite their efforts to articulate the linguistic items according to RP shows that these teachers do not teach RP. And this confirms Ngefac's (2011) claim that the language policy in Cameroon is one in which a blind person is leading another.

Second, the fact that up to 50% of our informant admitted to use a mixture of both SBE and CamE in their language class and more than 30% recognised to be using only CamE in their language class shows the inability of teachers to approximate SBE in our language classes. According to a particular informant, if SBE wants to be implemented in ELT, it should be done in our own way. According to him, the syntax, morphology, lexis and other linguistic elements should obey the SBE norms but the phonology should obey our indigenised variety because students understand it better. This can be confirmed by the fact that more than two-third of the students were in favour of CamE who considered it easy and it naturally produced.

Third, our finding equally revealed that up to 40% of the students were in favour of the use of CamE in ELT; this is an indication that attitudes are changing and students are becoming aware of their inability to attain full proficiency as far as RP is concerned. Previous works on attitudes towards RP showed that up to 75% of the students were in favour of SBE and only 25% were for CamE (Pouokam 2015). Thus, the government should look for means to codify and standardise CamE instead of insisting on a target language which cannot yield the required results. May be the remaining 60% of students who were in favour of SBE remained on their standpoint because there is no standard variety of Cameroon English.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter focused on the summary and discussion of the major findings of the investigation. It also discussed the various sociolinguistic and pedagogic implications of the study.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The purpose of this work was to investigate the mastery of RP by university students and secondary school teachers and their attitudes towards Cameroon English pronunciation. The first part of our test which was given to our informants consisted in articulating twenty words with the aim of recording and identifying RP and CamE pronunciation. The second part consisted in giving a questionnaire to our informants where they were expected to express their attitudes towards CamE pronunciation. This work was carried following the hypothesis that, both students and teachers do not master RP and they have controversial attitudes towards the teaching of Cameroon English in schools; teachers have negative attitudes towards the teaching of CamE because they believe that the language that will be useful to students is the SBE since it is the language used for international communication. Students on the other hand have positive attitudes towards the adoption of CamE in schools because they find it easier than SBE especially at the level of phonology and also because it reflects their sociocultural and linguistic realities.

Our findings revealed very interesting results which shall be presented under two main rubrics. First, our findings revealed that students as well as teachers do not master RP as it was hypothesised. This can be justified by the fact that only an average of 7.7% of the students could pronounce the twenty words with the RP accent. On the other hand, teachers showed better results considering the fact that they had an average of 33.8% success as far as the pronunciation of these sample words were concerned. But these results are still below expectations since they are considered as professionals of English. Second, our findings revealed that both teachers and students have positive attitudes towards the teaching of RP in classrooms. The results therefore contradicted the hypothesis formulated from the onset to a certain extent. It was stated that students have positive attitudes towards the teaching of CamE. This was proven wrong in the course of our investigation because only 40% of our informants were in favour of CamE accent. As far as teachers were concerned, the hypothesis was confirmed since up to 67.5% of the informants were in favour of SBE as the variety to encourage in our language classrooms.

This study thus brings up a controversial situation where we find students and teachers not mastering RP but advocating RP in schools. After this keen observation, one question came to our mind: do students really know what RP is? We saw the case of students who admitted to admire the way their English Language teachers speak the English Language not knowing that these people they admire do not speak RP. May be these students just need a standardised

and codified variety of language that they can use in their professional careers. Thus, the government should start looking for means of redefining language policies in Cameroon.

Suggestion for further research

This work investigated the mastery of RP by students and English Language teachers and their attitudes towards CamE pronunciation. However, it will be absurd to claim that the study has covered everything in its area. Further studies can still be carried out to fill in other knowledge gaps. This work limited itself in investigating the mastery of RP by students and teachers and their attitudes towards CamE pronunciation; another research could be conducted on the correlation that exist between some sociolinguistic variables and the mastery of RP. At this level, the researcher will be expected to find out what are the different sociolinguistic variables (professional status and level of education) that influence the mastery of RP.

