AN ATTITUDINAL STUDY OF ENGLISH USAGE IN TWO NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

BY

KENNETH BASSEY MKPA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN TEACHING OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (TESL)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY
ZARIA

NOVEMBER, 1985

DEDICATED TO:

KATHY and IDONG

my companions in

life's dubious battle.

DECLARATION

I declare that this Thesis is an original work of research by me. To the best of my knowledge, this work has never been presented in any previous application for the award of a higher or any other degree. All quotations and sources of information are acknowledged by means of references.

No part of this work may therefore be reproduced without the consent of the author except for academic critique or citation.

KENNETH BASSEY MKPA

1985

CERTIFICATION

This thesis entitled AN ATTITUDINAL STUDY OF ENGLISH USAGE IN TWO NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING by Kenneth Bassey Mkpa meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Master of Education in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) of Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Chairman, Supervisory Committee Date_____

Dr. D. Williams
Member, Supervisory Committee Date_____

Dr. A.A. Sambo
Head of Department Date_____

Dean, Postgraduate School Date_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My profound gratitude to Dr. D. Williams, my Supervisor and Head of the Language Arts Section, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, for his expert advice and meticulous supervision. I must say that but for his fatherly guidance and moral support at critical moments, this work would not have come to fruition.

My indebtedness also goes to Dr. S. Fianu, the statistician, who inducted me into the world of statistical analysis and contributed to the general improvement of the work. I am also indebted to Dr. A.E. Odumuh of the English Department, for providing me with the much needed literature on Nigerian English.

I am also very grateful to Chief B.A. Nyong, Principal, School of Arts and Science, Uyo, for making it possible for me to obtain leave of absence to undertake this study.

My sincere gratitude to my friend Emma T. Eshett of the British Council Lagos and his wife Pat. Their material and moral support made so many things possible.

A special thanks to the Education and English students and their lecturers at the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, and the University of Calabar. Without their kind and honest co-operation, this work would not have materialized. The same goes to Mr. Christopher Sale Bakoshi who patiently typed this Thesis.

I shall always remember with gratitude the contributions of Sister E. Ike and Mr. S.J.A. Ekpo of the Demonstration Secondary School, Miss Iniabasi Adiakpan and all others too numerous to mention.

Finally, to my wife, Kathy and son, Idong, I say thank you immensely for your love, understanding and readiness to bear deprivations so that this work might be completed. To my in-laws, especially Mr. E.M.A. Ema, my brother Big Dan, and cousins, Dr. S.E. Bassey and Rev. Dr. J.P. Ekarika I offer my profound gratitude for taking care of home when life was most trying.

ABSTRACT

This study is a sociolinguistic survey of attitudes of educated Nigerians to English usage in Nigeria. It assumes the existence of a Nigerian English and identifies penultimate and final year Nigerian undergraduates specializing in Education and/or English as constituting a segment of the educated users of English. It then assesses the acceptability of selected Nigerian English lexical and syntactic items of usage to 4:00 of the above-defined respondents randomly selected from two federal universities; the Ahamadu Bello University, Zaria in the North and the University of Calabar in the South, to represent a North - South balance.

The matched-guise technique (MGT) of language attitudes assessment was used to elicit the reactions of the respondents to the selected items of usage. It comprised a free response Acceptability Rating judgement test and a complementary forced-choice preference test where the same items of usage presented in the earlier judgement **test** were paired **with correct**[1] **English**

alternatives (British Standard English - BSE). By contrasting the free spontaneous reaction scores of the items with the preference scores for the same items paired with 'correct[1] English alternatives, legitimate Nigerian English usages wore identified.

From the analysis of the results obtained, the researcher came to the following conclusions: (l) that the attitudes of educated users of English to Nigerian English are influenced by allegiance to BSE, the 'correct' pedagogical model their schooling had exposed them to; (2) that much of the hitherto identified Nigerian English usages were actually transitional errors caused by faulty English language teaching and learning; (3) that in educated usage, legitimate Nigerian English usages are consistently preferred to the 'correct' BSE equivalents since the former reflect the creative use of the English language to accomodate the Nigerian socio-cultural experiences; *(k)* that the issue of a standard Nigerian English cannot be divorced from the notion of international intelligibility if the emergent variety is to be accepted as a medium of international exchange,

The implications of the above for the classroom teaching of English were that, the teacher of English had of necessity to be prescriptive by drawing the line between bad Nigerian English and linguistically creative usages. But that prescriptivism did not connote arbitrari-ness, pedantry or unrealistic conservatism, else the teacher might find himself in a linguistic Siberia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	Title Page	i
	Declaration	ii
	Certification	iii
	Acknoledgements	iv
	Abstract	vi
	Table of Contents	ix
	List of Tables	xi
	List of Appendices	xii
	Abbreviations and Definitions	xiii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.0	Need for the Study	1
1.1	Purpose of the Study	6
1.2	Statement of the Problem ..	7
1.3	Hypothesis	8
1.4	Basic Assumptions	9
1.5	Significance of the Study ..	10
1.6	Limitations of the Study ..	11
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
2.0	Introduction	13
2.1	Language Variation and the English Language	13
2.2	Common Features of Nativized Languages	17
2.3	The Nativization of the English Language in Nigeria	23
2.4	Attitudes Towards Language Variation	42
2.5	Language Attitudes	49
2.5.1	Matched-Guise Technique Studies	55
2.6	Language Attitudes Towards Nigerian English	60

Chapter		Page
3	RESEARCH PROCEDURES	66
3.0	Introduction	66
3.1	The Pilot Study	66
3.2	Design of Test Instruments ..	68
3.2.1	Acceptability Rating Test ..	68
3.2.2	Use of English Test	73
3.2.3	The Rationale for Double Testing	75
3.3	The Study Sample	76
3.4	Test Procedures	78
4	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA	79
4.0	Preamble	79
4.1	Acceptability Ratings ..	80
4.2	Consistency Score	83
4.3	Rank Order of General Acceptability	84
4.4	Ratings by Education and English Studies Students	90
4.5	Ratings According to Test Modules	93
4.6	Ratings of Idioms by Language Groups of Judges	98
4.7	Hypothesis Validation ..	101
4.8	Discussion of Findings ..	102
5	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, TEACHING IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	109
5.0	Review	109
5.1	Summary	110
5.2	Conclusions	111
5.3	Implications for English Language Teaching	112
5.3.1	Teacher's Objectivity ..	112
5.3.2	Correctness vs Appropriateness	113
5.3.3	Creative vs Deviant Usage ..	116
5.3.4	Acceptability vs International Intelligibility	119
5.4	Suggestions for Further Research	120
REFERENCES	.. ..	122
APPENDIX	.. ..	137

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
4.1	Acceptability Rating Scores ..	81
4.2	Use of English Test Scores ..	83
4.3	Rank Order of General Acceptability with Use of English Test Scores	85
4.4	Ratings and Use of English Test Scores of Education and English Specialists Showing Rank Order of Acceptability	91
4.5	Test Modules' Ratings and Use of English Test Scores Showing Rank Order of Acceptability	95
4.6	Ratings of Idioms by Igbo, Hausa, Efik and Yoruba Speaking Judges, Showing Rank Order of Acceptability	99
4.7	Comparison of Mean Scores on Ratings and Use of English Test	102

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
I	Acceptability Rating Test ..	137
II	Use of English Test	142

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

ASE: American Standard English.

Attitudes: An attitude, according to Droba (1933), is a mental disposition of the human individual to act for or against a definite object (educated Nigerian English in this study).

BSE: British Standard English.

ELT: An acronym for the profession of English language teaching both in native and non-native English speaking communities.

ENE: Educated Nigerian English. The term as used in this study, refers to the standard usage in each variety of English discernible in the Nigerian English language sciene (excluding Pidgin). It is not necessarily associated with the educational attainment of the user or class of users, but is characterized by appropriateness and intelligibility.

ESL: English as a Second Language. It refers to a situation where the English language though not used as a native language, is accorded an official status and is used for a wide variety of purposes, as in Nigeria.

GA: General America, one of the three main dialects of American English, equivalent in status to the Received Pronunciation (RP) in Britain.

Judges: This refers to the respondents used for the language attitudes tests in the study.

MGT: Matched-guise technique - an indirect language attitudes measuring method developed by Wallace Lambert and his co-workers in Canada in 1960.

NE: Nigerian English; which in this study refers to the totality of the varieties of English used in Nigeria (excluding Pidgin).

NESA: An acronym for the Nigeria English Studies Association.

Nigerianisms: These are usages which reflect the adaptations of the English language to the Nigerian socio-cultural cum linguistic environment. Such usages that do not obstruct communication but are creatively effective.

NNE: Non-native Englishes, It refers to all the varieties of English used in non-native English speaking communities; for example, Nigerian English, Indian English, etc.

NSE: This is the hypothetical variety of English which would emerge when Nigerian English is stripped of all errors. It would be socially appropriate, intranationally and internationally intelligible, comparable to other World Standard Englishes like the ASE or BSE.

RP: Received Pronunciation - the name given to the regionally neutral accent in British English.

WAEC: An acronym for the West African Examinations Council.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Need for the Study

The field of English language teaching (ELT henceforth) is under seige. At the centre of the crisis is the question of correctness in usage - an issue which has generated much acrimonious controversy between supporters and critics alike as the following titles exemplify: Cottle (1975), laments The Plight of English and in 1977 Hudson compiled The Dictionary of Diseased English. Meanwhile, Hall (1950), pontificates Leave Your Language Alone! and Labov (1970), offers an apologetics on 'The Logic of Non-Standard English', to mention just a few.

The battle line is drawn between the doctrinaire and descriptive attitudes to usage. The doctrinaire and authoritarian camp take it for granted that 'there is a right way to use words and construct sentences, and many wrong ways' (Follett, 1966: 3). They invoke the age old rules to give credence to their preferred usages.

Using the Latin model as their touch-stone, they will dismiss 'Who did you see?', as 'incorrect', preferring the objective whom as the 'proper' form (i.e. the accusative case). In the same vein, 'under no circumstance' is quite wrong to them on grounds of illogicality - one cannot be under what is around (Latin circum). They also insist on limiting the reference of between to two items, on the strength of its etymology (bi-twain).

In opposition to the doctrinaire prescriptivism are the descriptivists supported by modern linguistic science. This latter camp, as if to spite the opposition, adopt the extreme stance of 'denying that there is such a thing as correctness.. their governing principle epitomized in the title of a speech by a distinguished member of the profession: "Can Native Speakers of a Language Make Mistakes?" (Follett, op. cit.). To the descriptivists then, 'correctness' in language use is a misleading notion. R.A. Hall, Jr. (1960), sees 'correct' language as nothing short of a confidence trick when he declared that he was looking forward to a time when 'a claim to dispensing "correct" speech will be treated as being equal in fraudulence to a claim to dispensing a cure all in medicine'. He consolidates his

position later on by adding that 'the only time we can call any usage totally incorrect is when it would never be used by any native speaker of a language, no matter what his social or intellectual standing' (Hall, 1964). Quirk (1962) is of the same view when he contends that what we mean by correct usage is decided not by grammarians or English specialists but by common usage.

In such a climate of linguistic strife, the work of teachers of English and incidentally, all teachers who use the English language for instruction, is made more and more difficult if not impossible. Baker (1970: V) writing of the ELT situation in England has this to say:

> The teaching of English is no easy task. For about fifty years teachers have been increasingly bewildered by conflicting advice... The old grammatical certainties have melted away together with so many previously accepted standards... The aims of English at post - G.C.E. and even before that level have become less and less clear. The result is a sort of aimlessness, even listlessness in the classroom. What should be taught? The answer to this question still remains to be settled.

If the above were true of a native language setting where a large majority of the populace speak

and write English as a mother tongue, then in non-native English speaking settings the ELT condition can at best be described as dismal. In these latter contexts, the majority of English teachers being non-native speakers of English lack that native-speaker intuition which could have guided them in matters of usage. Moreover, the orthodox forms of English in these settings - British Standard English (BSE) and American Standard English (ASE) - often exist in conflict with less orthodox variants which have developed locally (such local variants are labelled non-native Englishes "NNEs" in this study). The increase in diversity of forms of English available for use brings in its wake attitudinal conflicts among its users.

In Nigeria for instance, where the transplanted native variety of English - BSE - has given rise to various variants of NNE, different climates of opinion, ranging from zealous euphoria to 'righteous' disdain, abound among the 'élite and language experts alike, for any usage suspected to be a Nigerianism. On the one hand, linguists like Bamgbose (1971), Adetugbo (1977) and Odumuh (1981) among many others, have attested to the legitimacy of an indigenized variety of English identifiable

as 'Nigerian English' (NE). Some foreign experts like Richards (1979), Strevens (1980), and Broughton et al.(1978) have even advocated the use of such a variant for classroom teaching. But on the other side of the divide, Salami (1968), and Adeyanju (1981) to mention a few, taking their cue from native-speaker experts like Prator (1968) and McGregor (1971) declare that setting up such a locally acceptable variant as NE for pedagogical purposes will impair international intelligibility.

From the foregoing, the teacher of English in Nigeria is bound to be disorganized like his counterpart in other NNE-speaking nations. His perplexity is aggravated by the fact that for all the euphoria over a domesticated English, and the desirability of adopting such for classroom teaching, there are yet no pedagogical grammars or manuals to guide ELT planning as far as NE is concerned. In fact only a handful of researches on NE have direct pedagogical applications (see Adetugbo, 1977; Jibril, 1982; Banjo, 1971; Ekong, 1982; Abubakar et al. 1982; Odumuh, 1984; Williams, 1984). A disappointed Adeyanju (1981: 15-16) dismisses the epoch of researches in NE as:

> ... (decades) of fashionable sociolinguistic distraction (during which) nothing useful has slipped into the English classroom in Nigeria. There is hardly any handbook on Nigerian English pronunciation and usage. Worse still, the distinction between what is the result of bad teaching and/or poor learning and therefore outright faulty, and which represents linguistic creativity is much blurred today. (My emphasis underlined).

This study is an attempt to fulfil that need - identifying what is creative linguistic usage emanating from the symbiotic marriage of the English language to the Nigerian socio-cultural and linguistic environment.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is, first and foremost, to assess the nature and extent of the acceptability and rejection of a number of debatable usages at the lexical and syntactic levels of NE. The usages are debatable in the sense that they are acceptable to some linguists, educated Nigerian English users as well as native speakers of English, while others question their legitimacy. It is the purpose of this study to measure the attitudes of English language teacher trainees and English honours students towards such usages.

Secondly, it is to identify a typology of legitimate usages eligible for the emergent Nigerian Standard English (NSE), while eliminating the unacceptable and illegitimate.

Finally, it is hoped the findings of this study will provide teachers of English with pragmatic information about current English usage in contemporary Nigerian society, so that they would be able to perform their duty of teaching appropriate usage with neutral objectivity.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The study will seek to answer the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of English language teacher trainees and English honours students towards certain lexical and syntactic items of usage in NE?
2. Are the elicited attitudes constant, or do they vacillate in the presence of a 'correct' model of a standard English, i.e. BSE?
3. What is the difference, if any, in the acceptability of lexical over syntactic items of NE usage?

4. How acceptable are culturally conditioned items of usage (lexis and idioms) across the different first language backgrounds of the respondents?
5. What is the difference, if any, in the degree of tolerance of Nigerianisms, between English language teacher trainees and English honours students?
6. What is the effect of the test batteries sequencing on tolerance for Nigerianisms?

1.3 Hypothesis

The null hypothesis for the study is that: Attitudes towards Nigerian English usage are not affected by attitudes towards British Standard English.

That is to say, there will be no difference in the responses of the judges when they are presented with items of Nigerian English usage in isolation and when the same items are later on paired with British Standard English alternatives.

The research tools for data collection and statistical analysis used to test this hypothesis are discussed fully in Chapters 3 and 4.

1.4 Basic Assumptions

The following are the basic assumptions upon which the study is based:

1. That attitudes are acquired through learning as confirmed by research (Allport, 1924; Razran, 1938; Osgood, 1957). That the respondents after an immersion of at least twelve years (6 years primary, 5 years secondary, and at least 1 year university education) in English language usage, must have developed some sort of attitude towards usage in general and should be able to take a stand on NE usage.
2. That since the respondents will be engaged in active academic pursuit, their linguistic reflexes will be very finely tuned, to enable them to adequately discriminate between errors and standard English usage.
3. That a person's attitude towards an issue can be elicited and measured using the matched-guise technique (MGT) used for this study (Lambert et al, 1960; Lambert, 1967; Cooper, 1975; Fishman et al, 1977).

4. That the emergence of a Nigerian Standard English is an inevitable phenomenon based on the theory of language variation (Weinreich, 1953).

1.5 Significance of the Study

The question of English language usage is of practical educational importance in Nigeria, since the process of education is inseparable from the English language, which still remains the principal medium of instruction in spite of the governmental move to replace it, at least in the junior primary, with Nigerian languages. Thus this study will be of pedagogical importance not only to teachers of English, but also to all teachers in Nigeria who use the English language as the medium of instruction.

The findings of this study should furnish the English language teacher with some information on the type of English he should teach. Armed with such information, he should be able to adopt an objective stand on NE usage.

The result of this study might persuade the various examination boards - the arbiters of English language usage in the Nigerian academic circles to modify their standard by accomodating linguistically creative NE usages.

