Archives of Business Research – Vol.4, No.2
Publication Date: April. 25, 2016
DOI: 10.14738/abr.42.1921.
Atechi, S., & Fouda, S. M. E. (2016). On Novel Language Phonology: What do Fcotrs tell us in Non-Native Settings? *Archives of Business Research, 4*(2), 149-160.

On Novel Language Phonology: What Do Factors tell us in Non-Native Settings?

Samuel Atechi
Department of English, University of Yaounde I

Simplice Magloire Essomba Fouda
Department of English, University of Yaounde I

Abstract

This paper looks into factors affecting the spoken production of Bilingual Two students of the University of Yaounde I. Emphasis is laid on the effect of three main factors (previously spoken language(s), formal instruction and motivation) which are assumed to impact bilinguals' ultimate attainment in the production of English consonants and vowels. The role of age is discussed incidentally here. The paper follows an inferential reasoning in an attempt to explicate features of CamE and CamFE. It therefore attempts an explanation of the origin of these features, on the one hand, and determine how close to or distant the speech of each set of bilinguals is from the other hand and RP on the other hand, owing to the supposed effect of affecting factors. The paper shows that RP, Cameroon Francophone English (CamFE) and the speech of Anglophone bilinguals share a sizeable number of segmental traits. However, CamFE and English-French bilinguals' speech differ significantly from RP, and thus have each traits that are peculiar to them alone. It was inferred that previously spoken language(s)-namely French and Pidgin English- and to a very minor extent age could better account for that. It is also shown that a number of RP renditions are attested in the speech of some bilinguals. Two factors were said to stand at the inception of this: formal instruction and notably motivation.

Key words: Bilingual Students, L2 phonology, Affecting factors, Ultimate attainment, CamFE

INTRODUCTION

Human societies are dynamic, so too are languages that they use. Languages follow twists and turns of societies that use them. With regard to this dynamism, certain languages have expanded and spread over different horizons. The English language, for instance, has spread its tentacles to all corners of the world to become a global language, world language, international language and world lingua franca (Kachru 1986, 1994; Bamgbose1998; Atechi; 2006; Crystal 1997; Jenkins 2000). Consequently, English is today spoken in virtually all settings, domestic and non-domestic alike. The language has thus assumed different statuses: as a native language (NL), second language (L2) and foreign language (FL)--these three statuses correspond to Kachru's (1986) concentric circles, namely the Inner, Outer and expanding circle.

It is in this line that this paper focuses on the movement of English away from the British Isles to exploitation areas which were not populated by British settlers like Nigeria, India and Cameroon, but where English was adopted for administrative purposes, functioning as a superstrate to the local languages spoken prior to it. In these areas, English is both second

Copyright © Society for Science and Education, United Kingdom

language (ESL) and official language (OL). Cameroon's case was however peculiar in that it had undergone the influence of several European powers.

The territory known today as Cameroon was German protectorate from 1884 to 1916, before one of its parts was placed under French and the other under British administrations following the League of Nations' trusteeship. Each of the colonial powers administered its own share of the territory as part of its colonial empire till the independence of French Cameroon (East Cameroon) in 1960, followed by the independence of British Cameroon (West Cameroon) in 1961, which spawned a federal state often referred to as the Cameroons owing to its dual linguistic practice. Since the creation of the federal state of Cameroon in 1961 linguistic policy has been one of promoting official language bilingualism, at least in principle. This policy, spelt out in the constitution and its several amendments, makes English and French the official languages of the country with equal status and prestige. It is following this policy that English happens to be learnt in different acquisition patterns and for different functions in the country.

ENGLISH AND ITS VARYING STATUSES IN CAMEROON

The complexity of the linguistic landscape of Cameroon is well known by scholars. In fact, Cameroon is known to have more than 200 home languages. Simo Bobda & Fasse Mbouya (2005) give a figure of 260 languages, while Echu (2003) reports 247ethnic community languages and Ethnologue numbers 279 living languages. Meanwhile, there are Pidgin English (PE) used as a lingua franca and Camfranglais used as a language of in-group communication among the youths of urban Francophone areas. The linguistic landscape of Cameroon is further compounded by the existence of English and French mentioned earlier.

Owing to the unique political history of Cameroon, English and French assume different statuses for Cameroonians, depending upon their (regional) origin. What we are, however, concerned about in this paper is the various statuses of English in Cameroon, not French. English has traditionally assumed two statuses for Cameroonian speakers: as ESL for Anglophones and as EFL for Francophones. These different statuses imply that the pattern of acquiring the language differs between these two groups of users. However, Simo Bobda and Fasse Mbouya (2005) observe that some linguistic concepts long taken for granted in Cameroon must be revisited since they create a lot of confusion.