REFERENCES

- Agheyisi, R. and Fishman, J.A. (1970). "Language Attitude Studies: A Brief Survey of Methodological Approaches." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12, pp. 131-57.
- Almani, J. (2007). "Students attitudes in the context of the curriculum in Libyan education in middle and high schools." PhD thesis, University of Glasgow.
- Anchimbe, E. A. (2006). *Cameroon English: Authenticity ,Ecology and Evolution*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Anchimbe, E. A. (2007). "On Norms and Prejudices: The Notion of Maturation in new Englishes." *Interlinguistica*, 17, 151-160.
- Atechi S.N (2004). "The Intelligibility of Native and Non-native English Speech: A Comparative Analysis of Cameroon English and American and British English." Unpublished PH.D Thesis, University of Chemnitz, Germany.
- Baker, C (1988). *Key Issues of Bilingualism Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Banyuy, S.E (2014). "Attitudes of Cameroonians towards Cameroon English Accent and Received Pronunciation." Unpublished Post Graduate Dissertation, ENS Yaounde.
- Brown, H. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (2nd ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Clement, K. (2015) "The Correlation between some Sociolinguistic Variables and Standard British English Stress Pattern from Romance Languages." Unpublished post dissertation, ENS Yaounde.
- Corder, S. P. (1967) The Significance of Learners' Errors. Reprinted in JC Richards (1974, 1984) *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman, (Originally in *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5 (4), pp.19-27.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (1988). *The English Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Crystal, D. (2003b). *English as a Global Language (2nd ed.)* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Bot et Al. (2005) *Second Language Acquisition: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.

- Ellis, R (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fabrice, P. (2015) "Attitudes of students and English Language teachers towards the teaching of RP in Cameroon" Unpublished post dissertation, ENS Yaounde.
- Fishbein, M. and Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. London: Addison- Wesley.
- Gardner, R. and Lambert, W. (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Gardner, R (1985). *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2006). *Current perspective on teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca*. TESOL Quarterly 40(1), 157-181.
- Kachru, B.(1985). "Standards, codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the Outer Circle." In R. Quirk and Widdowson. (eds.) 11-30.
- Kachru, B (1986). *The Alchemy of English: the Spread, Function and Models of Non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kachru, B (1992), "World Englishes: Approaches, Issues and Resources." *Language Teaching* 25(1), 1-4.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kouega, J.P (1999). 'Some Major Speech Traits of Cameroon Media News in English'. *English Studies*, 80(6), pp. 540-55.
- Kouega, J.P.(1999). 'Some Speech Characteristics of News in English: An Explanatory Study of Radio and Television News Text'. Unpublished Doctorat de 3e Cycle Thesis, University of Yaounde.
- Kouega, J. P. (2013). RP and the Cameroon English Accent: An over view. *US-China Foreign language*, 11, (12), 887-900.
- Labov, W. (1966). *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, D.C.:

Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Lambert, W. (1967). "A social Psychology of Bilingualism." *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, pp. 91-109.
- Mbangwana, P.N.(1987). 'Some Characteristics of Social Patterns of Cameroon Standard English'. *Multilingual*,4, pp. 411-424.
- McArthur, T. (1999). *English Today*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Mesanga, P. N (1983). "The Spoken English of Educated Mghamo people: A phonological Study." Unpublished Doctorat de 3e Cycle, University of Yaounde.
- Montano, and Kasprzyk D. (2008). *Theory of reasoned action, theory of planned behavior, and the integrated behavioral model*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass 67 – 96.
- Ngefacc, A. (2008a) " The Social Stratification of English in Cameroon." *World Englishes* 27(3/4), 407-418.
- Ngefacc , A.(2008b). *Social Differentiation in Cameroon English. Evidence from Sociolinguistic Fieldwork*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ngefacc, A. (2008c). "Which Englishes for Cameroonians in New Millennuim: the Quest for English and cultural identity?" *Annals of the Faculty of Arts, Letters and Social Science, University of Yaounde I special Edition, Festschrift in Honour of Professor Paul N. Mbangwana*, pp 139-151.
- Ngefacc, A. (2010). "Cameroon English Accent: Issues of Standardisation, Attitudes and pedagogic concerns" *Journal of Language and Culture*.1(1),1-7.
- Ngefacc, A.(2011). 'When the blind Lead the Blind: the Fallacy of Promoting Standard British English Accent in Cameroon'. *Journal of language teaching and research*,n2(1), 40-44.
- Ngefacc, A. (2012). "From Skin Colour Mutilation to Tongue Rejection: Cameroonians' Attitudes towards their Local Tongues." In Echu *Fifty Years of Official Bilingualism*. 163-191.
- Platt, J., Weber, H and Ho, M. L. (1984) *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge.
- Quirk, R. (1985). *The English Language in global context*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Quirk, R. (1990). *Language Varieties and Standard Language*. London: Routledge.
- Rajaduria, J. (2005) 'Revisiting the Concentric Circles: Conceptual and sociolinguistic Consideration'. *Asian University EFL Journal*, 7 (4) pp.1-24.

- Salman, R. (1991). *Imaginary homelands: Essay and Criticism*. Mass Market: Penguin.
- Schmeid, J. (1991) *English in Africa*. London: Longman.
- Schneider, W.E (2007). *Postcolonial English: varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simo Bobda, A (1992). "Aspects of Cameroon English Phonology". Unpublished Dissertation for the Doctoratd'Etat, University of Yaounde.
- Simo Bobda, A. and Mbangwana, P.N. (1993). *An Introduction to Spoken English*. Lagos, University of Lagos Press.
- Simo Bobda, A. (1994). *Aspects of Cameroon English Phonology*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Simo Bobda, A. (2002). *Watch Your English! A Collection of Remedial Lessons on English Usage*. (2nded). Yaounde: B&K language Institute Press.
- Simo Bobda, A. (2004). "Linguistic Apartheid: English Language Policy in Africa." *English Today* 77, 20 (1), pp. 19-26.
- Tiffen, B. (1974). "The Intelligibility of Nigerian English." Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Widdowson H. G. (1994). 'The ownership of English' *TESOL Quaterly*, 28(2) pp.337-389.

APPENDICES

Appendix One: List of Words Used to Collect Data

The following list of words has been designed for research purpose exclusively. Please, pronounce the words as closely to Standard British English as possible. Thanks for cooperating

1	Purpose
2	Courteous
3	Attend
4	Today
5	Parliament
6	Country
7	Labour
8	Budget
9	Storage
10	Enough
11	Learn
12	Circle
13	Fatal
14	Malaria
15	Ensure
16	Desire
17	Player
18	Lower
19	Worship
20	Tortoise

Appendix Two: Realisation of Linguistic Items by Teachers and Students.