The study should also be a contribution to efforts in language standardization, particularly the standardization of NE. In this wise, it should be of much interest to ELT textbook writers, curriculum planners, teacher trainers, language policy planners and lexicographers in Nigeria.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The study assesses attitudes to English usage among educated users of English in contemporary Nigerian society. It identifies penultimate and final year Nigerian undergraduates specializing in Education and/or English as constituting a segment of such users (see Section 3.2, for the rationale behind this choice).

It uses the matched-guise technique (MGT) to measure the acceptability of selected items of debatable usage in Nigerian English (NE) at the lexical and syntactic levels. The bulk of the material is heavily biased toward written language (see 3.2.1).

Since for practical reasons, it was not possible for the investigator to reach the target population, two federal universities reflecting a North-South balance were selected as experimentally

accessible population (the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria in the North and the University of Calabar in the South). Altogether 400 undergraduates of the above-defined criteria were randomly selected as judges; 200 from each university. They represented 66 out of the 394 different Nigerian language groups (Hansford et al. 1976).

In view of the above limitations, the study is necessarily illustrative rather than comprehensive. Its findings would be saying in effect; 'This is the way this class of educated Nigerians use the English language to accomodate their Nigerian experience'.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on language variation along temporal and spatial dimensions, with special reference to the English language, the linguistic universals in language change and their realization in NE. Finally, attitudes towards language change and their implications for NE are examined.

2.1 Language Variation and the English Language

> One of the most fascinating things about language is its seemingly infinite variety... Each language... manifests variations induced by space, time and situation (Banjo, 1979).

That one language could give rise to many different tongues in the course of time, is a linguistic axiom as old as man. One of the first hypotheses of language variation postulated by the medieval philologists was adapted from the story of the Creation (Genesis, 1). In what came to be known as the 'Babel Hypothesis', they postulated that the whole world had but one

language which miraculously generated other tongues in the course of time. From this premise, they developed the language families theory. The social history of the classical languages reveals this process of language variation or devolution (Quirk, 1960, 1972; Brann, 1980), in time as well as in space. The existence today of Classical Greek in opposition to the spoken varieties within the same geo-political setting, is a manifestation of language change in time. The same can be said for Arabic and Hebrew, among many others. The emanation of the present day Romance Languages from a common stock, Latin, is an example of language variation caused by geographical separation.

English is not an exception to this phenomenon of language fissiparousness; if anything, it is the one language that has seen the most or greatest changes of any contemporary language. The differences between the English of Chaucer and that of Shakespeare, is evidence of the English language change in time. Besides, this change is an ever continous process. Thus in modern English we witness changes in standard usages such as: 'Between you and I'; 'It is me'; 'different to'; 'Between seven nations'.

Language change induced by space is evidenced when groups of native speakers of a language are separated, and they deport the language from its native home. One of the most striking characteristics of a spatially separated language is its adaptability to its new place of operation. This adaptability, tagged 'deviation' (Weinreich, 1968; Bynon, 1977) is a natural and an inevitable language phenomenon. Natural in the sense that language has always been a tool in the service of man, who manipulates it at will as he seeks to communicate with, or, mislead his fellow man, or use it creatively to accomodate new environments and the ever changing experience of life. Inevitable in the sense that language is dynamic, ever changing irrespective of its status, even in its own native setting. Thus we find the terms 'nativization' (Kachru, 1981b), and 'indigenization' (Moag, 1977; Richards, 1978a) more concordant with the concept at work. Other euphemistic and metaphorical terms used to describe the process of language variation caused by spatial separation are; 'transplanted', 'transported', or, 'twice-born', varieties of the language (Turner, 1966; Ramson, 1970; Mukherjee, 1977).

One finds 'transported' Englishes springing up in the former English dominions of North America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In these settings, the English language though used by a substantial number of the population as a first language, is different from its parent stock, BSE, by virture of its contact with new lands, with their different climates, terrain flora and fauna, as well as different languages.

A similar process of English language nativation to accomodate new environments and new experiences is manifested in the ex-colonies of the British Empire in Asia, Africa and the pacific Islands. But these varieties of English are quite different from the transported varieties in North America, Australia, New Zealand and Canada (Baugh and Cable, 1978). In the ex-colonies, there was no significant population of English native speakers who settled down to establish the English language and culture permanently. Rather, the British administrators and missionaries 'presided over communities which throughout remained overwhelmingly non-English in ethnic stock, social habits and language' (Moore, 1969). However, during almost three hundred years of continous contact with Asia and Africa, the English language

has been completely adapted to accomodate the local contexts, and could be said to have gone through the process of nativization. In anglophone West Africa, for example:

> Newspapers are produced in English, journals in English grow in number year by year, and parliamentary debates are for the most part held in English. West Africans are contributing, often through the medium of impeccable English, to scientific thoughts and historical investigation; and the new poetry, drama and fiction in English which is now emerging from West Africa is catching the imagination and commanding the admiration of the English-reading world, (Spencer, 1971:2).

The English language then through the process of language variation has spawned other Englishes throughout the world, and now ranks as one of the world's most popular languages with over 700 million speakers, out of which, roughly 400 million speak it as a second or foreign language (Newsweek, Nov. 15, 1982).

2.2 Common Features of Nativized Languages

> When a language is imported from its home of abode, and taught as a second language, there must be deviations from the norm of both languages, (Weinreich, 1968).

That a transported language must deviate from its parent stock in order to adapt to its

new place of operation, is a linguistic truism. But more often than not, this deviation is given a pejorative connotation, especially in situations where the transported language is used by non-native speakers. In such situations, the deviation becomes synonymous with substandardness, or 'fractured' and 'mangled' usage, attributed to the interference of the non-native speakers' first languages with the new language. Undoubtedly, interference from the languages of the new environments does affect a transplanted language, more obviously at the phonological level in the form of accents, but to present it as if it were the overriding factor in language variation is to distort a linguistic fact. Besides, interference is a natural by-product of bilingualism and its effect is *not* unidirectional (Weinreich, op. cit.)

Structurally, a transplanted language does not deviate from the parent language in any fundamental sense, since it is a dialect continuum, still linked to its parental source by a linguistic umbilical cord. That is to say, the structure of transplanted languages obeys the same essential rules of well formedness (Chomsky, 1957), or have the same 'common core' features (Lyons, 1968), as

the parent languages. As such, a parent stock and its variants are basically one and the same language. For example, if the sentence pattern of a parent language is say, SVC or SOV, the nativized variants will adopt the same pattern, and, if CV, VCVC, or CCCV are the phonological sequence, failing which they would be termed different languages. However, it is at the levels of lexis, semantics and pronunciation that the most perceptible distinctions of nativized languages are exhibited.

The history of the English language in new settings confirms the sharing of these common core features peculiar to all nativized languages. For instance, structurally, American English, Australian English or South African English are basically the same. Likewise, Indian English, Filipino English, Ghanaian English or Nigerian English share the same grammatical structure with all Englishes everywhere. At least, they all employ the same English alphabets and obey the same rule of sentence formation. But variety markers are discernible at the lexical, syntactic, semantic and prosodic levels.

At the lexical and semantic levels, nativization occurs in the forms of borrowing,

adaptation or extension of meanings to reflect the different socio-cultural and linguistic settings in which the transplanted language now operates. Thus the English language in the process of adaptation to the New World, borrowed words like raccoon, moose, skunk, tomahawk, moccasin, canoe, squaw, totem, wigwam, toboggan, from the American - Indian languages. American English also absorbed new words from the earlier European settlers: portage, chowder, cache, caribou, bureau, bayou, depot, pumpkin, prairie came from the French; cookie, stoop, boss, scow, dumb, sleigh, Santa Claus, bedspread from the Dutch; creole, abode, bonanza, cockroach, corral stampede, vigilante, ranch from the Spanish. Familiar English words like robin, corn, turkey, rabbit, lumber, and many others have been given somewhat modified meanings different from their traditional BSE usages (see Mathews, 1931; Francis, 1958; Partridge and Clark, 1951).

Australian English in a similar fashion borrowed boomerang, kangaroo, wombat, gum-tree, and dingo from the aboriginal languages. At the same time familiar English words like blue, bush, creek, field, station, and rum had their meanings

either extended or modified from those found in traditional BSE (see Morris, 1898; Baker, 1945; Ramson, 1966; Turner, 1966).

In non-native settings like Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean, the nativization of the lexis and semantics of the English language became so expansive as to embrace translations, semantic shifts and hybridization. The following examples from West African English embody translations; chewing-stick (twig used for cleaning the teeth), cover-shoulder (blouse), hot drink (spirit), outdooring (first appearance of a baby in public), small house (toilet), tight friend (bosom friend), semantic shifts: Sir (honorific for a superior), sorry (general expression of sympathy), welldone (general greeting for anyone at work), and hybridization; dunnodrums, bodom beads, awerba lamp, gele veil (Bamgbose, 1971; Sey, 1973). Kachru (1965, 1966) lists a large number of such nativized English usage in Indian English.

Nativized features of English at the syntactic level are embedded in idioms and clauses. For example, American English favours many prepositional idioms where BSE will make do without, as in: check up on, cash in on, look up to, get by with,

consult with (see Follett, 1966; Webster, 1956, 1961; Francis, 1958; Pyles, 1952). Australian English contains the following idioms; put a pot on (inform on somebody, rat bag (eccentricism) beer up (drunk), - Turner (1966)

Kirk-Greene (1971) records bone-to-bone (a man dancing with a male partner), to use long-leg (using unofficial influence to secure service), to branch (call at a place), to escort somebody (see him off), enstool (install a king) as some examples of West African English idioms (see also, Bamgbose, op. cit.; Adetugbo, 1977, 1979; Sey, op. cit. Odumuh, 1981), Kachru (1975, 1978) and Cassidy (1966) also record Indian and Jamaican English idioms, respectively.

The nativization of the phonology of a transplanted language is mostly manifested in the modification of the vowel sounds and prosodic features such as, stress, intonation or tone, rhythm and assimilation, resulting in 'local colouring' (Grieve, 1964) or accents peculiar to the different varieties.

From this brief outline of the features of nativized languages, we have sought to establish that word borrowing, expansion of the lexical range,

semantic shifts and phonology modification, are entirely normal processes of languages in contact with new environments which are exhibited by the different varieties of English in the world. Thus, all the Englishes in the world are the natural outcome of the adjustment of the structure of the parent language BSE to new situations; as Haugen (1938: 113) has rightly observed, '... what has really taken place is a shift of structure... correlated to a shift in cultural and social form'. We shall next examine how the same process has helped to shape the emergence of a Nigerian English.

2.3 The Nativization of the English Language in Nigeria.

Reflecting on the nature of the English language in Nigeria, Professor Tamuno in his opening address to the 9th Annual Conference of the Nigeria English Studies Association (NESA) had this to say:

> The English language is no longer foreign to Nigeria for we have effectively appropriated it. In the process of appropriation, many varieties have arisen... We have to reckon with the hard fact that.... Nigerians have successfully colonized English as a second language, (Tamuno, 1979).

Professor Tamuno's statement was an affirmation of a natural linguistic phenomenon; the adaptation of a transplanted language to its new environment. In other words, NE has emerged as part of the social history of the English Language in new geographical settings. As is normal in language nativization, the bulk of the nativized features of the English language in Nigeria is contained in the lexicon and semantics of NE. Lexical and semantic adjustments are natural sociolinguistic processes of languages in contact (Weinreich, op. cit.).

When two languages, and, incidentally two cultures are in contact, it becomes necessary for the languages of these cultures to adapt themselves to each other, so as to be able to express unfamiliar concepts. As such, the English language in Nigeria, like any other language in similar circumstances, has had to adapt itself to the Nigerian environment by extending its lexical and semantic resources to accomodate the local terrain, fauna, flora and climate, as well as the socio-economic, political, religious and educational set-up. Examples of local food items and drinks in NE lexicon include

eba, fufu, amala, gari, akara, suya, panla/ okporoko, egusi, emu, burukutu, pitto, kai-kai, and many others. It also borrows words like buba, danshiki, aso ebi, wonyosi, akwete, gele, baban riga, ukad, onyonyo, from local items of clothing. Chieftaincy institutions also loan honorifics to NE lexicon as in; Obong, Oba, Obi, Emir, Nsom, Amanyanabo, among many others.

Neologisms and hybridization are other examples of the resourcefulness of the English language in relation to the Nigerian socio-cultural and linguistic settings. Neologisms embrace those individual or compound words whose elements are adapted to conform to the morpho-phonemic combinatory rules of the recipient language (Lyons, 1968), while a hybridized compound comprises at least one lexical item from the foreign language, and the others from the native languages (Whinnom, 1971). The following examples from NE are illustrative of the above features: chewing-stick, go-slow, talking drum, loin-cloth, barbing saloon, small house, invitee, house warming, kia-kia bus, gele veil, egusi soup, uta music.

NE idioms provide examples of semantic shifts and/or, extensions as in the following expressions: Sorry (expression of sympathy), Welldone (greetings to some at work), Excuse me (seeking permission or calling someone's attention), I'm coming (I'll be back shortly), Is this your eye? (It's ages since we last met), May we live to see ourselves tomorrow (good night), You have no chest (you are a coward). Studies done by Brosnahan (1958), Bamgbose (1971), Akere (1980), Adetugbo (1977, 1979), Boadi et al (1968) and Odumuh (1981), among many others have confirmed the adaptation of the English language lexicon and semantics to the Nigerian sociolinguistic and cultural environment.

At the syntactic level, however, apart from the identification of local idioms, there appears to be a lack of consensus among Nigerian linguists on what constitutes legitimate syntactic features of NE, and what is grammatically unacceptable or illegitimate. In other words, the distinction between creative syntactic manipulation devised 'to carry the weight of our (Nigerian) experience (Achebe, 1975: 62), and occasional 'non-systematic deviations' (Corder, 1967, 1973), associated with linguistic immaturity is blurred. For example,

Olagoke (1981), identifies NE syntactic class markers as comprising; neologisms, extension/ restriction of lexical meanings, transliterations from the mother tongue, redundancy, inappropriate use of idioms, violation of the rules of semantic selection and co-occurence restriction as well as the use of big words. He holds up these features as symptomatic of the general poor standard of the English language in Nigeria. However, he adds on a more realistic note that:

> ... while some (of the listed features) are deviants, reflecting transitional competence (Corder, 1973), others are culturally motivated variants, reflecting the socio-cultural environment in which the English language is used in Nigeria, (Olagoke, 1981: 37).

Such culturally motivated variants which can be identified from his list are, neologisms and lexical shifts, which we had earlier endorsed as legitimate language nativization phenomena. The remaining items on the list are instances of errors in the use of English as a second language (ESL) which he has rightly acknowledged.

Odumuh (1981), also identifies NE syntactic aspects as comprising among others; omission of articles, pluralization of mass nouns, reduplication, confusion of reciprocal and reflexive

clauses, and an phorical polarity in answering Yes/No questions. This list, as the former one by Olagoke, contains elements of errors in language learning which reflect what Corder (1973: 257), calls 'transitional competence' in the use of English by ESL learners (see also Nemser, 1971a; Selinker, 1972; Sampson and Richards, 1973; Richards, 1977).

The above confusion with regard to NE syntactic features arises from three factors; the orientation of the mentioned studies, the use of the level of educational attainment as a proficiency parameter, and the nebulousness of the term, NE. The two studies cited earlier, Olagoke (1981), and Odumuh (1981), like many other researches on NE were error analysis biased in their attempt to describe the deviation of NE from a presumed norm (see also Jibril, 1979; Eka, 1979; Dunstan (ed.) 1969; Ekong, 1982; and Akere, 1977).

Besides, both studies also rested on the assumption that, advanced education is synonymous with high proficiency and competence in the use of English in ESL contexts. Olagoke (op. cit.) used university undergraduates as his sample,

while Odumuh (op. cit.) drew his data from the English of students in tertiary institutions of learning, with the assurance that 'students at this level can be safely taken to typify educated Nigerians' (Odumuh, op. cit.: 56). Other scholars like Brosnahan (1958), Banjo (1969), Adesanonye (1973), and Osisanya (1979) have also used educational attainment as a measure of competence in English.

Such a presumption is fallacious. It is fallacious in the sense that, although it is true that the level of education in Nigeria is ranked in a hierarchy of the primary, secondary, tertiary and university, it does not necessarily follow that a secondary school graduate is more competent in English language use than a primary school leaver. The fact as revealed by actual performance is rather that; 'there are not a few ex-secondary pupils in (Nigeria) able to flourish certificates purporting to show that they are literate in English when in fact they are not' (Grieve, 1977).

Moreover, the label, NE, is very often used ambiguously. The pertinent question is: does it refer to a standard variety of English in Nigeria,

just as British English or American English is synonymous with BSE or ASE? The term needs to be redefined more vigorously; for as Grieve (1964) observes:

> The point about English in Nigeria is not just that it is different from British or American English. It is rather that there are several varieties of English from something very near to standard English to the patois of the market place.

Unless the above point is borne in mind, we run the risk of comparing the English spoken in the Nigerian secondary schools with the English spoken in the Inn Court or the United Nations, and automatically judging the former as 'inferior'.

At the phonological level, Banjo (1969), edited a collection of contrastive analyses of 12 Nigerian languages and the English language. This work, although a valuable ELT supplementary text only predicts potential areas of phonological difficulties the ESL learners from the contrasted language groups are likely to encounter. Moreover, the findings are yet to be validated in empirical studies à la Briere (1968).

The first authentic investigation of NE phonology is given by Adetugbo (1977a).