They, in fact, show that English has become a mother tongue to many Anglophone Cameroonians—mother tongue here refers to the language acquired first and that consequently one knows best. Atechi (2010) observes that the English language spoken in Cameroon can be placed on continuum ranging from something close to near native to something quite distant from it. Various studies also indicate that more and more Francophone Cameroonians pursue their academic careers in the Anglophone sub-system (Atechi 2006; Nkwain 2010; Essomba 2012, 2013). Given that for this category of learners, English serves as a medium of formal instruction, it can be argued that they use it as an L2. The same argument could be made for Francophones learning and specialising in English at university. Whatever the statuses of English to Cameroonian users are, L1, L2 or FL, it remains true that it is picked up in a way different from that of mother-tongue Englishes .That is, its pattern of acquisition is influenced by a number of factors at various levels thus making it distinct from L1 Englishes, notably RP.

THE PROBLEM

Several studies on CamE and CamFE agree that English-French and French-English bilinguals' spoken Englishes vary. The same vowels and consonants used in the same environments for

example are not rendered identically, making the English of bilinguals lack consistency and uniformity. The same observation can also be extended to word stress. Previous studies on CamE have attempted an explanation of this variety's features by such verbal strategies as overgeneralisation, spelling pronunciation and interference, to cite a few (Kouega 1991, 1999; Simo Bobda 1994; Atechi 2006). The present paper, on its part, tries out a novel explanation of CamFE's and CamE's speech traits. This is an entirely inferential reasoning, based on the analysis of speech samples of Bilingual Two students of the University of Yaounde I, which posits that the spoken production of these speakers is shaped by four factors, namely speakers' L1s, formal instruction, motivation and to some extent age. Before attempting this inferential explanation, it is worth reviewing literature on L2 phonology and ultimate attainment. The following section is devoted to this end.

In recent times, L2 phonologists have been keen on investigating the supposed factors mediating with ultimate attainment in novel language phonology. Investigated factors are either internal or external to the language learner. They are inter alia the learner's first language, language learning aptitude, motivation, formal instruction, linguistic universals, learner affective filter, personality, gender and age, to cite but a few. Only learner's first language (referred to as learner previously spoken language-s- in this paper, for it deals with multilingual subjects), motivation, formal instruction and incidentally age are given consideration in this paper.

THE ROLE OF LEARNER'S FIRST LANGUAGE OR NATIVE LANGUAGE

The role of learner's native language has been the interest of many works in the area of ultimate attainment in L2 phonology in recent times (Bunta 2005; Piske et al. 2001; Flege 1998, 2003). A debate has been one of determining whether or not the native language (NL) militates against phonology acquisition, and to what extent. Tarone (1987) argues that the influence of the NL on the acquisition of target language (TL) phonological skills is paramount. In her view, a contrastive analysis is sufficient to predict the difficulties brought about by the interference between the NL phonological forms and the TL phonological forms. Similarly, Keys (2001) argues that learners simply use NL sounds when producing the TL's. This could be due to the difficulty encountered in the production of TL sounds, or because the learner's L1 lacks a sound that the TL possesses.

Most English L2 learners will for example replace /θ/ and /ð/respectively with /t/ and /d/ or, in some non-native varieties of English, with /s/ and /z/. Works which describe CamE phonology clearly indicate that CamE speakers systematically substitute the alveolar sounds /t/ and /d/ for the interdentals /θ/ and /ð/ (Simo Bobda 1994; Atechi 2006, to cite just these).To explicate such phenomena, Major (1987) argues that interference processes affect the beginning of the acquisition process more than the subsequent stages, owing to the little knowledge of the TL the learner possesses in the early stages of acquisition.

Flege (1995) points out that in the early stages of second language acquisition, bilinguals manage to process the TL phonetic segments using the grid of their NL phonology. He however also explains phonological errors made by bilinguals by the differences in the inventory of sounds used by the NL and the TL.

Other important issues concerning the NL are those singled out by Flege et al.'s (2003) study on the effect of L1 use the on degree of ultimate attainment in L2 pronunciation among the Italian migrants in Canada. Participants were labelled (late-high, early-high, late-low and early-low). Late were learners who embarked on the study of English after the age of 15, and early were those who started learning English before 12. High and low are categories denoting the

amount with which the subjects continued to use their NL (Italian) in Canada? The results showed that those bilinguals, early and late alike, marked as low users of the NL proved more proficient in producing English /e'/. Late-high and early-high alike had a more noticeable foreign accent, as their Italian /e/ interfered with the English /e'/. Flege et al.'s (2003) study thus viewed L1 use as a predictor of foreign accent, that is, as a factor militating against ultimate success in L2 phonology. Meanwhile, L1 infrequent use was regarded as promoting the formation of L2 phonetic categories. Though Flege et al. (2003) acknowledge the impact of L1 on L2 phonology acquisition, Bunta (2005) however argues that L1 use has marginal effect as a predictor of foreign accent in L2 phonology development/attainment.