Linguistic variables		Variants			Informants			
					Teachers		students	
N°	Items	SBE	CamE	Others	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
1	Purpose	[pɜpəs]			28	70%	12	30%
			[pɜpəs]		12	30%	28	70%
2	Courteous	[kɜtiəs]			9	22.5%	5	12.5%
			[kɜtiəs]		31	77.5%	35	87.5%
3	Attend	[ətend]			11	17.5%	3	7.5%
			[atend]		29	72.5%	37	92.5%
4	Today	[tədeɪ]			00	00%	00	00%
			[tude]	[tudeɪ]	22/18	55/45%	10/30	25/75%
5	Parliament	pɑləmənt]			00	00%	00	00%
			[pɑliəmənt]		40	100%	40	100%
6	Country	[kʌntri]			20	50%	00	00%
			[kauntri]		20	50%	40	100%
7	Labour	[leɪbə]			5	12.5%	2	5%
			[lebɔ]		35	87.5%	38	95%
8	Budget	[bʌdʒɪt]			3	7.5%	00	00%
			[bʌdʒəd]		37	92.5%	40	100%
9	Storage	[stɔrɪdʒ]			35	87.5%	00	00%
			[stɔretʃ]		5	12.5%	40	100%
10	Enough	[ɪnʌf]			21	52.5%	00	00%
			[enɒf]	[ɪnɒf]	7/12	17.5/30	40	100%
11	Learn	[lɜn]			37	92.5%	30	75%
			[len]		3	7.5%	10	25%
12	Circle	[sɜkl]			5	12.5%	10	25%
			[sɛkl]	[saɪkl]	19/16	47.5/16	10/20	25/50%
13	Fatal	[feitəl]			23	57.5%	10	25%
			[fatal]		17	42.5%	30	75%
14	Malaria	[məleəriə]			2	5%	00	00%
			[malɛria]		38	95%	40	100%
15	Ensure	[ɪnʃuə]			9	22.5%	2	5%
			[ɛnʃɔ]		31	77.5%	38	95%
16	Desire	[dɪzaɪə]			22	55%	00	00%
			[dɪzajə]		18	45%	40	100%
17	Player	[pleɪə]			29	72.5%	00	00%
			[plejə]		11	27.5%	40	100%
18	Lower	[ləʊə]			9	22.5%	00	00%
			[lowə]		31	77.5%	40	100%
19	Worship	[wɜʃɪp]			28	70%	12	30%
			[wɔʃɪp]		12	30%	28	70%
20	Tortoise	[tɔtəs]			5	12.5%	2	5%
			[tɔtɔɪs]		35	87.5%	38	95%

Appendix Three: Students' Questionnaire

Dear respondents,

The present questionnaire has been designed to serve academic purposes exclusively. It intend to get your opinion on the adoption of CamE in ELT.

SECTION A

➤ Name of the school:

.....

➤ Sex: Male Female

➤ Age:

➤ Class.....

➤ Linguistic background? Anglophone Francophone

➤ Which language do you use the most for your daily communication?

1) English 2) French 3)Pidgin English 4) mother tongue

➤ Why?.....

.....

.

SECTION B

➤ How do your English teachers speak the English language?

- Well

- Very well

- Poorly

➤ Is their accent different from those of Britain? YES NO

➤ Do you admire their way of speaking the English Language? YES NO

➤ Can you make a difference between Cameroon English and British English?

YES NO

➤ According to you which accent should be promoted in the Cameroonian system of Education?

- Standard British English
- Cameroonian English
- Both

➤ Why?.....
.....

➤ Do you admire Cameroonians who maintain their Cameroonian accents?

YES NO

➤ Why?.....
.....

➤ Which accent do you adopt while speaking the English language?

- Cameroonian accent
- British Accent
- Both

➤ Will you change your accent if you had the opportunity? YES NO

➤ Why?.....
.....

.

Appendix Four: Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear respondents,

The present questionnaire has been designed to serve academic purposes exclusively. It intend to get your opinion on the adoption of CamE in ELT.

SECTION A.

- Name of the school:.....
- Sex: Male Female
- What is your linguistic background?
Anglophone Francophone
- For how long have you been teaching English language?
- In which classes have been teaching English language?
.....

SECTION B.

- Do you know Cameroon English? YES NO
- Do you know British English? YES NO
- How well do you speak or understand Cameroon English?
 - Well
 - Very well
 - Poorly
- How well do you speak or understand British English?
 - Well
 - Very well
 - Poorly
- Which accent do you use when teaching your students?

- Cameroon English
- British English
- Both

➤ Why do you use your chosen accent?

.....

.....

.....

➤ What do you think of the use of Cameroon English in Cameroonian secondary schools?

- It is acceptable
- It should be discouraged
- It should neither be discouraged nor be encouraged.

➤ Do you admire your colleagues who maintain their Cameroonian accent?

- YES NO

➤ Why?

.....

.....

➤ According to you which accent should be promoted in Cameroon classroom context?

- RP Cam Eng Both

➤ Why?