Contrasting the phonology of NE with RP he identifies 7 NE simple vowels as against RP's 12. Morevoer, NE reduces two RP diphthongs /ei/ and /əu/ to /e/ and /o/ respectively, thus winding up with 6 diphthongs in contrast to RP's 8. He further contends that at the consonantal level "NE does not deviate significantly from RP" (p.6). The only notable differences are that: NE aspirates all voiceless stops no matter the environment where they occur. It also renders the phonemic morphemes (Z^1, Z^2, and Z^3) i.e. noun phural, noun possessive, and third person singular present form of the verb, as /s/ in all cases. Where RP uses two allomorphs (D^1 and D^2) for the past particle morpheme, NE invariably affixes /d/. These findings should however be accepted with some reservations. In the study, he stated that the given description was common to most Nigerian English users, while select crop of sophisticated users approximate RP in their speech, i.e. exhibiting the necessary segmental and suprasegmental finesse. From this last observation, it would appear that there are at least two NE phonologies; the sophisticated and the unsophisticated.

"Standard Nigerian English phonology", a Ph.D. thesis by Eka (1985) is by far the most sophisticated study of NE phonology to date. Combining auditory with instrumental approach, he investigates not only segmental features of standard NE (SNE) phonology like phoneme distribution, vowel weakening, consonant clusters and dialectal variations but also non-segmental features like tones, rhythm and their respective functions. The study faults several findings of Adetugbo (op. cit.). It isolates 19 SNE vowels in place of the former's 13, disproves voiceless plosives aspiration, shows SNE as capable of quantitative distinctions between /i:/and /i/, /u:/ and /u/ and goes on to prove that words in SNE are dependable on orthography rather than L_1 interference - a pet assumption of NE intelligibility studies (pp. 23 - 24). Other studies on spoken NE tend to focus on typology, intelligibility and acceptability.

Typology studies on Nigerian spoken English dates back to Brosnahan (op. cit.). Scholars in this group have often isolated four varieties of Nigerian spoken English, except for Akere (1980), who identifies three. Excepting the latter, they

all invariably use educational attainment as their typology parameter. Brosnahan (op. cit.), in identifying four varieties of Nigerian spoken English, places the primary school leaver's variety at the bottom of the competence scale, while the university graduates' English rests at the top. Similarly, Banjo's (1969) variety one (Nigerian spoken English), is realized by semi-literates, while variety four (the near-native accent is spoken by university graduates - mostly the 'been-tos'.

One shortcoming in the use of educational attainment as a competence parameter in English language usage in ESL settings, as we have pointed out earlier, is the lack of correlation between the level of formal education and proficiency in English. As Sey (op. cit.) remarks on the ESL situation in West Africa:

> There are a number of people whose English may be said to be of university standard though they have not had university education; similarly there are university graduates whose standard of English does not give immediate indication of the degree of their education.

As a result of the above-mentioned anomaly, we would rather the educational attainment criterion be de-emphasized, or if it must be used, it should

be restricted to English/Language Arts specialists. Consequently, we find Akere's (1980) non-educational criteria for categorizing varieties of Nigerian spoken English more realistic. He identifies three varieties of accents among African speakers of English; the educated, the broad, and the localized accents, based on the parameters of fluency, intelligibility, and acceptability.

Concerning the intelligibility of Nigerian spoken English, Brian Tiffen's (1974) study readily comes to mind. Analysing the recorded speech of twenty-four first-year Nigerian undergraduates, he found the average educated Nigerian speaker of English to be 64% as intelligible as the native (RP) speaker. Going a step further, he introduced an ethnolinguistic factor into NE studies - variation in intelligibility across the different language backgrounds of the speakers. On this score, he found 'Hausa speakers (of English) significantly more intelligible than Yoruba speakers' (Tiffen, op. cit: 178). Since then, one Nigerian expert on English after the other has sought to establish the superiority of one ethnic accent of NE over the other (intelligibility wise). So far, it is the Hausa English

accent which seems to have the upper hand. For example, Jibril (1979, 1982), Nuttal (1961), and Thompson (1963) all rate the Hausa English accent as more internationally intelligible than the Southern accent.

The problem with the notion of intelligibility discussed above, is that, it is tied up with the level of educational attainment of the speakers. The apparent divergence in intelligibility to British listeners between the Northern and Southern accents, is due in part to the unequal exposure of the subjects used in the study to RP. While the pupils in the North had expatriate RP speakers who taught corresponding smaller and more manageable classes, their counterparts in the south were not so blest. The ELT scene in the South was dominated by the Irish and Scottish missionaries (non-RP speakers), assisted by a large inadequately trained indigenous staff who, naturally, could not teach what they did not know, i.e. RP. In the words of Jibril:

> The only acceptable explanation for the Southern pronunciations.. appears to be poor teaching which encourages the learner to fall back on spelling which, as is well known, is a poor guide to English pronunciation. The Northern pronunciation... appears to reflect

> the more careful teaching
> in the North by RP speaking
> teachers (Jibril, 1979: 47).

This investigator feels that intelligibility studies can only be meaningful and objective, in a context where the subjects had been exposed to the same model for the same duration, especially in their formative years before fossilization sets in. Moreover, control groups, which none of the cited studies had, should be used to validate the findings of the surveys. As it is, we can only regard the above findings as inconclussive. In fact, a recent intelligibility study (Ekong, 1980), invalidates the findings of Taffen (op. cit.). Ekong faults the latter as being methodologically 'prejudiced in favour of the native speaker' (Ekong, op. cit.: 3) and the goes on to establish that the average Nigerian speaker of English was just as intelligible as the native speaker. Two years later, she consolidated her position by affirming that with a high exposure to standard varieties of English through the electronic media, and a higher degree of English language usage in Nigeria, a standard Nigerian spoken English will emerge (Ekong, 1982: 90). This is in consonance with Jibril's prediction that:

> In the next twenty or so years, the distinction between the Northern and Southern accents is likely to disappear... and the "posh" accent of Nigerian television announcers will, in due course, gain currency among Nigerian elites regardless of their ethnic group. When these two predictions materialize, we will be able to speak of a "General Nigerian" accent and a "Standard Nigerian" accent' (Jibril, 1979: 50).

Research on the acceptability of Ne is a backlash of intelligibility studies, especially the notion of international intelligibility. Reacting against the 'bogey' of international intelligibility, Banjo (1979) asserts that much else lies beyond intelligibility; for instance, the appropriateness of a language to its immediate socio-cultural and linguistic contexts. Adetugbo (1982) passionately decries international intelligibility aa an unnecessary luxury, in fact a bane, arguing that:

> The Americans have their own national variety. So do the Australians. But none worries about international intelligibility. So why should we?'

While not dismissing intelligibility outright, other scholars in this group have concentrated on national acceptability of the different varieties

of English spoken and written in Nigeria. Their premise is that the concept of acceptability subsumes that of intelligibility. Since a non-intelligible variant would not be acceptable to its users. Moreover, they feel that the standard for a living language should be established from within the socio-cultural context in which it is used for communication (endonormic) and not imposed from outside (exonormic).

As regards the acceptability of NE, various attempts have been made to elicit from Nigerians, the variety of spoken English they preferred. Obanya et al's (1979) acceptability study one NE, found that, 'on the average, the subjects tended to accept a native speaker's accent more readily than that of a near-native Nigerian speakers'. Also, 'teachers of English tended to accept the native and near-native accents more readily than non-teachers of English'. However, this study was defective on certain methodological aspects. First of all, only two of the major Nigerian languages based accents of English, - Yoruba English and Igbo English - were tested, leaving out the Hausa English accent which has been claimed to be the most internationally acceptable variety

(see Tiffen, op. cit., Jibril, 1979; among others). Secondly, 83% (165 out of 199) of the subjects were from one ethnic group, the Yoruba, which made the Yoruba English accent more readily acceptable than the Igbo English variant. Finally, the study did not include any female informant, or the American accent, which is gaining currency among the younger generation of Nigerian speakers of English (see for example, Adetugbo and Awonusi, 1983).

To make up for these methodological lapses, Williams (1981b) acceptability study on Nigerian spoken English recorded five female and six male Nigerians, from five different Nigerian language groups, as well as three native speakers from the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada, respectively. Eighty-one Language Arts undergraduates drawn from thirty-six different Nigerian language backgrounds, were used as respondents, to rate the accents for acceptability on the cognitive affective and conative dimensions, a la Cooper and Fishman (1977). The most important finding of this study was 'the preference for the near-native type of accent' exhibited by the Nigerian informants. The near-native accent

(Type I in the study) was defined as 'recognizably Nigerian, not neutral and certainly neither British nor American (Williams, op. cit.: 165). This finding refutes Obanya et al's (op. cit.) claim that the near-native accent was less fancied by Nigerians on the grounds that 'many Nigerians will consider as affected or even snobbish any Nigerian who speaks like a native speaker of English' (Obanya et al, citing Bamgbose, 1971). Empirical studies by Ekong (1980, 1982) and Adeyanju (1981) have also confirmed the preference for the near-native accent of English by Nigerians.

The foregoing has sought to establish that NE is a natural offspring of the social history of the English language; the nativization of a transplanted language to suit the socio-linguistic cum cultural setting of its new environment. It is characterized by systematic 'deviations' from BSE in vocabulary, phraseology and pronunciation coloured by the various Nigerian languages with which it is in contact. But basically, it could be said that Nigerian standard English parallels BSE and other standard varieties found in the anglophone communities, by virture of its sharing the same common core features of the English

language. By this sharing of the common core features of vocabulary and structure found in other varieties of English, NE is thus a dialect of English.

However, language experts are divided on the issue of the status of NE. While scholars like Banjo (1970), Bamgbose (op. cit.), and Tamuno (op. cit.), agree that Nigerians have successfully appropriated the English language, others either completely deny the existence of NE, or accord it a grudging acceptance, usually in terms of an embrassing sociolinguistic accident which time will mercifully wipe away. Owing to the influence of this last school of thought, the majority of researches on NE have concentrated on the documentation of 'common errors' found in the written and spoken English of Nigerians (see for example, Olagoke, 1981; Adesanoye, 1973; Adeniran, 1974; Tiffen, op. cit; Adeyanju, 1981; among many others).

It is however reassuring to note that such a crisis of confidence among experts with regard to language variation is not peculiar to the ESL scene in Nigeria. In fact, the controversy surrounding language change dates back to the classical times.

2.4 Attitudes Towards Language Variation

As stated earlier, all languages are subject to change, both through the normal tendency of language to change, and as a result of external factors such as movement of populations. But very often these changes are resisted by some members of the society.

The most frequently advanced hypothesis for the resistance is that implying some sort of linguistic decay. The emerging varieties have often been labelled as 'clumsy', 'sloven', or 'degenerate'. Traditionally, this charge of debasement rested on moral principles - it would be irresponsible and disastrous for the society if the language is allowed to fall into decay. George Orwell warned in 1946 that, 'one ought to recognize that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language', and that 'one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end'. And a decade ago, Dr. Boyson (1975) issued his rather censorious statement that, 'the debasement of the meaning of important words can help to destroy a free society'.

In order to 'protect their own society', the Roman grammarians took up grammatical arms to

defend the 'purity' of their language (Classical Latin) from 'corruption' by the common people, vulgus, from whom emanated the label 'Vulgar Latin'. All the same, Vulgar Latin waxed stronger, eventually giving birth to modern day Romance Languages. But paradoxically, we find that when Italian and French, two Romance Languages, had finally gained independence from Latin, they turned around to enforce their own form of language censorship by establishing the academy. Italy in 1582 set up the Academie della Crusca, whose main objective was the purification of the Italian language. France followed suit by setting up the Academie Francaise (1635), with the principal function of cleansing their langue of impurities.

The English are not exempt from this linguistic intolerance towards language change. As early as 1632, Swift had talked about 'fixing' the English language. Other scholars after Swift kept up the battle till the 18th Century when things came to a head. One of the most ambitious hopes of this age was its attempt to 'fix the (English) language, and put a stop to those alterations which time and chance have hitherto been suffered to make in it without opposition' (Ben Johnson, 1755).

The situation in America was not different. First the English tried to stifle the emergence of American English. But when finally, it gained independence from BSE, the Americans turned the tables in seeking to protect the 'purity' of their language from insidious Briticisms. An article in the New York Review (April, 1842) warned Americans: 'We should be careful to preserve our independence of any illicit fashions of speech which chanced to be in use in England. Otherwise we may be importing... vulgarisms, and provincialisms'.

When one considers that the above battles of attitudes towards language change were waged among native speakers of the various languages in question, one can then imagine their attitudes towards non-native variants. With respect to varieties of the English language in non-native settings of Asia, Indo-Asia and Africa, Kachru (1981) notes that;

> ... the attitude of native English speakers has not necessarily been one of acceptance, or recognition. It is a long story of a long battle of attitudes which has yet to be fully studied.

One of the most frequently advanced criticisms against non-native varieties of English is that of

loss of efficiency or international intelligibility. Newsweek (November, 1982) complains that the problem of the new varieties of English is that 'they are barely understandable in another English-speaking country. As an illustration, it cites instances of deviant usages from Indian English such as:

> 'My heart is garden-garden' (I am very happy).
>
> 'I am not vacant'. (I am occupied).

On the same note Readers' Digest (August, 1982) laments:

> From Tokyo to Tahiti, they are tying knots in our mother tongue. Words corkscrew wildly, spellings run amok, meanings turn inside out, grammar takes a holiday.

Then it goes on to illustrate instances of disfigured speech; e.g. 'steamed muscles' (musseles). 'Beware Falling Angels' (statues). 'Grilled Chinese and Ham on Toast' (Grilled Chinese Ham on Toast).

The above examples of grammatical deviations are not Indian or Japanese English, any more than we can count as BSE, a notice chalked on the North Wembly Railway Station which read: 'Owing to the lights are dim at South Kenton, so passengers must

mind the platform' (Readers' Digest, December, 1980), or the following news item written by a BBC sub-editor, 'She was taken to Poole General Hospital, where she was said to be satisfactory' (Hudson, 1977). Citing examples of linguistic aberrations from NNEs, as if they were the norm rather than occasional errors, is definitely prejudiced, considering the fact that NNE-speaking nations have educated English users who have been contributing to the learned professions, the sciences and world literature in impeccable English.

On the home front of the NNEs, the situation is not better. In Nigeria for example, the majority of indigenous linguists, taking their cue from native English speaking members of the profession like Prator (1968), McGregor (1971) and Gower (1967), often treat NE as if it were a skeleton in their ELT cupboard. Salami (1968) denies the very existence of a Nigerian English. Adeyanju (op. cit.) thinks it is the cumulative deficiencies in ELT such as, 'the inability of the educational system to handle interference problems from the mother tongue, the absence of educated and well-trained teachers', among other factors 'that is being grandiosely referred to as

Nigerian English'. Other scholars like Ekpenyong (1965), Olagoke (1981), Adeniran (op. cit.), Osisanya (1979), and Egbe (1979) have often investigated NE from the angle of 'deviation' from BSE, which to them connotes substandardness. Jibril (1982: 74) sums up their collective attitudes in the following statement:

> Most Nigerian speakers of English think that Pidgin English is what is meant by Nigerian English, since in their view, they speak and write the Queen's English.

The above arguments reflect the age old anxieties by various sections of the society about language change. Such anxieties are not unconnected with the classical fallacy of the changeless purity of language, which must be defended at all costs. But the idea that change can be avoided is a forlorn sentiment, as it is in the nature of all languages to change. In the words of Webster:

> It is quite impossible to stop the progress of language - it is like the course of the Mississippi, the motion which is at times scarcely perceptible yet even then it possesses a momentum quite irresistible. Words and expressions will be forced into use in spite of all the exertions of all the writers in the world, (Webster in Gowers, 1973: 265).

In recognition of the legitimacy of language devolution, voices have been raised in defence of English language variation, especially with regard to NNEs. Trifonovitch (1981) calls on the native speakers of English to replace their linguistic chauvinism with an attitude of linguistic tolerance, and the non-native speakers to abandon their inferiority complex in realization that English now belongs to the world and not to an elite group only. Strevens (1980: 80) adds in a more reflective tone that:

> It would be naive... to make the assumption that all Englishes are "equal"... Nevertheless, it is necessary to remove value judgements from consideration and to accept that the language "English" manifests itself in a large number of forms, that all forms are equally worthy of consideration and potentially acceptable in a given community.

Other linguists like Perren and Holloway (1965), Richards (1979), Adetugbo (1979, 1982) Kachru (1976) and Banjo (1970), 1979), among many others, have all argued for the legitimacy of NNEs.

All the foregoing arguments, for and against the fissiparousness of the English language, have only served to exacerbate the

attitudinal controversy surrounding English language usage. Consequently, the ELT profession is left in a linguistic quandary, and the educational system in Nigeria is thrown into jeopardy, especially as regards language policy formulation. In order to give an objective appraisal of the problem, there is a need to take a look at researches on language attitudes, especially language attitudes in multilingual settings.

2.5 Language Attitudes

The study of attitudes has been the major preoccupation of social psychology for quite some time now, but that of language attitudes is a more recent development (see Shuy and Fasold, 1973). This area owes something to the socio-linguistic as well as psychological tradition in language learning. The first empirical study of note on language attitudes was carried out by Lambert et al (1960) in Ontario and Quebec. Though it was based principally on second language acquisition, and bilingualism, it has, over the last two and a half decades, provided a number of insights into the implications of attitudes for language learning/teaching. The main contention

of the study is that a favourable attitude contributes to the ease and depth of language learning. This has become a widely accepted point which has motivated a number of studies on attitude formation, its components and maintenance, especially in multilingual settings where different languages as well as different language varieties compete for recognition.