It is therefore in this light that this study aims at examining the impact of the L1 factor on the development of English phonology by non-native speakers in a non-native setting with a complex linguistic landscape as Cameroon. The aim is to see if the L1 (mostly regarded here as previously spoken language-s-) factor can be claimed to have the same effects on learners in a non-native set-up as it is claimed by the aforementioned works in native settings. In fact, there are a number of flaws in the studies of the abovementioned scholars as follows.

First, these inquiries were conducted in native settings but their findings were generalised to all learning scenarios, native and non-native settings alike. That is, the subjects in the studies were immigrants (non-natives) in the target-language community. In this regard, their daily use of the target language could have influenced the results yielded by these papers. That is, the subjects had somehow got exposed to the target language, and might have conversely lost something of their native languages; which could have favoured native-likeness in TL phonology on the one hand, and loss of NL accent on the other.

Second, all these studies assessed learners of TL who had been monolingual till their settling abroad. Admittedly, this (pre)monolingual status of informants could have accounted for the lessened effect of the L1 noticed by linguists, for the interaction between two linguistic subsystems may be easier than that between more languages.

In a multilingual setting like Cameroon, features of local languages, French and Pidgin English might have led to different results Simo Bobda (2009: 266) says, "the fossilization of interfering features is sometimes reinforced by the combined interfering effect of several languages" The point highlights the effects of languages owned by speakers besides English in this setting. Still talking about Cameroon's linguistic landscape and the consequent interaction between linguistic (sub) systems that occur here, Simo Bobda & Fasse Mbouya (2005:2122) say:

In this kind of landscape, Cameroonians live with far more languages than elsewhere, which means that there is more interaction between these languages than between languages in a different landscape. A typical Anglophone Cameroonian in Yaounde the capital, for example, speaks naturally and normally the following languages daily: one or more home languages (HLs), Pidgin English (PE), English and French.

A similar statement could also be made about a Francophone in Yaounde who, besides the use of English at school, grapples with French and at least one home language on a daily basis.Thus, more often than not, Cameroonians have to grapple with two official languages, besides local languages and Pidgin English. From this, it can be broadly summarised that the learner, in most cases, first develops an L1 which is followed by the first official language (OL1) then comes the second official language (OL2), which can be English or French as the case may be.

FORMAL INSTRUCTION

Formal instruction is another factor identified as a significant predictor of degree of L2 foreign accent (Thompson 1991; Elliot 1995; Flege 1995). Similarly, Bongaerts et al. (1995); Moyer (1999); Flege & Fletcher (1992) and Missaglia (1999) identify formal instruction as a predictor of improved performance in L2 pronunciation. Piske et al (2001:200), echoing Flege & Fletcher (1992), say "the number of years of English instruction" is a significant predictor of degree of foreign accent, that is, of ultimate success in L2 phonology. Bongaerts et al. (1995) and Moyer (1999) conducted a research among late learners who participated with specialised training in the L2 and experience of teaching undergraduates and found that they attained native-like success in German pronunciation. Missaglia's study compared two groups of German learners. One had received prosody-centred training and the other segmental-centred training. As expected, the group who had received segmental-centred training performed better in this than the group who had received prosody-centred training and vice versa.

The difficult question is however to determine the length, qualification and specialization which one needs to be able to attain success in L2 phonology. Moreover, in our view, formal instruction may be argued to bear correlates with other factors (such as learner's motivation, learning conditions/context and possibly learner's NL or even learner's language learning ability) to yield such results.

To sum up, although none of the works cited here provided an accurate amount of the influence of formal instruction on attainment in L2 phonology, they demonstrated that formal instruction aids acquisition in some significant way, while the lack of a specialised training in pronunciation can rather hamper ultimate attainment.

With regard to the Cameroonian set-up, English-French bilingual Cameroonians are exposed to English long before their French-English counterparts. They virtually get in contact with the language in school at around the age of 3-5 (nursery or primary school). They also move along the primary and secondary cycles mostly using English as a medium of instruction, and Pidgin English for everyday communication. After these two cycles, they continue using English as a language of education in the university. Thus they spend about sixteen years or more learning English. On the other hand, French-English bilinguals first get in contact with French both at home and at school. They study French from nursery or primary school to the university, before they are exposed to high-level English. Thus, as a result of the latter's relative late acquisition of English, their performance in pronunciation reportedly differs from that of English-French bilinguals in some aspects (Amah 2012; Essomba 2013). This suggests that formal instruction (probably coupled with other factors) may have impacted it, in some specific way as yet to be established. Yet this too is not conclusive because it is known that bilinguals exposed to the same amount of university instruction do not attain same results. This makes us consider the supposed role of motivation in shaping the learner's L2 phonology.