But despite the prominent role of attitudes in social psychology, there is a lack of consensus among researchers as to its definition and method of assessment. One of the snags in the definition of attitude concerns the issue of dimensional dichotomy. Some researchers like Osgood et al (1957) and Oskamp (1977) conceive of an expressed attitude as a unidimensional entity, whereby many perceived consequences of an act are combined into a single act corresponding to attitude (i.e. favourable or unfavourable).

However, other scholars like McGuire (1969), Triandis (1964), and Bagozzi (1981) see attitudes in multidimensional social terms. For example, Bagozzi (op. cit.) argues that a multidimensional approach is the more reliable, especially when we observe that an increase in the meaning and

consequences of an act, increases the complexity of an attitude held towards the object in question. Taylor et al, (1977) in their study of second language learning variables include measures relating to attitudes towards; (1) the group which speaks the language in question, (2) the learning of the language, (3) the language course, and (4) the language instructor.

Given the importance of language in intercultural relations, and the embedded intricacies in the concept of culture, it appears prudent to allow for the multidimensional aspect of language attitudes. In this study therefore, we shall adopt a multidimensional approach to the concept of language attitudes comprising: (1) attitudes towards features of a language, and (2) attitudes towards the use of the language in question (d'apres Cooper and Fishman, 1974). This definition will be inferred from a group's expressive behaviour towards a variety of English - ENE.

As regards the assessment of attitudes, the major problems derive from the mentalistic/ behaviouristic approaches to the definition of attitude. Allport (1954), leading the mentalists,

defines attitude as 'a mental and neural state of readiness'. He then goes on to state that attitudes are not directly observable, but have to be inferred from a respondent's introspection. But Newcomb (1953) and Schachter (1951) hold a behaviouristic view, defining attitude in terms of directly observable behaviour.

However, many researchers, especially researchers on language attitudes, have surmounted these conceptual problems by adopting a wide variety of methods and perspectives in the measurement of language attitudes. For example, Ryan et al, (1982) distinguish between 'direct assessment' and 'indirect assessment' of language attitudes (see also Shuy and Fasold, op. cit.; Agheyisi and Fishman, 1974; Lambert et al 1965, 1972).

A direct measurement of language attitudes is obtained through questionnaires bearing explicitly on;

1. language evaluation (e.g. how favourably a language variety is viewed);
2. language preference (e.g. which among two languages or language varieties is preferred for certain purposes in certain situations);

3. desirability and reasons for learning a particular language (e.g. integrative and instrumental reasons); and
4. perception and evaluation of social groups who use a particular language or variety of a language as well as opinions on the maintenance or shifting of language policies.

Important contributions in these areas have been made by Cohen (1974), Orstein (1974), Thompson (1973), Fishman et al, (1977).

A major weakness of this method of language attitudes assessment is the intrusion of emotional constructs in responding to statements such as; 'I like speaking RP'. 'The compulsory learning of Hausa should be encouraged'. 'English should be replaced with a major Nigerian language'. ' 'Nigerian English is not a standard dialect of English', and so on. Response bias is another inherent weakness of this method. The bias is motivated by the desire of respondents to make a good impression or a 'good' score. It has been shown that, if a respondent has an idea about the kinds of traits being measured, as is more likely in direct attitude assessment questionnaires, he tends to choose the 'expected' responses without

regard to whether such responses reflect his candid opinion (Guildford, 1954; Gordon, 1951; Greenbaum and Quirk 1970).

The indirect method of language attitudes measurement is usually obtained through the elicitation of listeners' subjective reactions to different speech styles on audiotapes. This approach forms the foundation of the social and psychological perspectives on language attitudes (Price et al, 1983; Giles and Powesland, 1975). One of its techniques, the matched-quise technique technique (MGT hereafter) has undoubtedly become one of the most popular instruments used in eliciting people's evaluative reactions to various speech styles, accents, dialects and languages.

In the traditional form of the MGT, respondents hear voices of 'different' speakers usually reading the same standard passage of prose and afterwards are asked to rate the speakers on a series of rating scales (e.g. level of education, sense of humour, good looks, leadership quality, and so on). Unknown to the respondents, the speech is in fact produced by one speaker using realistic quises of different languages or speech characteristics. When convincing matched-quises

are unavailable, the contrasted speech styles may be produced by distinct speakers (Cooper, 1975; Huygens and Vaughan, 1983; Cooper and Fishman, 1977). Thus differences between the average ratings of speakers in each language or language variety will reveal the stereotyped views of the judges about each language or language variety.

The MGT is particularly valuable as a measure of group biases in evaluative reactions. Its main strength lies in its ability to reveal non-consciously held attitudes towards different language varieties and/or speakers of the varieties in question, which cannot be determined by direct questionnaire methods (Lambert, 1967: Giles and Powesland, op. cit.). For this reason we shall adopt the MGT for our study of language attitudes towards ENE.

2.5.1 Matched-Guise Technique (MGT) Studies

The first empirical study on language attitudes using the MGT was that of Lambert and his co-workers (op. cit.). In the study, English Canadians and French Canadians rated ingroup and outgroup speakers (i.e. English Candians and French Canadians, respectively). English Canadians

were found to view the ingroup as superior to the outgroup speakers, while the French Canadians seemed to have endorsed the inferior position assigned them by the majority of the culture around them (i.e. by also rating their ingroup lower). Since this first study, the MGT has been widely employed both in its original as well as adapted formats. Empirical researches in various parts of the world have yielded a generally consistent pattern of results; speakers of 'high' dialects are rated highly on competence as well as socio-economic status, while speakers of 'low' dialects are downgraded on these dimensions (Labov, 1966; Lambert, op. cit.; Lambert and Cooper, 1977).

The preference for prestigious dialects as revealed by MGT studies has given birth to a tradition of ranking dialects and speech styles along hierarchical scales thereby encouraging linguistic prescriptivism (Drake, 1977). The general result of such prescriptivism is that some forms of accented speech or language varieties are rated lower on linguistic potentiality by 'the system' (Shuy and Fasold, op. cit.; St. Clair, 1982). This has become the underlying

factor in all indirect assessments of language attitudes, especially in multilingual and multicultural settings in which, dominant and subordinate groups, majority and minority languages, and standard as well as non-standard varieties of language coexist.

Huygens and Vaughan (op. cit.) using the MGT set out to find the extent to which ethnic speech styles can be detected and how such are evaluated when contrasted with RP. Samples of spontaneous speech of English, Dutch, Pakeha and Maori speakers of English were presented on audiotapes to 120 Pakeha and Maori students (the two major indigenous language groups in New Zealand). Ratings were made on four personal and four social scales, while an attempt to describe the type of accent was invited.

The result showed that accurate identification of speakers varied according to group, with the Maori speakers being the least successfully identified. In fact, very good Maori speakers of English were often identified as Pakehas. Speech styles approximating RP were rated the highest. Prestige ratings on both the social and personal scales ranked English, Dutch and Pakeha

higher than Maori. These results bear obvious resemblance to those found elsewhere using a typical MGT. For instance, the Maoris were behaving like the French Canadians in Lambert's et al's (op. cit.) study, by adopting a self denigrating posture in the face of an all white culture - Pakehas are white New Zealanders while the Maoris are black, so the former naturally found affinity with the English and Dutch.

Extensive MGT studies have been carried out on the Welsh language in contrast with English. One of such studies by Price, Fluch and Giles (op. cit.), ran true to type; i.e. English with RP accent elicited more favourable reactions than English with a Welsh accent. Using two groups of pre-adolescence bilinguals, the authors assessed reactions towards Welsh speakers reading a passage of prose in three language varieties; English with RP accent, English with a Welsh accent, and Welsh. They also sought to determine what effect the language of testing (Welsh vs English) might have on the children's evaluation of speech styles. The Welsh accented English was rated as either snobbish or selfish when Welsh was the language of testing, and was regarded as less intelligent

when English was the language of testing. In both cases, Welsh and RP were always favourably perceived (see also Sharp et al., 1973; Lewis, 1975; and Williams, 1979).

Bourhis, Giles and Tajfel (1973) using the MGT also recorded positive reactions to the Welsh language and a mildly accented English. They asked three groups of listeners - Welsh-English bilinguals, Welsh learners, and English only speaking Welsh persons - to listen to, and evaluate certain personality traits of various Welshmen they would hear reading a passage of prose on tape, using three guises - Welsh, RP English, and Welsh - accented English. All the groups upgraded the Welsh speakers on most traits rather than the supposedly high prestige RP accent. The only traits on which listeners upgraded the latter were on arrogance, snobbishness, and conservatism. The study also showed that the Welsh accent could potentially serve as a marker of national identity.

The last observation was confirmed in two MGT studies by Bourhis and Giles (1977), and Bourhis, Giles and Lambert (1975). They found that Welsh learners who value their nationality and the

Welsh language highly, deliberately turn on their Welsh accents in English as a symbol of ethnic allegiance when the value of Welsh language is questioned in a derogatory manner.

The last four studies are in contrast with typical MGT study findings; that RP English is accorded evaluative superiority along many dimensions, especially status and socio-economic ones in anglophone communities (see Edwards, 1982).

2.6 Language Attitudes Towards Nigerian English

Empirical studies to elicit from Nigerians the variety of English they liked best, seem to be the nearest thing to language attitudes research on NE. Kai Bornya et al., (1979) conducted an acceptability study on Nigerian spoken English. Their major concern was, to determine which of the selected samples of competing varieties of English spoken in Nigeria would be most acceptable to an educated group of Nigerian listeners. They found that, 'on the average, the subjects tended to accept a native speaker's accent more readily than that of a near-native Nigerian speaker', and that, 'teachers of English tended to accept the native and near-native accents more readily than non-teachers of English. These findings should however be accepted with some reservations, as the

study was defective on certain methodological aspects. The most glaring of such shortcoming was that about 83% of the subjects were from one ethnic group, the Yoruba, which obviously made the Yoruba English accent more readily acceptable than the Igbo English variety in the study.

Adeyanju (1981) used open-ended questionnaires to determine the attitudes of Nigerians to the different varieties of English coexisting in the Nigerian linguistic milieu. Using sixty-four Bachelor of Education in Language Arts students, drawn from twenty-five different bilingual backgrounds (i.e. English and at least, one Nigerian language) he sought to find out, among other things, the subjects' aspirations with respect to spoken English, and the advantages they sought to derive therefrom. Their responses, to which variety of English they preferred, showed that '78% of them preferred native speaker, near-native speaker, and international varieties of English to Nigerian English' (Adeyanju, op. cit.: 9). With regard to the envisaged advantages of speaking English like a native speaker, only 10% of them gave 'integrative' reasons, while 88% gave 'instrumental' reasons, like obtaining a good job with the media houses

as well as ensuring international intelligibility. This result indicates the importance of instrumental attitude as the principal motivating force in English language learning, especially in ESL contexts. However, the main weakness of this study is the error caused by response bias inherent in all open-ended questionnaires on attitudinal study, which we have discussed elsewhere (see 2.5).

Williams (1981b), used an adapted MGT, a la Cooper and Fishman (1977), to clarify issues on attitudes towards varieties of Nigerian spoken English. Eighty-one judges (English teacher trainees), were asked to rate the acceptability of the different accents of English they would hear on audiotape, on the cognitive, affective and conative dimensions. Fourteen informants, comprising eleven Nigerians representing five different language groups, and three native speakers from the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada respectively, were recorded. The Nigerian accents of English were categorized as 'near-native', 'accented-Nigerian', and 'heavily accented'. 'With just a few exceptions, the results reveal a pattern of acceptability very much in favour of the native and near-native accents' (Williams, op. cit.: 60).

The preference for the near-native accent is the most relevant finding of the above study. The near-native accent is defined as 'recognizably Nigerian; not neutral, and certainly neither British nor American'. This finding seems to be in consonance with an earlier finding (Williams, 1981a), rejecting the idea of a Nigerian speaking with the accent of an Englishman. Probably the idea is that such an accent would 'sound too westernized for nationalistic comfort' (Odumuh, op. cit.: 30). The above findings upset popular opinion that RP or BSE is always the prestige dialect of English in anglophone communities, especially the British ex-colonies (see Edwards, op. cit., and the earlier cited studies by Adeyanju and Obanya et al). The prevailing attitude in many ESL nations, is to impart a national identity to the English language spoken in their respective countries, in terms of accents, which will make a speaker identifiable as a national of a particular country but at the same time maintaining international intelligibility (see Richards, 1979; Achebe, 1975; and Smith 1981).

Williams (1984) provides the most comprehensive summary of attitudinal studies on NE. Using an adapted MGT, 878 judges comprising, 186 graduates,

221 undergraduates, 224 tertiary level, and 247 post-primary education students were involved in a series of language attitudes studies spanning two years (1981 - 1983). The main objective of these studies was to findout the extent to which NE lexis and structure were acceptable as standard usage for academic purposes. Some important findings of these studies were that teachers of English were more definite in their evaluation than teachers of other subjects (i.e. they registered lower scores on the uncertainty scale) while non-English teachers were more liberal towards Nigerianisms than teachers of English. Moreover, the degree of acceptance of the notion of a standard Nigerian English varied according to the level of education of the judges; Graduate, 33.6%; Undergraduate, 46.3%; Tertiary, 51.0%; Post-primary, 53.7%.

One major limitation of this study, which the researcher himself acknowledges, is the negligence of the situational aspect, an important criterion in acceptability study. In the words of Ekong (1982: 89):

> ... the situational function of a speech variety should be made clear to respondents in acceptability rating (since) the same variety of speech

> (or writing) may not be acceptable in all situations, just as more than one variety may be acceptable in any one situation.

This flaw was probably responsible for the rather large scores of uncertainty besides outright rejection. The limitation notwithstanding, the implications of the findings of the study for ELT is obvious; for the prupose of norm setting in English usage in ESL contexts where the speakers lack native speaker intuition, it would appear that it is the verdict of those higher up the educational hierarchy that matters, provided such judges are English language specialists such as English language graduates and graduate teachers of English.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

3.0 Introduction

This section discusses the instrumentation, sources of data, choice and description of sample as well as the test administration procedures followed in the study in consonance with its stated objective.

The main objective of the study was to assess the attitudes of educated users of English towards English usage in Nigeria, through an assessment of the acceptability and rejection of selected lexical and syntactic items of NE usage.

3.1 The Pilot Study

The main purpose of the pilot study was to assess the suitability and reliability of the test instruments to be used in the study. It was also to provide a preview of the problems that might surface during the use of the research instruments in the field. The final format of the test instruments used in the study was an outcome of the modifications, and at times outright rejection of items, carried out on the strength of the findings of the pilot study.

An inventory of seventy sentences, reflecting certain lexical and syntactic features of NE, culled from the print and electronic media, Nigerian novels and NESA journals, were presented to twelve language and literature specialists in the Departments of Education and English of the Ahmadu Bello University, as well as the School of Basic Studies and the Institute of Education. The judges were requested to evaluate the acceptability of the items in four different situations (Informal Speech, Informal Writing, Formal Speech, Formal Writing) or indicate a rejection. Their comments on any unacceptable or impossible-to-categorize item were also requested.

Based on their reactions, forty items were selected from the inventory, and made into an acceptability rating test with a corresponding matched-guise forced-choice selection test. In order to determine the viability of the two instruments, they were administered on fifty WAEC English and Literature in English examiners during the December 1984 marking exercise at the College of Advanced Studies, Zaria. The acceptability rating test was administered first, then followed the forced-choice selection test. On the strength of the feedback obtained from this group of judges,

the final format of the research instruments used in this study, was developed (see Appendices I and II).

3.2 Design of Test Instruments

An adapted MGT, reviewed in the previous chapter (see 2.5), was used in the study. It comprised two test batteries; a 'judgement' test and a complementary 'performance' test (see Greenbaum and Quirk, 1970). Judgement tests are usually the principal instruments used for eliciting language-oriented attitudes from subjects. For this study, the evaluation type of judgement test (ACCEPTABILITY RATING TEST, see Appendix I) was used. Performance tests, on the other hand, provide the chief method of assessing subjects' language use. The forced-choice selection type of performance test (USE OF ENGLISH TEST, see Appendix II) was used in the study.

3.2.1 Acceptability Rating Test

This was a 40-item Likert type summated ratings questionnaire, designed to elicit the attitudes of the respondents (judges hereafter) towards certain items of usage (lexical and syntactic) in written and spoken NE. The judges were asked to record their spontaneous reactions

to each item on a three-point scale:

'ACCEPTABLE'

'NOT SURE'

'UNACCEPTABLE'

Furthermore, the acceptability of each item was considered under four types of situation- Informal Speech, Informal Writing, Formal Speech, Formal Writing. The situational aspect is a crucial variable in acceptability rating as Lyons points out:

> We can... say, if we wish, that some speaker of a regional dialect of English has produced an incorrect (unacceptable)... form because this form is not in conformity with the patterns of standard English: but we are now assuming that he ought to have been speaking standard English in that particular situation, (Lyons, 1968: 42).

The items were selected examples of NE lexis and syntax, culled from informal as well as formal sources. The informal sources are the speech of educated Nigerians available to the researcher through personal communication and the local electronic media, besides the personal experience of the researcher. The formal sources, used mostly for literary prose, comprised data from two national dailies (The National/Sunday Concord,

and The Guardian) for a year (1982 - 1983), the no novels of four popular Nigerian prose writers in English - Chinua Achebe, Nkem Nwankwo, Elechi Amadi and Flora Nwapa - and selected NESA periodical.