MOTIVATION

Many studies on the role of motivation in TL sound system mastery have come up with diverging findings (Suter 1976; Thompson 1991; Moyer 1999; Oyama 1976; Purcell & Suter 1980 and Elliot 1995). Piske et al. (2001, echoing Oyama 1976) and Thompson (1991), argue that motivation does not affect the degree of foreign accent. However, Suter 1976; Purcell & Suter 1980 and Elliot 1995 found motivation as a predictor of ultimate attainment in TL phonology. This is consonant to Bongaerts et al.'s (1997) study of 11 late Dutch learners of English as L2. Their study found that two of their subjects who were university teachers spoke English without a detectable Dutch accent. Meanwhile results of this inquiry revealed that five

of the eleven subjects obtained ratings comparable to those obtained by native speakers who made up a control group. The authors conclude that the high degree of zeal of these five Dutch learners of English to have accent-free pronunciation justifies their success.

Similar evidence in support of the role of motivation is that offered by Moyer's (1999) study on 24 English learners of German. Moyer found that these learners were very successful in German pronunciation due to their high degree of professional motivation (subjects had taught German to undergraduates). Nevertheless, motivation is not the only factor for success in producing TL sounds.

AGE

Although the age factor is only dealt with incidentally in this work, several works underscore age as a factor in ultimate attainment of pronunciation in L2. It is argued that age of learning, age of arrival to the TL community and chronological age are all connected to critical period hypothesis.

According to Piske et al. (2001), age of learning proves to be the most significant variable militating against or in favour of ultimate attainment in L2 phonology. They suggest that "the first ability to be lost [if learning were to start late] would be the one needed to develop a native-like pronunciation of an L2" (brackets are ours). They further argue that individuals who began acquiring an L2 before the end of the critical period would have a much better pronunciation compared to those who began after the end of it- this could be due to the loss of neural plasticity that occurs after the end of critical period. It is also construed that if L2 acquisition commences long after the NL system has been developed, there will be stronger NL influence on the TL hence, more foreign accent.

However, some studies argue that late learners have better performances than early learners (Piske et al. (2001). Snow & Hoefnagel-Hohle's (1977) compared older native English children and adults on the one hand and younger native English children on the other hand. Consequently, both older native English children and adults could imitate Dutch sounds in individual words better than younger children tested 6 weeks after their arrival in the Netherlands. Overall, irrespective of how conclusive these findings seem to be, they are subject to debate and do not necessarily match complex multilingual non-native settings like Cameroon. This study therefore sets out to, among other things, verify whether or not the age at which one started learning English impacted their achievement in novel language phonology—the case in point here is the differing ages at which Anglophones and Francophones start to learn English in Cameroon.

METHOD

This study was carried out on the basis of two tape-recorded tests: sentence reading style (SRS) for phonemic identification and production, and passage reading style (PRS) for confirmation of segments renditions.

A questionnaire was also used for determining the importance informants placed on good English pronunciation. To this effect, they were required to grade the importance of good English pronunciation on a continuum ranging from unimportant to extremely important.This methodological approach has been used by Piske et al. (2001); Suter (1976); Thompson (1991) and Moyer (1999). Informants were also required to give self-made estimates of their daily percentage use of English, offering a list of languages they spoke on a daily basis. This was done

in order to determine the languages the subsystem of English interacts with on a day-to-day basis.

Test1consisted of five sentences with target features to be read into a recorder for phonetic identification and production analysis. Test 2 consisted of a text containing words used in context being read into a recorder. It simply aimed at confirming renditions heard in test 1. The questionnaire and tests were presented to a population of 20 Bilingual Two students of the University of Yaounde I (10 English-French and 10 French-English bilinguals). Tests were conducted in a quiet room on the university campus.

For the listening procedure, target segments were chosen in the five sentences and the text and transcribed in Standard British English (SBE) pronunciation. Full transcriptions of all the five sentences were also established by referring to the dictionary. Then, we listened to each bit of sentence or text played thrice, and wrote down a phonetic transcription of what we had heard only the third time. Thus, an inventory of the (phonemic) speech traits of English-French and French-English bilinguals was made. The latter was to serve as a working basis for highlighting similarities and/or differences between these speeches and between each and SBE. The ultimate aim for carrying out this task was to trace back the influence of factors which had shaped speakers' pronunciation of English words. These data were thus grouped according to rubric and tabulated for convenience of presentation. The next section presents the findings.