The two mentioned dailies were selected for the high standard of their English usage. There is no denying the fact that the linguistic performance of Nigerian media practitioners, is to say the least, rather disappointing. Errors of grammar, spelling and pronunciation are the rule rather than the exception. However, there are some among them whose competence in English is at par with the 'standard', in any English speaking country. The Concord and Guardian groups of newspaper, had such competent users of English on their editorial staff during the period under review. They were Ray Ekpu and Dele Giwa, two journalists of international repute, Eddie Iroh the novelist, Drs. Chinweizu and Jamie, literary critics, just to mention a few.

Concerning the literary texts, it must be admitted that literary English is not necessarily co-terminous with actual usage in society because of stylistic licence. But if literary prose must be used as an aid to language teaching and learning, as is often the case in ESL contexts, the chosen

model should be as near as possible to everyday usage. It is for this reason that four Igbo writers of fiction in English were chosen. In the words of Bernth Lindfors:

> Most Igbo novelists who write in English... tend to favour a calm, graceful, proverb-studded idiom which resembles natural expression in their native tongue... The imagery, figures of speech and patterns of thought characteristic of communication in Igbo are rendered as faithfully as possible in English (Lindfors, 1971: 27).

Moreover, the novels of the selected writers are popular literary texts both at the secondary and university levels of education in Nigeria. This it was felt that the selected items of usage culled thereof would be familiar to the judges.

The final selected items were drawn from a pool of Nigerianisms validated in a pilot study. They were representative examples of the syntactic and lexical features of NE. Here are some examples with corresponding BSE equivalents in parentheses:

NE/CATEGORY	BSE EQUIVALENTS
<u>Coinage/Neologism</u>	
Lagos could have been a nice place but for the frustrating <u>go-slow.</u>	(traffic hold up)

Since all the invitees are here, I feel we could start. (invited guests)

Indigenes are not entitled to warm clothing allowance. (natives)

Let us meet next-tomorrow (the day after tomorrow)

Article Omission

Only few members turned up for the meeting. (a few)

WAI will not succeed because majority of Nigerians are unpatriotic. (the majority)

Pluralization of mass noun

I lost all my luggages to thieves at the airport. (luggage)

Nigerian science teachers are always complaining about lack of equipments. (equipment)

Confused reflexivization

We haven't seen ourselves for the past two years. (each other)

A marriage can never succeed when husband and wife do not love themselves. (one another)

(See Appendix I for the full list of items).

The selection was based on two major categories Nigerianisms and debatable usage. Nigerianisms are those usages, which are undeniably, adaptations of the English language to the Nigerian socio-cultural and linguistic environment such as neologisms, coinages and idioms. Such usages do not obstruct communication, if anything, they are creatively effective, and are in common use among competent Nigerian users of English. Debatable items of usage are such usages as are common with the not-so-well-educated and sad to say, non-English graduate Nigerians (e.g. pluralization of mass nouns, collapsed semantic boundaries etc.), but which some linguists identify as legitimate NE usage.

3.2.2 Use of English Test

This was a 45-item, forced-choice selection performance test in complement to the earlier judgement test, i.e. the Acceptability Rating Test. It was designed to check the emotional bias inherent in the complementary free response attitudinal test. It was aimed at evaluating the judges' attitudinal consistency towards NE in the face of an alternative variety of English (in this study, BSE). Its ultimate goal was to help find an

answer to the second research problem:

> Are English language trainees constant in their attitudes towards NE, or do their attitudes vacillate in the presence of a correct model of a standard English - BSE?

Basically, the same lingustic problems explored in the judgement test were repeated in the performance test, but with matching 'correct' alternatives (BSE equivalents) among which the judges were asked to choose from. This instrument then represents the matched-guise component discussed in the previous section (see 2.5). Here are a few examples of the matched items (see Appendix II for the complete list of items).

Examples

_____ of members were absent from the meeting.

(a) Majority (b) The majority

I am afraid the car can't take all your _____

(a) luggage (b) luggages.

Good neighbours should always help_____.

(a) each other (b) themselves

All_____ are please requested to stay behind.

(a) invited guests (b) invitees

The accused denied_____ the money.

(a) not stealing (b) stealing.

In this way, all the forty lexical and syntactic items of NE usage in the judgement test were repeated in the performance test. The additional five items were thrown in as sleeper items, so that the judges might not guess that they were responding to the same items of usage.

3.2.3 The Rationale for Double Testing

It was necessary to administer two structurally different but interrelated tests (a judgement test and a complementary performance test) one after the other, to the same group of judges, for the following reasons.

First and foremost, it was a design to help evaluate the consistency of the elicited attitudes towards NE. As Greenbaum and Quirk (1970) have pointed out, one's attitude to usage may not necessarily correlate with one's actual usage, when it comes to linguistic acceptability. Besides, attitudinal measures elicited solely with the Likert-type judgement test, tend to be unreliable because of response bias (Cohen, 1960). Oftentimes, judges go out of their way to endorse current fashionable opinions about the issue at stake, or endorse what they imagine the investigator

2. Since all of them were actively engaged in academic pursuit and as such mentally alert to the notions of 'correctness' and appropriateness in language usage, they would be in a better position to arbitrate on the issue of acceptability of NE.

3. The choice of an academic setting for the administration of the tests was to keep the tese conditions strictly similar for all groups of the judges. This was to ensure the validity of compared results. Moreover, the academic setting was to facilitate the manipulation of variables during testing.

4. It was hoped that the federal representation admission policy adopted by the federal universities would ensure a fair representation of Nigerian language groups; a judge's bilingual/multilingual background is an important variable in the study, i.e. determining the popularity of some mother tongue based NE idioms across different Nigerian language groups. All together, 63 Nigerian language groups/

clusters beside the 3 major ones were identified.

3.4 Test Procedures

The tests were administered in classrooms under examination conditions. However, the judges were put at ease before the start of the tests. Explicit instructions were given and a few examples of the required tasks were done with the judges as a practice run, to enable them complete the tests within the stipulated time. The 40-item judgement test was completed within 7 minutes - to ensure spontaneity, while the performance test was completed within 5 minutes. The completed questionnaires were collected on the spot.

The judges were divided into two groups. To one group, the judgement test (Acceptability Rating Test) was administered first, to elicit their spontaneous reactions to the concept of NE, after which they were given the forced-choice performance test (Use of English Test). This procedure is referred to as Test Module 1 in the study. The other group took the performance test first, before the judgement test (referred to as Module 2). These procedures were to help determine what effect, if any, the sequencing of the test batteries had on the attitudes of the judges.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.0 Preamble

In this chapter the responses of the judges are analysed both in raw scores and percentages to provide answers to the following research questions.

1. What is the extent of the acceptability and rejection of the items of usage?
2. How consistent are the elicited responses when the judges are presented again with the same items of usage, but paired this time with 'correct' English alternatives, i.e. BSE?
3. What is the general rank order of acceptability of the items?
4. How do responses vary according to: (a) the subject specialization of the judges, (b) the order of presentation of the test batteries?
5. How popular are mother-tongue based idioms and expressions across the different language groups of the judges?

The statistic $(\bar{x}_1-\bar{x}_2)$ or the sampling distribution of the difference between means will be computed to test the null hypothesis for the study at the 0.05 level of significance:

> Attitudes towards English usage are not affected by attitudes towards BSS.

4.1 Acceptability Ratings

A maximum score of 4 points (one point for each domain of discourse. Informal Speech, Informal Writing. Formal Speech, Formal Writing) was computed for each accepted item. With 400 judges assessing the acceptability of 40 items, each in four types of situation, the total possible score is $400x40x4 = 64,000$ points. Each response of uncertainty or outright rejection also scored 4 points since it meant that in each case, the judge could either not decide or considered the item unacceptable in any of the four given domains of discourse.

Table 4.1 summarizes the composite pattern of responses for each of the three categories of attitudinal measurement: ACCEPTABLE, NOT SURE and UNACCEPTABLE, as well as each of the four sub-categories of acceptability.

Table 4.1

Acceptability Rating Scores

Category of Response	Informal Speech No	%	Informal Writing No	%	Formal Speech No	%	Formal Writing No	%	Total	Average %
Acceptable	11,211	70.1	10,046	62.8	4,824	30.2	4,605	28.8	30,686	48.0
Not Sure	198	1.2	198	1.2	198	1.2	198	1.2	792	1.2
Unacceptable	4,591	28.7	5,756	36.0	10,978	68.6	11,197	70.0	32,522	50.8
Total	16,000	100	16,000	100	16,000	100	16,000	100	64,000	100

The results show an inclination towards rejection than acceptability (50.8% to 48.0%). In the least censorious settings of the four domains of discourse - informal settings - there were high scores of acceptability (70.1% for Informal Speech and 62.8% for Informal Writing). Tolerance fell to approximately a third in the formal settings (30.2% for Formal Speech and 28.8% for Formal Writing).

The above pattern of distribution of scores in a declining order of acceptability from informal to formal settings can be attributed to an already existing strong linguistic instinct. That is, writers/speakers are less fastidious in informal situations than in formal settings (Joos, 1967; Bey, 1973).

The 1.2% score of uncertainty indicates a high degree of decisiveness among the judges with regard to what was acceptable or unacceptable in Nigerian English. This score differs remarkably from the 8.4% recorded by a similar group of judges (English specialists) in a comparable study (Williams, 1984). The grading of acceptability into different domains of communication, which was absent in the cited study, can be said to

be responsible for the minimal score of uncertainty. This underscores the importance of the situational variable in acceptability testing (Lyons, 1968; Ekong, 1982).

4.2 Consistency Score

One of the main functions of the MGT used in the study was to help verify the consistency of any elicited attitude by checking the response bias inherent in a direct attitude measuring instrument like the rating scale. To this end, it becomes necessary to contrast the acceptance score of each item on the Rating Scale with its corresponding score when it is paired with a 'correct' English equivalent as in the Use of English Test. Table 4.2 presents the result of the judges' choice between 'correct' and 'incorrect' usage represented in the study by BSE and NE respectively.

Table 4.2

Use of English Test Scores

Category of Response	Total No.	%
Correct	11,296	70.6
Incorrect	4,704	29.4
Total	16,000	100

Nigerian English, represented by the 'incorrect' choices has a score of 29.4%. This score is at variance with its earlier score of 48.0% given by the same judges on the Rating Scale (see Table 1). This result reveals a deviation of 18.6% (48.0% - 29.4%) in consistency. It can therefore be said tentatively that there is at present an ambivalent attitude towards NE, at least among this group of English users. The generalisability of the finding is subject to the validation of the null hypothesis for the study which examines the same problem - the effect of ESE on attitudes towards NE (see 4.7). The discrepancy in attitude collaborates other MGT study findings on language attitudes (Lambert, 1967; Cooper, 1975; Huygens and Vaughan, 1983; Williams, 1984).

4.3 Rank Order of General Acceptability

The total ratings of acceptance of each item was computed in percentages. On this basis, the rank order of general acceptability was established as shown in Table 3. The corresponding Use of English Test score of each item is presented in the right hand column together with the rank order of general preference.

Table 4.3

Rank Order of General Acceptability with Use of English Test

Rank	Acceptability	Item No	Usage	%	Rank
1	75	13	Complimentary cards...	81	1
2	73	19	Each graduand...	57	6
3	72	17	Indigenes are not...	70	3
4	70	5	urged the academicians..	74	2
5	67	33	My wife has put to bed..	55	7
6	66	12	decorated our parlour..	34	13
7	65	10	only few members...	41	9
8	64	8	should join hands with..	15	28
9	63	4	the invitees are here..	27	20
9	63	22	because majority of Nigerians...	54	8
11	62	6	see a native doctor...	25	23
12	61	11	My wife has taken in...	37	12
13	58	14	is not on seat...	58	5
13	58	28	to manage with the little	28	19
15	55	26	Zorro is a moneydoubler..	31	17
16	53	40	I have checked for that book...	26	22
17	52	31	Mrs. Okoh, chair-lady	39	10
17	52	30	buy...from one customer..	32	15
19	51	1	the frustrating go-slow..	6	36
20	48	3	Let's meet next-tomorrow.	24	25
21	47	18	Welldone Ade...	25	23

Rank	Acceptability	Item No	Usage	%	Rank
22	45	21	We...enjoyed at the picnic..	32	15
22	46	25	passengers to shift for one more...	10	31
24	43	32	What of you...	39	10
24	43	34	That your room mate...	11	29
26	42	9	Sorry Sir...	64	4
27	41	15	I met your absence...	20	26
28	40	20	I'm coming...	3	40
29	37	2	lack of equipments	17	27
30	35	7	I am doubting...	31	17
31	33	38	Our co-wife...	34	14
32	32	27	all my luggages...	9	32
32	32	35	We haven't seen ourselves..	27	20
32	32	39	do not love themselves...	11	29
35	29	23	Is this your eye?...	8	33
35	29	24	you are not believing me...	4	38
37	28	37	she is... a gossiper...	6	36
38	27	29	laughing with all her teeth..	8	33
39	19	36	you are late...isn't it?...	4	38
40	15	16	Yes I haven't...	8	33

Rank Order Correlation of the two tests' scores:

Spearman's $r_s = .62$

Only 19 of the items are rated above 50%. This means that 19 items were acceptable in at least three domains of discourse (two informal settings and a formal setting, or two formal settings and an informal one). Tentatively, it can be said that less than half of the items were favourably received by the judges. The result is tentative in the sense that when the Use of English Test scores are examined the number of undisputably acceptable items drops to just seven (Items No. 13, 19, 17, 5, 33, 22, 14). Correlation between the two test scores shows a lack of substantial agreement between the earlier expressed acceptability and preference for the same items when paired with BSE equivalents. Here again the power of the MGT to reveal a groups bias in evaluative reactions is demonstrated.

Six out of the seven genuinely acceptable items belong to the lexical/semantic class, while the grammatical class has only one item. On the other hand, six out of the ten bottom items are of the grammatical class. This result pattern is consonant with normal language nativization process - lexical items are more amenable to language change than gramatical items, (Haugen, 1938; Whinnom, 1971; Moag, 1977; Kachru, 1981b).

It also collaborates Williams (1984) findings on NE usage.

The rejection of usages like 'equipments' (37% vs 17% 'luggages' (32% vs 9% - pluralization of non-count nouns, 'see ourselves' (32% vs 27%) 'love themselves' (32% vs 11%) - collapsed reflexivization, 'Isn't it?' (19% vs 4%) - universal NE question tag?, as well as 'Yes, I haven't' (15% vs 8%) - anaphorical polarization, upsets popular findings on NE usage. Scholars like Adetugbo (1977), Adeyanju (1981), Olgoke (1981) and Odumuh (1983) had often identified such usages as educated Nigerian English usage. The difference in findings can be attributed to the research instruments as well as the category of judges used for the respective studies. Their implications for ELT especially the role of judges of English usage in ESL situations is discussed later (see 4.8).

Table 4.3 also elaborates on the distinction between informal and formal usages summarized in Table 4.1. A rule of the thumb would be to regard all items scoring 50% and above (Rank 1-19) as usages acceptable in both informal and formal contexts and those scoring below 50% (Rank 20-40) as strictly informal usages. A more detailed

analysis shows that out of the first category (i.e. 50% and above) complimentary card, academician, chair-lady, join hands and not on seat could be regarded as belonging more to formal contexts since 50% of their total scores were in the formal column. In the same vein, manage, money doubler, check for, customer, go-slow could be added to the ranks of strictly informal usages since 50% of their total scores were found in the informal column.

From the above, it would appear that this group of educated users of English in Nigeria are less bookish in their English usage contrary to what earlier researches have shown (see Ubahakwe, 1976; Adetugbo, 1980).

The rank order of some items raises a few questions; first as matter for speculation but more importantly for ELT purposes. Does '... majority of ...' (article deletion) ranking 9th with high acceptability and consistency scores (63% vs 54%) qualify as educated Nigerian English usage? If so, what about a similar usage '... few members ...' which ranked even higher - 7th, but with a below average consistency score (65% vs 41%)? Why was 'Sorry...', 26th rejected on the ratings

Scale (42%) but gained acceptance (64%) when paired with a 'correct' English alternative? Why should '... believing me' (35th) (stative verb progressivization) seem so much more objectionable than a comparable usage 'I am doubting' (30th)? Obviously, a more rigorous and delicate investigation is needed before the last word could be said on English usage or anything like a reliable guideline on usage established for ELT.

4.4 Ratings by Education and English Students

Table 4.4 shows the rank order of acceptability of each item by Education and English Studies students. Each ratings score is paired with its Use of English Test score in the percentage column.

Table 4.4

Ratings and Use of English Test Scores of Education and English Specialists Showing Rank Order of Acceptability.