FINDINGS

Results of the Questionnaire

Analysis of informants' answers to the question requiring that they indicate which languages besides English they spoke on a daily basis and their percentage use of English gave the following results. 2 English-French bilinguals said they spoke 20% English daily, four 4 said they spoke 50%, while 3 claimed to go up to 60% and only 1 indicated to speak 80% English daily. French-English bilinguals produced the following estimates: five 5 claimed to speak 20% English daily, 4 claimed to go up to 40% and 1 claimed to speak 60% of English daily. The table below summarises this data:

Table 1: Informants' self-reported estimates of daily use of English

% use of English	10%	20%	40%	50%	60%	80%	90%	100%
Engl.-Fren. Bil.	0	2	0	4	3	1	0	0
Fren.-Engl. Bil.	0	5	4	0	1	0	0	0

The above results clearly indicate that none of the speakers used 100% English daily. They all, to different degrees, spoke one or more languages besides English. These were notably Pidgin English, one or two home languages and French (for English-French bilinguals) and one or two home languages and French (for French-English bilinguals). It was thus evidenced from the above that the phonetic subsystem of English interacts with at least one language in the psycholinguistic apparatuses of these speakers.

When required to rate the importance of good English pronunciation to them on a continuum ranging from unimportant to extremely important, the following results were arrived at. 1French-English bilingual regarded good English pronunciation as unimportant, 7 looked at it as important and two 2 saw it as very important. The scenario was a little bit different in the English-French bilinguals group, as 4 of them saw it as unimportant, while 5 regarded it as important and only one 1 viewed it as very important. This process of rating the importance of good English pronunciation was relevant and accurate, for it offered a way to determine

informants' degree of zeal towards good English pronunciation. The above data are summarised in the table below:

Table 2: Importance of good English pronunciation to informants

Importance of good Engl. Pronunciation	Unimportant	Important	Very important	Extremely important
Fren.-Engl. Bils.	1	7	2	0
Engl.-Fren. Bils.	4	5	1	0

As the data above suggest, French-English bilinguals were slightly more motivated than English-French ones by three points, that is, 9 to 6. However, no informant indicated that good English pronunciation was extremely important to them. This hinted at the fact that many saw good pronunciation as useful but not indispensable for speaking English.

Results of recorded speech samples

This section presents and analyses traits specific to the speeches of bilinguals with a view to show how distant from or close to, they are from each other and each from RP.

Vowels

From the analysis of speech samples, it was revealed that both English-French bilinguals and CamFE pronounced words differently from one sub-variety to another and from each to RP. They were notably found to restructure RP vowels in slightly different ways, albeit common features were found to exist between these speeches. Striking processes here were amongst others, the restructuring of long monophthongs, the substitution of peripheral vowels for central ones, the restructuring of diphthongs and triphthongs as well.

As for long monophthongs, they were pronounced in a way as to making it almost impossible to distinguish them from their short counterparts in vocalic pairs as shown in the table below:

Table 3: Restructuring of long monophthongs in Bilinguals' speech

Feature	Word	CamE	CamFE	RP
/i/, /ɪ/	read, peat	/rit/, /pit/	/rit/, /pit/	/rid/, /pit/
	rid, still	/rit/, /stil/	/Rit/, /stil/	/rɪd/, /stɪl/
/u/, /ʊ/	school, soon	/skul/, /sun/	/skul/, /sun/	/skul/, /sun/
	could, full	/kut/, /ful/	/kut/, /ful/	/kʊd/, /fʊl/
/ɔ/, /ɒ/	John, along	/alɔŋ/, /dʒɔn/	/dʒɔn/, /alɔ̃/	/dʒɒn/, /əlɒŋ/
	morning, moral	/mɔniŋ/, /mɔral/	/mɔniŋ/, /mɔrəˑl/	/mɔnɪŋ/, /mɔrəl/

As pointed out above peripheral vowels were systematically substituted for central ones as shown in the table below:

Table 4: Restructuring of central vowels

Feature	Word	Subs.	CamE	CamFE	RP
/ə/	Peter, attain	/a/	/pita/, /aten/	/pitəˑ/, /əˑten/	/pitə/, /əteɪn/
	government, parted	/ɛ/	/gɔvɛnmɛn/, /partɛt/	/gɔvɛnmɛn/, /partit/	/gʌvmənt/, /pɑtəd/
	police, impression	/ə/	/pɔlis/, /imprɛʃɔn/	/pəˑlis/, /imprɛʃəˑn/	/pəlis/, /ɪmprɛʃən/
	parliament	/ia/	/paliamɛn/	/paliamɛn/	/pɑləmənt/
	the	/e/	/de/	/də/	/ðə/
/ɜ/	Her, interpretation	/a/	/ha/, /intapriteʃɔn/	/hœ/,/intœpriteʃəˑn/	/hɜ/, /ɪntɜprɪteɪʃən/
	attorney	/ɔ/, /œ/	/atɔni/	/əˑtœni/	/ətɜni/
/ʌ/	couple, just,cover	/ɔ/	/kɔpl/,/dʒɔst/, /kɔva/	/kɔpl/,/dʒɔst/,/kɔvəˑ/	/kʌpl/,/dɜʌst/, /kʌvə/

Diphthongs were either restructured to inexistent RP features or shortened to monophthongs. Restructuring mostly occurred in English-French bilinguals' speech, while shortening to monophthongs occurred predominantly in French-English bilinguals' speech. This is tabulated here below:

Table 5: Restructuring of RP diphthongs in Bilinguals' speech

Feature	Word	CamFE	CamE	RP
/eɪ/	take,	/tek/	/tek/	/teɪk/
	Rapist	/rapist/	/repist/	/reɪpɪst/
/əʊ /	going	/goiŋ/	/goin/	/gəʊɪŋ/
	Focused	/fokɔst/	/fɔkɔst/	/fəʊkəst/
/aʊ/	allow, outcome	/əˑlo/, /ɔtkɔm/	/alaɔ/, /atkɔm/	/əlaʊ/, /aʊtkʌm/
	About	/əˑbɔt/	/abaɔt/	/əbaʊt/
/ɪə/	realised, clear, era	/jirs/,/kliəˑ/, /ɛrəˑ/	/jiɛs/, /klia/, /ɛra/	/jɪəs/, /klɪə/, /ɪərə/
	behaviour, near	/biheviəˑ/, /niəˑ/	/biheviɔ/, /niɛ/	/bɪheɪvɪə/, /nɪə/
/ʊə/	ambiguous	/ambiguɔs/	/ambiguɔs/	/ambigjʊəs/
	curious	/kyriəˑs/	/kuriɔs/	/kjʊərɪəs/
/aɪ/	item	/aitɛm/	/aitɛm/	/aɪtəm/
/ɛə/	bare	/bɛ/	/bɛ/	/bɛə/
	Mary	/meRi/	/meri/	/mɛərɪ/

Triphthongs witnessed a process of internal gliding in both CamFE and CamE, making the medial element be pronounced /j/ or /w/. Besides, while /a/ was systematically substituted for the third element of the triphthong in CamE, a lengthened version of schwa stood for it in CamFE such that CamFE's thripthongs sounded more like RP's than camE ones. Minor instances of reduction to monophthongs were also heard occasionally. This is seen in the table below:

Table 6: Restructuring of RP triphthongs

Feature	Word	CamE	CamFE	RP
/eɪə/	prayer	/preja/	/prejəˑs/	/preɪə/
/aʊə/	hour, shower	/a/, /awa/, /ʃawa/	/awəˑ/, /ʃoəˑ/	/aʊə/, /ʃaʊə/
	power	/pa/, /pawa/	/paəˑ/, /pawəˑ/	/paʊə/
/aɪə/	trial	/trajal/	/trils/, /trajəˑls/	/traɪəl/
	unbiased	/ɔnbaist/, /ɔnbajast/	/ɔnbiəˑst/, /ɔnbajəˑst/	/ʌnbaɪəst/
/əʊə/	lower	/lowa/	/lowəˑ/	/ləʊə/
/ɔɪə /	royal, loyal	/rɔjal/, /lɔjal/	/lojəˑ/, /lɔjəˑ/	/rɔɪəl/, /lɔɪəl/

CamFE notably demarcates itself from English-French bilinguals' speech by the introduction of non-RP vowels like /y, œ/ and such nasal vowels as /□, □, □/. The high front vowel /y/ occurred in CuC-environments as in impunity, futility. Another very significant hallmark of CamFE was the occurrence of nasal vowels in CVnasalC-evironments. Similar vocalic renditions were also heard in camE, though with a slightly reduced degree of nasality: these were nasalised not nasal vowels, for the nasalised vowel was almost always followed by a nasal consonant distinctly pronounced. The following table summarizes this:

Table 7: Nasal and nasalised vowels in Bilinguals' speech

Feature	Word	CamFE	CamE	RP
/ɔ̃/	comfort, strongest	/kɔ̃fɔt/, /strɔ̃gɛst/	/kɔ̃mfɔt/, /strɔ̃gɛst/	/kʌmfɔt/, /strɒŋgəst/
	country, along	/kɔ̃tri/, /ə·lɔ̃/	/kɔ̃ntri/, /ə·lɔ̃/	/kʌntrɪ/,/əlɒŋ/
/ɛ̃/	members, intensions	/mɛ̃bə·s/, /ɛ̃tɛ̃ʃɪɔns/	/mɛ̃mbə·s/, /ɛ̃tɛ̃nʃɔns/	/mɛmbəs/, /ɪntɛnʃənz/
	sentence, impunity	/sɛ̃tɛ̃s/, /ɛ̃pyniti/	/sɛ̃ntɛ̃s/, /ɛ̃mpjuniti/	/sɛntəns/, /ɪmpjunətɪ/
/ɑ̃/	enhance, infants	/ɛnhɑ̃ns/, /infɑ̃ts/	/ɛnhɑ̃ns/, /infɑ̃nts/	/ɪnhæns/, /ɪnfənts/
	canceled, demanding	/kɑ̃sɛl/, /dimɑ̃diŋ/	/kɑ̃nsɛl/, /dimɑ̃ndiŋ/	/kænsəl/, /dɪmɑndɪŋ/