	EDUCATION		ENGLISH	
Item No.	%	Rank	%	Rank
1	48:3	19	54:6	17
2	37:13	27	37:17	30
3	46:22	21	49:24	20
4	63:20	10	63:27	8
5	73:75	2	66:74	6
6	63:27	10	60:25	11
7	34:26	29	35:31	32
8	64:16	8	63:15	8
9	38:64	26	46:64	22
10	65:39	7	64:41	7
11	63:36	10	59:37	13
12	64:35	8	67:34	4
13	72:81	3	77:81	1
14	54:57	15	61:58	10
15	37:18	27	45:20	26
16	12:6	40	18:8	39
17	70:69	4	73:70	2
18	47:25	20	46:25	22

Item No.	EDUCATION %	Rank	ENGLISH %	Rank
19	74:64	1	71:57	2
20	34:2	29	46:3	22
21	45:36	22	46:8	22
22	67:51	5	59:54	13
23	27:7	35	30:8	35
24	29:3	33	28:4	36
25	45:9	22	47:10	21
26	55:39	14	55:31	15
27	31:7	32	33:9	34
28	56:28	13	60:28	11
29	27:9	35	26:8	37
30	50:32	18	54:32	17
31	53:42	16	51:39	19
32	44:45	25	42:39	27
33	67:54	5	67:55	4
34	45:14	22	41:11	28
35	29:22	33	35:27	32
36	20:5	39	18:4	39
37	34:6	29	22:6	38
38	27:38	35	38:34	29
39	27:11	35	36:11	31
40	51:26	17	55:26	15

Rank Order Correlation of the two group scores:

Spearman's r_s = .95 (Ratings)
r_s = .91 (Use of English Test)

The general picture seems to suggest that there is little to choose between the ratings of the two groups of judges. Education students rated 18 items above 50%, while English students rated 19. A closer examination shows that the same items are endorsed by both groups with the exception of item No.1. When contrasted with their corresponding consistency scores, the number of undisputably accepted items comes down to seven for both groups (Items No. 19, 5, 13, 17, 22, 23, 14). The bottom nine ranks are also allocated to the same items by both groups. A measure of agreement on the ranking of items by both groups almost approaches perfection (Spearman's r_s = .95 for Ratings and .91 for Use of English Test). This finding which means that the two groups of judges are almost homogeneous in their attitudes to English usage nevertheless raises a question or two about the preparation of prospective teachers of English. The full import of this is discussed in section 4.8.

4.5 Ratings According to Test Modules

In order to determine whether the order of test presentation had any effect on the elicited attitudes, the judges were split into two equal groups of 200 students each. The first group were

given the Ratings Scale first before being given the Use of English Test with 'correct' English alternatives. This procedure is referred to as Test Module 1 in the study. The other group had the Use of English Test first before being administered with the Ratings Scale. This is referred to as Module 2. Table 45 presents the comparative result of the two procedures. The rank order of acceptability of each item is shown together with its Ratings and Use of English Test Scores in the percentage columns.

Table 4.5

Test Modules' Ratings and Use of English Test Scores showing Rank Order of Acceptability.

Item No.	MODULE 1 %	Rank	MODULE 2 %	Rank
1	53:4	16	48:8	20
2	39:13	29	36:22	30
3	48:20	19	41:28	27
4	64:24	10	63:30	8
5	69:76	4	71:72	4
6	65:21	8	58:29	13
7	32:29	32	38:32	29
8	67:13	6	60:18	11
9	41:66	26	44:69	23
10	70:36	2	60:46	11
11	60:30	12	62:45	9
12	66:26	7	66:44	6
13	73:79	1	76:84	2
14	54:49	15	61:68	10
15	40:14	28	43:27	25
16	15:8	40	15:7	40
17	70:59	2	74:82	3
18	45:20	22	48:31	20
19	69:47	4	78:68	1
20	41:5	26	39:1	28
21	43:93	25	49:32	19

Item No.	MODULE 1 %	Rank	MODULE 2 %	Rank
22	63:48	11	64:61	7
23	27:8	36	30:7	34
24	28:5	35	29:3	35
25	47:7	21	46:13	22
26	57:25	14	54:36	17
27	35:8	30	28:1	37
28	60:27	12	57:28	14
29	26:8	38	27:8	38
30	51:27	17	54:36	17
31	48:37	19	57:47	14
32	44:38	23	43:36	25
33	65:49	3	69:60	5
34	44:12	23	44:11	23
35	31:23	33	33:30	31
36	18:5	39	21:2	39
37	27:36	36	29:3	35
38	33:28	31	33:42	31
39	31:10	33	32:13	33
40	50:21	18	57:31	14

Rank Order Correlation of the two test modules' ratings: Spearman's r_s = .95 (Rating)
= .9 (Use of English Test)

It would have been thought that judges who took the Module 2 test would have been very critical of Nigerianisms, having been exposed to 'correct' English alternatives first before taking the Ratings test. But results show that Module 2 judges rated the same 17 items above 50% as judges in Module 1 (Items No. 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 40). The same six items were ranked among the top ten by judges in both modules.

Item by item ranking defies any systematic pattern. While items No. 6, 8, 10, 13, 17, 26 and 28 were ranked lower in Module 2, than in Module 1, indicating less favourable reception, two items (5 and 30) had tied ranks with the remaining items ranked higher in Module 2 than in Module 1. The same 6 items were ranked among the top ten by judges in both Modules, while the bottom ten items included 8 similar items in both modules.

The correlation coefficient values of r_s = .95 for the Ratings and .9 for the Use of English Test, indicating a near perfect agreement between the two test modules, clinches the argument that the order of presentation of the test

batteries has no significant effect on the attitudes of the judges. This finding lays to rest the speculation raised in comparable studies (Abubakar et al, 1982; Williams, 1984) as to whether the order of test batteries presentation had any effect on the attitudes of the judges. This result can also be taken as evidence of the reliability of the MGT to disquise the two tests so effectively that the judges had no idea they were responding to the same items of usage.

4.6 Ratings of Idioms by Language Groups of Judges

To determine the popularity of some mother-tongue based expressions selected for the study across the different language groups of the judges, total ratings of 9 items together with their Use of English Test scores were computed for 4 different language groups with more than 40 judges each. Table 6 presents the rank order of acceptability of the expressions among the Igbo (N = 67), Hausa (N = 51), Efik (N = 53) and Yoruba (N = 47) speaking judges.

Table 4.6

Ratings of Idioms by Igbo, Hausa, Efik and Yoruba Speaking Judges, Showing Rank Order of Acceptability

Item No	Usage	LANGUAGE GROUS Igbo %	Rank	Hausa %	Rank	Efik %	Rank	Yoruba %	Rank	Average	Rank
8...	join hands with...	69:13	2	68:11	3	70:9	1	56:15	4	65.8:12.0	1
30..	buy from customer	52:27	2	44:26	4	58:25	1	48:23	3	50.5:23.3	2
18...	Welldone..	44:15	4	52:39	1	45:17	3	46:19	2	46.8:22.5	3
9...	Sorry...	51:49	2	39:54	4	54:70	1	41:68	3	40.3:60.3	4
34...	That your..	43:9	3	39:12	4	44:11	2	45:17	1	42.8:12.3	5
15...	I met your absence	48:13	1	34:19	4	47:19	2	39:15	3	42.0:16.5	6
20..	I'm coming..	49:0	2	31:2	3	51:0	1	59:0	3	40.5:0.5	7
23..	Is this your eye?	34:0	2	26:14	3	36:4	1	23:2	4	29.8:5.0	8
29..	laughing with all teeth...	24:0	3	26:12	4	29:2	1	27:4	2	26.5:4.5	9

Two usages, 'join hands with' and 'customer' (= vendor) appear to be the most popular across the different language groups receiving an average rating of above 50% each, while the idioms 'Is this your eye?' and 'laughing with all her/his teth' were ranked at the bottom. But when the consistency scores are taken into consideration, it could be said that none of the idioms, except 'Sorry' received a genuine approval. 'Sorry' which ranked 4th, remains an enigma. It was rejected on the Rating Scale (46.3%) average, but was accepted (60.3%) when paired with its 'correct' English alternative. This paradox is discussed later.

It appears the once viable Nigerian colloquialism 'I'm coming' is on its way out as far as this group of judges are concerned. It received a negligible 0.5% average as its preference score over its BSE equivalent. Infact the retort, 'But you are going', is not an uncommon repartee among Nigerian undergraduates when some one takes a leave with the idiom; 'I'm coming'.

Another usage which attracts comment is 'customer' used to mean vendor. Williams (1984) had postulated its popularity to the Yoruba

comparable usage (onibara). The result shows the usage to be equally popular among the other major language groups accorded the 1st and 2nd ranks by the Efiks and Igbos and only a 3rd by the Yorubas. But all the same, it did not receive a genuine acceptance.

On the whole, it appears that NE idioms have not yet caught on with the category of judges used in the study.

4.7 Hypothesis Validation

It is the contention of this study that NE like other NNEs is suffering from a crisis of attitudinal confidence. It was hypothesized that continued allegiance to BSE, the parent stock from which NE sprank might be at the root of the crisis.

To test this hypothesis, the judges' average performance in the Rating Scale is compared with their average performance in the Use of English Test. That is, their spontaneous acceptance of NE usage when the items were presented by themselves is contrasted with their preference for the same items when paired with BSE equivalents. Table 7 presents the result of the 't' test at the 5% level of significance.

IBRAHIM LIBR

Table 4.7

Comparison of Mean Scores on Ratings and Use of English Tests

Category of Response	N	$\bar{x}$	$S_{\bar{x}D}$	t	df
NE Acceptance (Rating Scale)	400	76.72	5.80	5.15	399
NE Preference (Use of English Test)		46.84			

$\alpha = 0.05$

The 't' value for the difference between the mean scores on NE acceptance on the Ratings Scale and preference for the same usage on the Use of English Test is significant at the 0.05 level. It can therefore be stated that the judges' attitudes to NE usage is affected by their allegiance to BSE. This finding therefore not only confirms the earlier ambivalent attitude towards NE usage (see 4.2) but also specifies the cause of the ambivalence.

4.8 Discussion of Findings

> The prestige of any social science should not be abused by pretending to tell more than it knows (Hymes in Edwards 1976: 18).

This is by way of saying that limitations in the scope and methodology of the study must be

borne in mind in any discussion of the findings. Variables like the size and composition of the sample as well as the nature of the research instruments generally limit the generalizability of conclusions which can be made. There is also the question of usage - quite a hydra-headed notion. The acceptability of any usage is largely dependent on a judge's competence level in the English language, even where English is his subject of study. What about the selection of the items of usage?

Could the inclusion of more neologisms and other culturally determined usages have elicited a higher preference for NE than their BSE equivalents? All these notwithstanding, the usefulness of the findings should not be underrated.

The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. There is a general ambivalent attitude towards NE usage.
2. There was a greater preference for Nigerianisms presented by themselves than Nigerianisms paired with 'correct' BSE alternatives.
3. The rank order of acceptability showed a strong tendency to accept lexical

coinages and reject grammatical items of usage.

4. The NE idioms tested in the study are yet to stabilize.

5. There was a substantial agreement between Education and English Studies students in both their acceptance and rejection of the same items of usage.

6. The judges were very definite in their responses registering a minimal score of uncertainty.

The general ambivalent attitude towards English usage is best interpreted from a political and socio-linguistic points of view. Streven's statement on the social history of the English language in Africa is relevant here:

> For historical reasons, "English" in Africa has generally meant "British English", and until recently there was a tacit assumption that the only appropriate educational target for English teaching was "to make Africans speak like Englishmen" (Strevens, 1969: 19).

Contrary to popular expectations, this attitude still persists today and in no other group is it stronger than among the elite and the category of judges used in the study (English language teacher trainees and English Study students). Infacted

by the local spirit of nationism, the national yearning for linguistic independence, and the liberalness of descriptive linguistics, the judges embrace Nigerianisms on the Rating Scale. But when required to confirm their earlier attitude in the presence of 'correct' English alternatives, their school training in 'correctness' takes over causing the disparity in attitudinal score. The issue of divided usage is not peculiar to NE, but holds true for other NNEs in ESL settings like India, Ghana, Malaysia and Jamaica.

The peculiar case of 'Sorry' observed earlier can now be explained on the basis of this allegiance to a 'correct' English. The usage is one of the 'common errors' or Nigerianisms students have been told to avoid at all costs. But there is no denying the fact that usage changes according to situations and that 'correctness' is not synonymous with appropriateness. So the students who had earlier rejected the 'incorrect' usage in the Rating Scale had to fall back on it in the Use of English Test in spite of the presence of a 'correct' but culturally inappropriate BSE equivalent. This attitude is typical of the 'linguistic hatred' (Labov, 1972) among the elite in NNE settings who

favour circumlocutions and bookish English rather than go 'local' (Ubahakwe, 1972; Sey, 1975; Jibril, 1982).

In their ambivalent attitude, however, the judges did indicate in no uncertain terms, judging from their low 'NOT SURE' score, what should be considered legitimate NE usage. Potential SNE usages are those items which consistently score above 50% in both tests and are systematically chosen in their class. That is, a Nigerianism which is accepted when presented by itself as well as when paired with a correct BSE equivalent and which distribution is not haphazard in its class. For example, 'graduand' (a lexical coinage) which was consistently acceptable (73% vs 53%) as well as 'indigene' (72% vs 70%) and 'academician' (70% vs 74%) both lexical coinages, could be considered possible SNE candidates, but not 'majority' (article deletion) which was consistently accepted (63% vs 54%) and a similar class member, 'few members' (65% vs 41%) failed. If a larger number of such usages are validated in similar tests with other competent judges, a clearer picture of a possible SNE will emerge.

An examination of the data shows that the bulk of such potential SNE usages are lexical coinages

and neologisms. This trend is ir conformity with language nativization process arising out of language contact situations. During such a process, it has been established that lexical items are more amenable to carrying the socio-cultural burden of the new language communities than the syntactic items. This explains why almost all the synhactic items tested in the study failed to pass the acceptability test.

The absence of a significant difference in attitude between Education and English Study students seems to suggest that language teacher trainees are not more pedantic or 'grammatical' in usage than their non-teaching orientated colleagues. There are two possible explanations for this. One is the replacement of prescriptive grammar of old with modern descriptive linguistics in our teacher training colleges. The second is the poor teaching of grammar at the N.C.E. level where all the judges had passed through coupled with their over-rating by their university trainers. For example, some universities exempt their teacher trainees from the Use of English course and others who enforce it omit the fundamentals of grammar on the erroneous assumption that the

judges had been taught them.

The performance of the judges raises two pertinent questions; who should be judge in matters of usage in an ESL setting? and what should constitute acceptable performance? If it could be argued that it takes only a mother to understand the pangs of childbirth, then the researcher submits that there could be no better judges of English usage in an ESL setting than those who are specialists in the subject. Their performance however, will depend on the quality of their training.

Considering the generally dismal state of ELT in this country and the accompanying low competence of students, very stringent conditions of acceptability has to be applied, if anything like a standard is to be achieved. Firstly, any usage with an independent score (Rating Scale) of below 50% should not be considered acceptable. Secondly, such a high score must be confirmed in the presence of a 'correct' English equivalent. Then and only then, could it be taken that the usage was not an error. Finally, the acceptability of the usage must be consistent throughout its class of similar usages.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, TEACHING IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.0 Review

This study was designed to assess current attitudes towards English usage among educated users of English in Nigeria. Its purpose was to investigate the acceptability of certain items of debatable usage in NE with the aim of laying down some guidelines for ELT.

The main thesis of the study was that attitudes towards NE usage are affected by allegiance to BSE, the parent stock from which NE sprang. The specific research problems were:

1. to assess the extent of acceptability of selected items of debatable usage;
2. to measure the consistency of the judges' reactions in the face of a 'correct' English model, i.e. BSE;
3. to estimate the rank order of acceptability of the items of usage;
4. to guage the effect of (a) the judges' subject specialization, and (b) the

order of test batteries presentation on the degree of acceptability; and

5. to ascertain the popularity of some mother-tongue based idioms and expressions across the different language groups of the judges.

To resolve the above problems, the MGT of language attitudes testing was used. It comprised two test batteries: Test 1, a 40 item free response Acceptability Rating Scale designed to elicit spontaneous reactions from the judges. Test 2, a 45 item forced-choice Use of English Test, designed to measure the consistency of the judges' earlier reactions. The two tests were administered on 400 randomly selected penultimate and final year Nigerian undergraduates specializing in Education and/or English. They were drawn from two federal universities - the Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and the University of Calabar, Calabar. The elicited responses were analysed and discussed in chapter four.

5.1 Summary

The summary of the findings are as follows:

1. Attitudes towards NE usage are swayed by allegiance to BSE.

2. This divided loyalty leads to a general ambivalent attitude towards English usage in the society.
3. Nigerianisms presented by themselves are more acceptable than Nigerianisms paired with 'correct' English equivalents.
4. Lexical coinages are more acceptable than structural items of usage.
5. The NE idioms tested in the study are yet to stabilize.
6. Neither the judges' subject of specialization nor the order of the test batteries presentation made any significant difference in attitudes towards NE usage.
7. Attitudes towards NE whether favourable or unfavourable are very definite judging from the minimal score of uncertainty.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it would appear that the majority of usages that pass for NE are actually developmental errors accruing from the imperfect mastery of the English linguistic system by the learners. However,

genuine creative usages of the English language fashioned to accomodate the Nigerian socio-cultural experience do exist. Such usages are consistently preferred by educated users to the 'correct' BSE equivalents.

The absence of any absolute truths about usage should be understood in the light of the complexity of the issue at stake. Attitudes to usage arise from a number of conflicting factors like conservatism, liberalness, pedantry, myth and linguistic competence of the users.

5.3 Implications for English Language Teaching

Bearing in mind the limitations of the study and the controversial nature of usage, the following guidelines on the teaching of English usage are offered not as dogmas but as recommendations. The aim is to guard the teacher of English, who must of necessity be prescriptive in an NNE setting like Nigeria, against arbitrariness, prejudice and pontification.