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The analysis of the data tabulated above led to conjecture making as follows. Many participants in this study applied several speech strategies aiming for the production of English speech sounds. Speakers were found to restructure English monophthongs, diphthongs and triphthongs, giving them shapes and qualities not attested in RP. Besides, and interestingly enough, foreign sounds were found to be elbowing their way into the sound system of English as spoken by bilinguals. These were notably nasal and nasalised vowels in CamFE and CamE respectively. This was strong evidence of the interaction between the sound systems of French and English, for these nasal and nasalised vowels are hallmarks of the phonological system of French. However, no clear evidence of the influence of indigenous languages was found in this study. One language, besides, French, which was found as standing at the inception of most camE features tabulated above is Pidgin English. It was believed that since language use mediates very much with ultimate attainment (Flege ET al.2003), the high Pidgin English percentage use reported by most CamE speakers therefore constituted a valid basis for this view. Another point in case here is that in the literature, CamE, as spoken by non-English-French bilinguals, is not known to have nasal or nasalised sounds whatsoever, the influence of its speakers' ethnic languages notwithstanding. Thus, the fact that these are found in only the speech of bilingual camE speakers allowed for the point raised above. Also, the fact that most CamE speakers reported Pidgin English as the language with the highest daily percentage use allowed for tracing most of CamE's foreignness back to Pidgin English. The same reason is valid with regard to the effect of French upon CamFE.

Despite the overwhelmingly high number of instances of divergences described so far, a few speech-conscious participants were found to produce accurate renditions of the RP sounds. In effect, RP monophthongs (central and peripheral alike), diphthongs and triphthongs often occurred with no noticeable differences. Only two factors were found responsible for this state of affairs: formal instruction and motivation. But given that all the participants in this study had undergone the same amount of university instruction and none were physically defect, yet could not all produce RP accurate renditions, motivation seemed a more valid responsible factor for these renditions.

As it was pointed out earlier on in this study the age factor is discussed incidentally in this study. It was solely discussed in terms of AOL. In this regard, CamE speakers were identified as early learners and CamFE as late. CamE speakers were therefore expected to approximate RP far more than CamFE speakers. This, though, was not the case. Paradoxically, vowel reduction, which is a principal hallmark of native speech, was attested in only CamFE in the form of /ə·/. This led us to infer that AOL has no significant bearing on ultimate attainment in non-native

settings. The production of /əˑ/ was regarded as a logical outcome of formal training and motivation in English phonology.

CONCLUSION

This paper aimed at determining the extent to which factors like previously spoken languages, formal instructions, motivation and incidentally age account for variation in the speech of Bilingual Two students of the University of Yaounde I. A cursory look was first taken on the literature about the impact of these factors on ultimate attainment in L2 phonology. These presented age as a significant determiner of attainment. Meanwhile, L1 use and mastery were also seen to mediate with attainment. As concerns motivation and formal instruction, great disagreement remains amongst linguists as to what the roles really are. This study was carried out with intend to question some of the conclusions arrived at in the literature, critically looking at their procedures and the settings in which they were conducted (native settings). Unlike previous studies, this paper pointed to learners' previously spoken languages as the most relevant factor in shaping the phonology of English in a multilingual non-native setting like Cameroon. Besides this are motivation and formal instruction, which were found to favour success. The age factor was seen as playing no major role in either aiding or hindering success. This was so for CamE early learners who, according to advocates of critical period hypothesis in L2 phonology, were supposed to be more accurate in producing RP sounds, failed to meet this expectation. Conversely, it was impossible to determine exactly if the age factor hampered success in CamFE's speakers' production, for a certain number of them could produce RP sounds. Besides, their speech shared so much with English-French bilinguals' speech. Yet, no one factor could alone account for the speech traits described in this paper. This view meets Tarone's (1987) argument that "complex interrelationships of language, mind, body and society" must operate in tandem to determine the extent of L2 phonological attainment.

References

Amah, M. K. (2012). Some aspects of the English pronunciation of level IV bilingual Francophone student-teachers of ENS Yaoundé, Unpublished DIPES II Dissertation. ENS Yaoundé, University of Yaoundé I.