5.3.1 Teacher's Objectivity

The first enemy of ELT is the teacher of English himself. Very often teachers of English are accused, and with some justice too, of lack

of curiosity about the language they teach once they have 'made it'. The few who bother to refresh their knowledge of linguistic facts turn to outdated school notes. It therefore becomes imperative for every teacher of English to be informed about current usage and attitudes to usage if he is to function as an objective language policeman. As a policeman he doesn't make the rules, usage does it, and he merely enforces them. Apart from the limited information offered by a study such as the present one, he can consult relevant ELT journals, a good dictionary, as well as keep his ears and eyes open so as to adopt the expected neutrally objective stance. Otherwise, he may find his recommendations quite irrelevant in the face of actual usage in society.

5.3.2 Correctness vs Appropriateness

In teaching 'correct' usage, the teacher of English should be careful not to equate correctness with appropriateness. There are certain 'incorrect' usages coined to meet the peculiar Nigerian socio-cultural setting. For example, while informing his students that the 'correct' expression of sympathy for an English friend who has slipped on a wet floor is 'Do be careful...'

at the same time he should not fail to point out that saying the same to an elder who has spilled his snuff would be regarded as insolence. The appropriate usage for the latter is 'sorry'.

Other examples include the use of the plural form of the pronoun in addressing an elder or superior among the Yorubas, as in:

'They said I should greet you Sir'

'Who?'

'Uncle Ayo, Sir'

Also because of the Nigerian socio-cultural background where age is referred, young people find it difficult to say, Hi! or Hello! to their elders, preferring the honorific 'Sir' or Madam. It is also not unusual for a student to address his father in a letter as My dear Sir. Wives have also been known to address their husbands as Sirs. Polite adjuncts like kindly and please are common usages among Nigerians where the English would consider them redundant as in:

Kindly lend me your pen.

Please, may I come in?

Semantic extensions of kinship terms is peculiar to the Nigerian English language scene. Mummy or mother is a common name for a female

adult, while brother, uncle, auntie need not necessarily be blood relations.

The term half brother/sister is frowned upon in family circles because of its overtone of consanquineous alienation or illegitimacy. In the same view, an indigene is preferrable to a native by virture of the latter being considered derogatory.

The WAEC also distinguishes between correctness and appropriateness. Section A of the English Language Paper I, requires the candidate to choose between a formal and an informal letter. The marking scheme expects 'correct' usage for the formal letter, and favours colloquialisms which may seem 'incorrect' usage to purists for the informal letter. A candidate who mixes his registers is penalized.

For example, colloquialisms and pet names are allowed in the salutation:

> Hi!Ify, Hello! Bob Alingo, Suzi Baby.

In the body of the letter sentence fragments are preferred:

> Got yours two days ago (I got your letter two days ago)
>
> Hope you're OK. (I hope you are fine)
>
> Not to worry (I say you are not to worry)
>
> See you (I will see you later).

Also expected are phrasal verbs and slangs:

Trip is put off (postponed)

Don't give up (surrender)

I'll call on Bob (pay Bob a visit)

There'll be ebo tomorrow (a party)

Long time no see (It's ages since we met)

Interjections are common features in the ending:

Cheers! or Cheerio!, Au revoir!,

Ciao!, So long!

It is these kinds of distinctions in usage that the teacher should be aware of so as to train his students to use the proper word at the proper place.

5.3.3 Creative vs Deviant Usage

Even though it is in the nature of any transplanted language to adapt to its new socio-cultural environment, it must be pointed out that not every NE usage is an index of this linguistic versatility. Due largely to the failure of ELT, a lot of the so-called NE usages are deviants. As revealed in the study, the student who uses, 'Isn't it?' as a universal question tag, 'see ourselves' for, see each other, 'customer' for vendor, or 'Yes, I haven't' to mean No, I haven't, is very often exhibiting linguistic incompetence.

The moment he is presented with the 'correct' English equivalents he abandons the so-called NE usages.

Other instances of errors which students should be told to avoid include:

Pluralization of mass nouns:

furnitures, luggages, equipments,

informations, baggages, meats, properties.

Collapsed semantic boundaries:

Borrow me your book.

Learn me your language

I buy from my customer.

Progressi ization of stative verbs:

I am having your book.

Are you thinking that I am a liar?

We are doubting your story.

You are not believing me

Mother-tongue induced usages:

Is this your eye?

Remove your eyes from other peoples property.

That car has really suffered me.

Did you hear that smell?

My car battery is dead.

Extend my greetings to Udo and others.

I met your absence.

Redundancy:

return it back, repeat again, should in case, beef meat, showerbath, climinate out.

But alongside the deviants are genuine NE usages fashioned to carry the burden of our Nigerianess. For example, the English monogamous society had no adequate vocabulary for the additional wives a polygamous Nigerian might marry, so the word 'co-wife' was coined. Such a usage will be preferred even when paired with a 'correct' BSE equivalent. Also included in this category are usages like:

indigene (native)
invitee (invited guest)
graduand (graduating student)
complimentary card (visiting card)
beer parlour (pub)
hot drink (spirit)
executive chair (upholstered seat)
standing fan (pedestal fan)
townsman (compatriot)
You meet us well (join us at table)
He is not on seat (not at his post)
Welldone (weldone?) Ade (keep it up).

The above indicates that legitimate NE usages are not occasional errors but consistent and appropriate usages. The list is by no means exhaustive. The teacher of English must therefore be on his guard to sift the pedagogical wheat from the socio-linguistic chaff.

5.3.4 Acceptability vs International Intelligibility

The acceptability of NE cannot be divorced from the notion of intelligibility since the former subsumes the latter. What most Nigerian scholars kick against is the 'bogey' of international intelligibility which they regard as disguised neo-colonialism (Banjo, 1979; Adetugbo, 1982).

But as long as English remains a medium of international exchange, and if the desired NSE is to hold its own against other world standards, the teacher of English should see international intelligibility not as a threat, but as an incentive to aim at clarity and freshness of expression. By paying a little more attention to his vocabulary and sentence structure in class, as well as drawing the line between bad NE and linguistically creative variants, he should be able to see his students through the labyrinth of usage in an intranationally and internationally acceptable way.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The study was aimed at ascertaining the attitudes of educated users of English towards NE usage. The judges used in the study constitute only a category of the target population. There is need then to conduct the same test with other segments of the population like English language examiners, writers, editors of reputable national papers and magazines, and graduate teachers of English to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

Furthermore an enlarged corpus of usage and a wider population sampling could yield more reliable information. More items of usage in each category could be included to validate the consistency of the acceptability scores. With more funds from say the universities or the National Language Centre more institutions could be sampled.

Besides the sequencing of the situational domains of acceptability could be altered to say Speech (Formal/Informal); Writing (Formal/Informal) to verify whether the decline in acceptability from informal to formal settings (see 4.1) was a function of the sequencing of the situational settings or a confirmation of a natural tendency to be less

fastidious in usage in informal settings than formal ones (Joos, 1967).

Finally, it might be worthwhile to use similar tests to validate the findings of the present study.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, A.A. et al (1982). Nigerianisms in English: An Attitudinal Survey. Unpublished B.Ed. Project, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Achebe, C. (1975). Morning Yet on Creation Day. Heinemann, London.

Adekunle, M.A. (1974). The Standard Nigerian English in Sociolinguistic Perspective. Journal of Nigeria English Association, 6 (1): 24 - 37.

Adeniran, A. (1974). A Functionalistic View of Stylistic Restrictions in Nigerian English. Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association, 6 (1): 15 - 23.

Adesanoye, F. (1980). Patterns of Deviations in Written English in Nigeria. Journal of Language Arts and Communication, 1 (1): 53 - 65.

Adetugbo, A. (1977a). Nigerian English: Fact or Fiction. Lagos Notes and Records 6: 128-41.

_____ (1977b). Nigerian English Phonology: Is there any standard? Research Papers in Linguistic Sciences 5: 1-20.

_____ (1980). Appropriateness and Nigerian English. West African Journal of Education, 21 (2): 72-91.

Adetugbo, A. and Awonusi, S. (1983). Americanisms in Nigerian English: Paper presented at the Third Annual International Conference on African Literature and the English Language. University of Calabar, 3-7 May.

Adeyanju, T.K. (1981). Is Nigerian English a Realistic Model to Teach? Paper presented at the Sixteenth IATEFL Conference. Goldsmith College, London University, 18-21 December.

Agheyisi, R. and Fishman, J.A. (1974). Language Attitudes Studies: A Brief Survey of Methodological Approaches. Anthropological Linguistics, 12: 131-157.

Akere, F. (1977). Grammatical Competence and Communicative Competence in Relation to the Users of English as a Second Language. Lagos Review of English Studies 1: 65-76.

_____ (1980). Functional Variation and the Communicative Use of English in Nigeria. Lagos Review of English Studies 2: 19-39.

Alatis, J. (Ed.) (1970). Georgetown Monographs in Language and Linguistics, No. 22. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C.

Allport, E.H. (1924). Attitudes. In: Fishbein, D. (Ed.) (1967). Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Wiley, New York.

Allport, G.W. (1954). Attitudes Theory. In: Lindzey, J. Addison-Wesley, Cambridge, Mass.

Baker, E. (1970). Contemporary English. Pitman, London.

Baker, S.J. (1945). The Australian Language. Angus and Robertson, Sydney.

Bagozzi, R.P. (1981). Attitudes, Intentions and Behaviour: A Test of some key Hypotheses: Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41: 607-627.

Bailey, R.W. and Robinson, J.L. (1973). Varieties of Present Day English. Macmillan, New York.

Bamgbose, A. (1971). The English Language in Nigeria. In: Spencer, J. (Ed.) The English Language in West Africa. Longman, London, pp. 35-48.

Banjo, L.A. (1969). The Standard Nigerian Spoken English: Paper presented at the Conference of the West African Linguistic Society, Abidjan.

_____(1971). Standards of Correctness in Nigerian English. West African Journal of Education, 12 (2): 123-127.

_____(1979). Beyond Intelligibility: A Presidential Address. In: Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.), Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 10-15.

_____(1970). The English Language and the Nigerian Environment. Journal of Nigeria English Association, 4 (1): 45-51.

Baugh, A.C. and Cable, T. (1978). A History of the English Language. (3rd Edition). Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Birnie, J.R. (1981). Ghanaian English - the shape of things to come. In: Banjo,,A. et al. (Eds.) West African Studies in Modern Language Teaching and Research, pp. 128-136.

Boadi, L.A. et al (1968). Grammatical Structure and its Teaching. African Universities Press, Lagos.

Bourhis, R.Y. (1983). Language Attitudes and Self-Reports of French-English Language Usage in Quebec. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4 (2&3): 163-180.

Bourhis, R.Y. and Giles, H. (1976). The Language of Cooperation in Wales. Language Sciences, 42: 13-16.

_____ (1977). The Language of Intergroup Distinctiveness. In: Giles, H. (Ed.). Language Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations. Academic Press, London.

Bourhis, R.Y. et al. (1973). Language as a Determinant of Welsh Identity. European Journal of Social Psychology, 3: 447-460.

Bourhis, R.Y. et al. (1975). Social Consequences of Accomodating one's Style of Speech. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 6: 53-71.

Boyson, R. (1975). Politics of the Left and the English Language. In: Hudson, K. (1977). The Dictionary of Diseased English. Macmillan, London, pp. xvi.

Briere, E.J. (1968). A Psycholinguistic Study of Phonological Interference. Mouton, The Hague.

Brook, G.L. (1973). Varieties of English. Macmillan, London.

Brosnahan, L.B. (1958). English in Southern Nigeria. English Studies, 3: 97-110.

Broughton, G. et al. (1978). Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Bynon, T. (1977). Historical Linguistics. Longmans, London.

Cassidy, F.J. (1966). Jamaica Talk: Three Hundred Years of the English Language in Jamaica, Macmillan, London.

Chomsky, N. (1957). Syntactic Structures. Mouton, The Hague.

Cohen, A.R. (1960). Attitudinal Consequences of Induced Discrepancies between Cognition and Behaviour. In: Fishbein, J. (Ed.) (1967). Reading in Attitude Theory and Measurement. Wiley, New York.

Cohen, A.D. (1974). Judgements about Language Varieties. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 3: 33-51.

Cooper, R.L. (1975). Introduction to Language Attitudes. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 6: 5-9.

Corder, S.P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 4 (4): 161-170.

_____(1973). Introducing Applied Linguistics. Penguin Harmondsworth.

Cottle, B. (1975). The Plight of English. David and Charles, Vancouver.

Crystal, D. and Davy, D. (1969). Investigating English Style. Longman, London.

Dean, L.F. and Wilson, K.G. (Eds.) (1963). Essays on Language and Usage. (2nd Edition) Oxford University Press, New York.

Drake, C. (1977). The Role of Prescriptivism in American Linguistics, 1820-1970. John Benjamin, Amsterdam.

Droba, D.D. (1933). The Nature of Attitude. Journal of Social Psychology, 4: 444-463.

Dunstan, E. (Ed.) (1969). Twelve Nigerian Languages. Longman, London.

Edwards, A.D. (1976). Language in Culture and Class. Heinemann, London.

Edwards, J.R. (1982). Language Attitudes and their implications amongst.English Speakers. In: Ryan, E. and Giles, H. (Eds.) Attitudes Towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts. Edward Arnold, London, pp. 128-136.

Egbe, D.I. (1979). Spoken and Written English in Nigeria. In: Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.) Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 86-106.

Eka, D. (1979). A Contrastive Study of Efik and English Phonology. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

_____ (1983). Towards and Analysis of a Model of Educated Spoken Nigerian English. Paper presented at the Third Annual International Conference on African Literature and the English Language. University of Calabar, 3-7 May.

_____ (1985). Standard Nigerian English Phonology. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Ekong, P. (1980). Investigations into the Intelligibility of a possible Standard Model for Nigerian Spoken English. Journal of Language Arts and Communication, 1 (1): 1-11.

_____ (1982). The Use of an Indigenous Model for Teaching English in Nigeria: World Language English. 1 (2): 87-92.

Ekpenyong, J.O. (1965). The Use of English in Nigeria. In: Press, J. (Ed.) Commonwealth Literature. Heinemann, London, pp. 144-150.

Essien, O.E. (1970). Nigerian English. Insight, 13-14.

_____ (1977). The Role of the English Language in our Development. African Development Studies, 71-83.

Fishman, J.A. (Ed.) (1968). Readings in the Sociology of Language. Mouton, The Hogue.

Fishman, J. et al (Eds.) (1968). Language Problems of Developing Nations. Wiley, New York.

_____ (Eds.) (1977). The Spread of English. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.

Follett, W. (1966). Modern American Usage. Edited and completed by Jacques Barzun et al. Longman, London.

Foster, B. (1968). The Changing English Language. Macmillan, London.

Francis, W.N. (1968). The Structure of American English. The Ronald Press, New York.

Gardner, R. and Lambert, W.E. (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass.

Giglioli, P.P. (Ed.) (1972). Language and Social Context. Selected Readings. Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Giles, H. and Powesland, P.F. (1975). Speech Styles and Social Evaluation. Academic Press, London.

Gower, L.C.B. (1967). Independent Africa: The Challenge of the Legal Profession. Havard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Gowers, E. (1973). The Complete Plain Words. Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Greenbaum, S. and Quirk, R. (1970). Elicitation Experiments in English. Linguistic Studies in Use and Attitude. Longman, London.

Grieve, D.W. (1964). English Language Exepining. African Universities Press, Lagos.

_____ (1971). English Language Problems in West Africa. West African Journal of Education, 10 (2): 44-51.

Guildford, J.P. (1954). Response Biases and Response Sets. In: Psychometric Methods. (2nd Edition). McGraw-Hill, New York, pp. 216-223.

Hall, R.A. (1950). Leave Your Language Alone! revised as Linguistics and Your Language (1960). Anchor, New York.

_____ (1964). Introductory Linguistics. Chilton, Philadelphia.

Halliday, M.A.K. et al (1964). The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. Longman, London.

Hansford, K. et al (1976). Studies in Nigerian Languages. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Accra.

Haugen, E. (1938). Language and Immigration: In: Dil, A. (Ed.) (1972). The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen. Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 123-128.

Hudson, K. (1977). The Dictionary of Diseased English. Macmillan, London.

Huygens, I. et al (1983). Language Attitudes Ethnicity and Social Class in New Zealand. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development. 4 (2&3): 207-224.

Jibril, M. (1979). Regional Variation in Nigerian Spoken English. In: Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.) Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 43-53.

_____ (1982). Phonological Variation in Nigerian English. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Lancaster.

_____ (1982a). Nigerian English: An Introduction. In: Pride, J. (Ed.). New Englishes. Newbury House, Rowley, Mass, pp. 73-84.

Joos, M. (1967). The Five Clocks. Harcourt, Brace and World, New York.

Karchru, B.B. (1965). The Indianness in Indian English. Word, 21: 31-57.

_____ (1966). Indian English: A Study in Contextualization. In: Bazell, C. et al (Eds.) In Memory of J.R. Firth. Longman, London, pp. 255-287.

_____ (1969). English in South Asia. In: Sebeok, T. (Ed.) Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. 5, South Asia. Mouton, The Hague, pp. 73-88.

_____ (1976). Models of English for the Third World: White man's linguistic burden or language pragmatics? TESOL Quarterly 10 (2): 221-239.

_____ (1981). The Pragmatics of Non-Native Varieties of English. In: Smith, L. (Ed.) English for Cross-Cultural Communication. Macmillan, London, pp. 15-39.

Kirk-Greene, A. (1971). The Influence of West African Languages on English. In: Spencer, J. (Ed.). The English Language in West West Africa. Longman, London, pp. 123-144.

Labov, W. (1970). The Logic of Non-Standard English. In: Alatis, J. (Ed.) Georgetown Monographs in Language and Linguistics No. 22. Georgetown University Press, Washington, D.C., pp. 12-28.

_____ (1972). The Study of Language in its Social Context. In: Pride, J. and Holmes, P. (Eds.) Sociolinguistics. Penguin, Harmondsworth, pp. 5-17..

Lambert, W.E. (1972). A Social Psychology of Bilingualism. In: Pride, J. and Holmes, R. (Eds.) Sociolinguistics. Penguin, Harmondsworth, pp. 65-76.

Labert, W.E. et al. (1965). Evaluational Reactions of Jewish and Arabic Adolescents to Dialect and Language Variation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2: 84-90.

_____ (1960). Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages. Journal of Social and Abnormal Psychology, 60: 44-51.

Lewis, E.G. (1975). Attitude to Language among Bilingual Children and Adults in Wales. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 4: 103-121.

Lindfors, B. (1971). Yoruba and Igbo Prose Styles in English. Black Orpheus 2 (7): 21-30.

Lyons, J. (1968). Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, London.

Mathews, M.M. (1931). The Beginnings of American English: Essays and Comments. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

McGregor, G.P. (1971). English in Africa. Heinemann, London.

McGuire, W.J. (1969). The Nature of Attitude and Attitude Change. In: Lindzey, J. and Aronson, P. (Eds.) Handbook of Social Psychology (Vol. 3) Addison - Wesley, Reading, pp. 154-161.

Moag, R.F. and Moag, L.B. (1977). English in Fiji. Fiji English Teachers' Journal, 13, 2-26.

Moore, G. (1969). The Chosen Tongue: English Writing in the Tropical World. Longman, London.

Morris, E.E. (1898). Austral English. MacMillan

Mukherjee, M. (1971). The Twice-born Fiction: Themes and Techniques of the Indian Novel in English. Heinemann, London.

Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9 (2): 115-123.

Newcomb, T.M. (1953). Personality and Social Change. Dryden, New York.

Nuttal, C.E. (1971). Phonological Interference of Hausa with English: A Study in English as a Second Language. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Manchester.

Cbanya, P. et al (1979). An Empirical Study of the Acceptability of Four Accents of Spoken English in Nigeria. In: Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.) Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 242-256.

C'Donnell, W.R. and Todd, L. (1980). Variety in Contemporary English. George Allen & Unwin, London.

Cdumuh, A.E. (1981). Aspects of the Semantics and Syntax of Educated Nigerian English. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

_____ (1984). Dilemma of the Nigerian Teacher of English. Saiwa 2: 42-53.

Clagoke, D.O. (1981). Lexical Deviations in Nigerian English. Journal of Language Arts and Communication, 2 (2&3): 35-57.

Orstein, J. (1974). A Sociolinguistic Study on Southwest Bilingualism: A Status Report. In: Bills, T. (Ed.) Southwest Areal Linguistics. Institute for Cultural Pluralism, San Diego, pp. 124-130.

Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the English Language. In: Hudson, K. (1977). The Dictionary of Diseased English. Macmillan, London, pp. xx.

Osisanya, D. (1979). Register in Oral Discourse: A Contrastive Study. In: Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.). Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 230-241.

Oskamp, S. (1977). Attitudes and Opinions. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

Osgood, C.E. (1957). Method and Theory in Experimental Psychology. Oxford University Press, New York.

Partridge, E. (1947). Usage and Abusage. Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Partridge, E. and Clark, J.W. (1951). British and American English Since 1900. Longman, London.

Perren, G.E. and Holloway, M.F. (1965). Language and Communication in the Commonwealth. C.E.L.C./H.M.S.O., London.

Prator, C.P. (1968). The British Heresy in TESL. In: Fishman, J. et al (Eds.). Language Problems in Developing Nations. Wiley, New York, pp. 35-46.

Price, S. et al (1983). The Effects of Testing Bilingual Pre-Adolescents' Attitudes Towards Welsh and Varieties of English. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 4 (2&3): 149-62.

Quirk, R. (1962). The Use of English. Longman, London.

_____(1972). The English Language and Images of Matter. Oxford University Press, London.

Ramson, W.S. (1966). Australian English: An Historical Study of the Vocabulary 1788-1898. Australian University Press, Canberra.

_____ (Ed.) (1970). English Transported: Essays on Australian English. Australian University Press, Canberra.

Raven, B.H. (1959). Social Influence on Opinions. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 58: 119-29.

Razran, G.H. (1938). Conditioning Away Social Bias. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 54: 80-86.

_____(1979). Rhetorical and Communicative Styles in the New Varieties of English. Language Learning 29 (1): 1-25.

Ryan, E.B. and Giles, H. (Eds.) (1982). Attitudes Towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts. Edward Arnold, London.

Salami, A. (1968). Defining a "Standard Nigerian English". Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association, 2 (2): 99-106.

Sampson, G.P. and Richards, J.C. (1973). Learner Language Systems. Language Sciences, 26 18-24.

Schacter, S. (1951). Deviation, Rejection and Communication: Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46: 190-207.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10 (3): 209-231.

Sey, K. (1973). Ghanaian English. Macmillan, London.

Sharp, D. et al (1973). Attitudes to Welsh and English in the Schools of Wales. Macmillan, London.

Smith, L.E. (Ed.) (1981). English for Cross Cultural Communication. Macmillan, London.

Spencer, J. (Ed.) (1971). The English Language in West Africa. Longman, London.

St. Clair, R.N. (1982). From Social History to Language Attitudes. In: Ryan, E. and Giles, H. (Eds.) Attitudes Towards Language Variation: Social and Applied Contexts. Edward Arnold, London. pp. 50-57.

Strevens, P. (1969). English in African Education: What kind of English? In: Jolly, F. (Ed.) Education in Africa: Research and Action Kenya: Heinemann, Kenya, pp. 90-96.

_____ (1978b). English as an International Language: When is a Local Form of English Suitable for ELT Purposes? In English as an International Language. ETIC, London, pp pp. 84-90.

_____ (1978d). English for International and Intra-national Purposes: A Shift in Linguistic Perspectives. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics 4 (1): 91-98.

_____ (1980). Teaching English as an International Language. Pergamon Press, Oxford.

Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.) (1979). Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan.

Tamuno, T.N. (1979). Vice-Chancellor's Address to the Ninth Annual NESA Conference. In Ubahakwe, E. (Ed.). Varieties and Functions of English in Nigeria. African Universities Press, Ibadan, pp. 5-9.

Taylor, D.M. et al (1977). Threat to Ethnic Identity and Second Language Learning. In: Giles, H. and St. Clair (Eds.) (1979). Language and Social Psychology. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 124-130.

Thompson, P.D. (1963). The English in the Commonwealth Nigeria. English Language Teaching, 17 (4): 152-158.

Tiffen, B.W. (1974). The Intelligibility of Nigerian English. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of London.

Triandis, H.C. (1971). Attitude and Attitude Change. Wiley, New York.

Trifonovitch, G. (1981). English as an International Language: An Attitudinal Approach. In Smith, L. (Ed.) English for Cross Cultural Communication. Macmillan, London, pp. 211-219.

Turner, G.W. (1966). The English Language in Australia and New Zealand. Longman, London.

Weinreich, U. (1968). Languages in Contact. (6th Printing). Mouton, The Hague.

Whinnom, K. (1971). Linguistic Hybridization. In: Hymes, D. (Ed.). Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Cambridge University Press, London, pp. 97-106.

Williams, C.H. (1979). Language Contact and Language Change in Wales. In: Giles, H. and Saint-Jacques (Eds.) Language and Ethnic Relations. Pergamon, Oxford, pp. 242-259.

Williams, D. (1981a). Standard Nigerian English: An Attitudinal Perspective. In: Readings in Language and Language Teaching Methods. Institute of Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

_____(1981b). Attitudes Towards Varieties of Nigerian Spoken English. In: Readings in Language and Language Teaching Methods. Institute of Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

_____(1984). Acceptability of Nigerian English for Academic Purposes. Paper presented at Staff Seminar, Faculty of Education, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Wood, F.T. (1961). Current English Usage. Macmillan, London.

LITERARY SOURCES

Books:

Achebe, C. (1960). No Longer At Ease. Heinemann, London.

_____ (1966). Man of the People. Heinemann, London.

_____ (1974). Arrow of God. (2nd Edition) Heinemann, London.

Amadi, E. (1966). The Concubine. Heinemann, London.

_____ (1969). The Great Ponds. Heinemann, London.

Nwankwo, N. (1964). Danda. Heinemann, London.

_____ (1975). My Mercedes is Bigger than Yours. Andre Deutch, London.

Nwapa, F. (1966). Efuru. Heinemann, London.

_____ (1970). Idu. Heinemann, London.

NESA Journals

JNESA. Vol.2, No.1, (1968).

_____ Vol.4, No.1, (1970).

_____ Vol.6, Nos.1 and 2, (1974).

_____ Vol.8, No.1, (1976).

Magazines and Newspapers

Newsweek. November, 15, (1982), pp. 42-48.

Reader's Digest. December, (1980), pp. 50-51.

_____ August, (1982), pp. 37-38.

The Guardian (Lagos) (1982 - 1983).

National Concord (Lagos) (1982 - 1983).

Sunday Concord (Lagos) (1982 - 1983).

APPENDIX I

ACCEPTABILITY RATING TEST

A. Please supply the following information about yourself.

1. Sex_____ 2. Age_____
3. Course/Year of Study_____
4. Qualifications, e.g. WASC, Grade II, NCE, GCE A/L_____
5. Nationality_____
6. First Language_____
7. Other Nigerian Languages spoken_____

B. The following expressions contain underlined items of grammar and vocabulary which you may or may not consider acceptable as a standard for English Language usage in Nigeria. Paying attention to the notion of appropriateness, you are asked to rate each of the underlined items according to whether you consider it acceptable (in informal and/or formal situations as spoken (S) or written (W) form, or unacceptable in any situation. You should indicate those instances where you are not sure. Your reactions should be indicated by a tick (✓) in the appropriate column(s).

	ACCEPTABLE				Not Sure	Unacceptable
	Informal		Formal			
	S	W	S	W		
1. Lagos could have been a nice place but for the frustrating go-slow						
2. Nigerian science teachers are always complaining about lack of equipments						
3. Today is Friday. Let's meet next-tomorrow after service						
4. Since all the invitees are here, I feel we could start.						
5. The Pro-Chancellor in his address, urged the academicians to shun politics.						
6. I will advise you to see a native doctor						
7. I am doubting whether we can make Kaduna in thirty minutes.						
8. All Nigerian should join hands with the government and make WAI a success.						
9. The Dean tripped as he was mounting the rostrum and the assembly chorused, 'Sorry Sir'						
10. Only few members turned up for the meeting.						
11. My wife has taken in inspite of the I.U.D.						

	ACCEPTABLE				NOT SURE	UNACCEP-TABLE
	Infor- mal		Formal			
	S	W	S	W		
12. We have already decorated our parlour for Christmas. How about yours?						
13. Complimentary cards are very popular these days. Even the smallest business has one.						
14. The G.M. is not on seat. You can call back later in the day.						
15. I called at your office this morning, but I met your absence.						
16. You haven't broken that plate, have you? Yes, I haven't.						
17. Indigenes are not entitled to warm clothing allowance.						
18. Welldone Ade, I didn't know you were the one sweeping.						
19. Each graduand is allowed to invite two guests.						
20. 'I'm coming' she said to the visitors as she left the room briefly.						
21. We really enjoyed at the picnic.						
22. WAI will not succeed because majority of Nigerians are unpatriotic.						
23. Hello Peter, Is this your eye?						

	ACCEPTABLE				NOT SURE	UNACCEPTABLE
	Informal		Formal			
	S	W	S	W		
24. I can see that you are not believing me.						
25. The driver asked the reluctant passengers to shift for one more person on the already over-crowded back seat.						
26. You mean you didn't know Zorro is a money-doubler?						
27. I lost all my luggages to thieves at the airport						
28. You 'll have to manage with the little you have. Times are hard.						
29. No wonder Mary is laughing with all her teeth, her husband has been elected Governor.						
30. If you buy consistently from one customer, he will take advantage of you.						
31. The meeting was declared opened by Mrs. Okoh, the chair-lady.						
32. I have decided to follow Jesus. What of you?						
33. We'll need a nanny very soon. My wife has put to bed.						
34. That your room mate is very lousy.						

	ACCEPTABLE				NOT SURE	UNACCEP. TABLE
	Infor- mal		Formal			
	S	W	S	W		
35. We haven't seen <u>ourselves</u> for the past two years.						
36. You are late for that lecture, <u>isn't it?</u>						
37. Please don't tell Amaebo, you know she is a terrible <u>gossiper</u>.						
38. Our <u>co-wife</u> is a very difficult person to get along with.						
39. A marriage can never succeed when husband and wife do not love <u>themselves</u>						
40. I have <u>checked</u> for that book everywhere, but I can't find it.						

APPENDIX II

USE OF ENGLISH TEST

A. Please supply the following information about yourself.

1. Sex_____ 2.Age _____
3. Course/Year of Study_____
4. Qualifications, e.g. WASC, Grade II, NCE, GCE A/L_____
5. Nationality_____
6. First Language_____
7. Other Nigerian Languages spoken_____

B. Each of the sentences in this test is to be completed by selecting one of the two alternatives given (a or b). Indicate your choice by putting a circle round the appropriate letter.

1. We expressed the hope that we would se _____ again. (a) ourselves (b) one another
2. We_____ with the kids to Lagos for Christmas shopping.
   (a) travelled (b) went
3. Thanks for inviting me. I couldn't have_____ more.
   (a) enjoyed (b) enjoyed myself

4. Mr. Ojo lost all his money this morning to a _____

(a) money-doubler (b) swindler

5. All____ are please requested to remain behind.

(a) invitees (b) invited guests.

6. _____ television gives better pictures than black and white.

(a) colour (b) coloured

7. The later Professor Awojobi was one of our best_____

(a) academics (b) academicians

8. _____ will be the death of me.

(a) That my son (b) That son of mine

9. Kola looks very happy this morning. I'm sure his wife_____

(a) has put to bed (b) has been delivered of a baby

10. I am going for tennis_____

(a) How about you? (b) What of you?

11. Mum hasn't finished cooking yet, has she?_____

(a) Yes, she hasn't (b) No, she hasn't.

12. It is surprising that after ten years of independence the_____ are yet to take over from the expatriates.

(a) indigenes (b) natives

13. We were in the _____ watching television when the robbers struck.
    (a) parlour (b) living room

14. I can see that you have been busy keeping the yard clean,_____
    (a) Welldone (b) Keep it up.

15. All_____ should be seated by 10.00 a.m.
    (a) graduands (b) graduating students.

16. _____, she said to the visitors as she left the room briefly.
    (a) 'Excuse me for a minute' (b)'I' am coming'

17. Where have you been? We have_____ everywhere for you.
    (a) checked (b) looked.

18. Good neighbours should always help_____
    (a) themselves (b) each other.

19. The car belongs to John_____ at the factory.
    (a) a co-worker (b) a colleague

20. I can't stand that woman. She is a _____
    (a) cheater (b) cheat

21. You are going with Amina_____?
    (a) isn't it (b) aren't you

22. There is a terrible____ at Kowa street.
    (a) go-slow (b) traffic hold up.

23. Our problem in this school is inadequate____
    (a) equipment (b) equipments

24. Today is Friday. Let's meet_____ after service.

(a) next tomorrow (b) the day after tomorrow

25. Why don't we stop for a drink at that_____ by the bridge.

(a) beer parlour (b) pub

26. I will advise you to see_____

(a) a herbalist (b) a native doctor

27. _____ ___ my integrity?

(a) Are you doubting (b) Do you doubt

28. The secretary urged all members of the Youth Club to_____ with his government to make the project a success.

(a) join hands (b) co-operate

29. Da, I heard you lost your father_____

(a) Sorry (b) What a shame

30. Only_____ men can appreciate the problem of women. (a) few (b) a few

31. I won't wed her until she_____

(a) takes in (b) becomes pregnant

32. A salesman called while you were out, but unfortunately I've lost the ____ he gave me.

(a) complimentary card (b) visiting card

33. We called at the palace to see the Emir, but unfortunately_____

(a) we met his absence (b) he was not in.

34. Any civil servant who is not____ by 7.30 a.m. should be dismissed.
(a) on seat (b) at his post

35. I have not_____ any breakfast this morning.
(a) taken (b) eaten

36. _____ of members were absent from the meeting. (a) Majority (b) The majority

37. My car battery is ____ and I can't afford a new one now. (a) dead (b) flat

38. Hello, Toks old boy_____
(a) It's been ages (b) Is this your eye?

39. I am surprised dear that you_____ me.
(a) are not believing (b) do not believe

40. They all refused to____ for the late comer.
(a) shift (b) make room

41. The car can't take all your_____
(a) luggages (b) luggage

42. She___ when she was given the admission letter.
(a) was all smiles (b) laughing with all her teeth

43. I stopped buying from my regular____ when I discovered that he is a cheat.
(a) customer (b) vendor

44. Our____ for the evening is Dr. Mrs. Bassey.
(a) Chair-lady (b) Chairperson

45. I'm afraid you'll have to ____ with cold water, as I have no more drink in the house.
(a) manage (b) make do