Atechi, S. N. (2006). The intelligibility of native and non-native speech. Gottingen: Culliver Verlag.

..... (2010). the plurality of English in Cameroon and the international intelligibility question. Syllabus Review Letters, 1, 200-218.

Bambose, A. (1998).Torn between the norms! Innovations, World Englishes 17(1), 1-14, Blackwell Publishers: Oxford and USA.

Bongaerts, T., Planken, B. And schils. E. (1995). Can late learners attain a native accent in a foreign language? A test of the Critical Period Hypothesis. In D.Singleton and Z. Lengyel (Eds.), the age factor in second language acquisition. Multilingual Matters: Clevedon.

Bunta, F. (2005), Reconsidering factors affecting the acquisition of novel second language phonemes: A study of Hungarian ESL learners. Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism(pp 391-397) InJ Cohen, Kara T., McAlister, K. Rolstad, and J. MacSwan,(Eds.) Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press,.

Crystal, D. (1997). English as a Global Language, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Echu, G. (2003). Multilingualism as a resource: The lexical appropriation of Cameroon indigenous Languages by English and French", TRA0S. Internet- Zeitschrift für. Kulturwissenschaften. No. 13/2003.Retrieved 15 January 2004 from

Essomba, F. S. M. (2012).Evaluating the present State of Cameroon's bilingualism: An insight into the progression of individual bilingualism in Yaounde. Unpublished DIPES II Dissertation, ENS Yaoundé, University of Yaoundé I.

……. (2013). the impact of Affecting factors on the spoken production of bilingual students of the University of Yaounde I . Unpublished Master's degree dissertation, University of Yaounde I.

Flege, J.E. (1995), "The phonetic study of bilingualism", in G. Bloothooft, V. Hazan, D. Huber,J. Llisterri (Eds.) European Studies in Phonetics and Speech Communication pp 98-103.

……. (1998), "The role of subject and phonetic variables in L2 speech acquisition", in Gruber, M., Higgins, D., Olsen, K., Wysocki, T. (Eds.), Papers from the 34th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Vol. II, the Panels. Chicago Linguistic Society, pp.213–232.

Flege, J. E., Schirru, C. & MacKay, I. A. R. (2003). Interaction between the Native and Second language Phonetic Subsystems, Speech Communication, 40: 467-491.

Jenkins, J. (2000). The Phonology of English as an International Language, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. (1986). The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes, Oxford: Pergamon Press.

…….. (1994). "The speaking tree: a medium of plural canons. In Educational Linguistics, Cross

Cultural Communication and Interdependence." (Georgetown Roundtable on Language and Linguistics 1994). Edited by J.E. Alatis. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 6-22

Keys, J. K. (2001).State of art in interlanguage Phonology: Factors and processes in theDevelopment of a Second Language Phonology. Rev. Brasileira de Ling, vol. 1, No. 1: 155-190.

Missaglia, F. (1999). Contrastive prosody in SLA: An empirical study with adult Italian learners of German. Proceedings of the 14th international congress of phoneticsciences, Vol. 1: 551-554

Nkwain, J. (2010). Does language contact necessarily engender conflict? The case of Cameroon's quadralingualism. Linguistik online 43. Pp 81-98.

Oyama, S. (1976). A sensitive period for the acquisition of a non-native phonological system. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 5, 261-283.

Piske, T., Mackay, I., & Flege, J. E. (2001). Factors affecting degree of foreign accent in an L2: A review. Journal of Phonetics, 29: 191–215.

Purcell, E., andSuter, R. (1980). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy: A reexamination. Language Learning, 30: 271–287.

Simo Bobda, A. andFasse Mbouya, I. (2005). Revisiting some linguistic concepts and beliefs in the light of the linguistic situation of Cameroon, Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism, (eds.), James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister, Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, pp. 2122-2132.

Simo Bobda, A. (1994). Aspects of Cameroon English Phonology.Peter Lang, Inc.; European Academic Publishers, Bern.

……. (2009). Teaching StandardEnglish in an ESL and EFL context: The case of Cameroon.

In Ulrich Busse, Ralf Schneider, Anne Schroeder, (eds.) Codification, Canons and Curricula Description and Prescriptivism in Language and Literature. Bielefeld: Aisthesis.

Snow,C.and Hoefnagel-hoehle, M. (1977), The critical period for language acquisition: evidence from second language learning(pp 84-92).In S. Krashen, R. Scarcela, M. Long(Eds.), Child-adult differences in second language acquisition, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Suter, R. W. (1976). Predictors of pronunciation accuracy in second language learning, Language Learning, 26: 233-253.

Tarone, E. (1987). The Phonology of Interlanguage. In Ioup G; in Weinberger, S. (Ed.), pp 70-85.