The University of Nairobi Journal of Language and Linguistics, Vol. 9 (2022), 1-26

WHICH RP SHOULD WE TEACH IN KENYAN SCHOOLS: BRITISH RP OR "KENYAN-INDIGENISED RP"?

Alfred Buregeya
University of Nairobi

For at least three decades now, some Kenyan linguists have been advocating the teaching of a local, Kenyan accent of English, instead of the British English accent commonly known as Received Pronunciation, RP. Their key argument is that RP as a model cannot simply be achieved as an educational goal in Kenya because a local, widespread, and stable pronunciation has developed in Kenya. The present paper joins the fray of this argument by justifying it in greater detail and basing it on updated information on the status of RP. At the core of this expanded justification are two main observations: firstly, the traditional inventory of RP sounds that has all long been taught in Kenya now is a confusing list across British English dictionaries and linguists' publications, as a result of the changes it has undergone in Britain: in some cases "new" vowel phonemes have been added by some, while in others one or two phonemes have been "replaced" with others. Secondly, and more importantly, Kenyan English usage has significantly simplified the various segmental and suprasegmental aspects of British RP, so much so that it does not make much sense to continue using it as the reference for teaching and examination. Nonetheless, the paper also stresses the fact that despite all this British RP still enjoys a mythical status among very many Kenyan linguists, teachers of English and decision-makers, and, hence, cannot simply be wished away. That is why the paper proposes that what should be taken as the reference in Kenyan schools, for being a good reflection of mainstream Kenyan English pronunciation, should be labelled "Kenyan-indigenised RP", given the extent of its simplification.

Key words: Received Pronunciation (RP), British English, Kenyan English (KenE), accent, simplified

1. INTRODUCTION

Without being explicitly referred to as RP (for "Received Pronunciation" — a phrase which is less known than its abbreviation), this is the recommended model for teaching and practising the sounds of English in Kenyan schools. Thus, for instance,

one textbook of the Kenyan Institute of Education (1987: xi) lists, under the heading "Sounds of English", the twenty vowel phonemes of RP as can be found in Roach's (2009: x), for example. It is the very sounds that are indeed meant to be practised by students in that and other books recommended for Kenyan secondary schools. Yet, for at least decades already, keen observers and students of the Kenyan English accent have argued against continuing to use RP as the model in schools, suggesting that it was a waste of time. Okombo (1987: 54) wrote that "We believe that [Stigma Free Kenyan English] stands the best chance of being the local standard should Kenyans decide to use a local model in their English teaching". In the same vein, Ragutu (1993: 46) wrote:

> In conclusion, I would like to assert that it should not be the objective of the Kenyan educational system to produce school-leavers who speak […] like public schoolboys of England [because the Standard Accent of Kenyan English] is the accent that Kenyan learners and users of English speak and hear outside their English pronunciation [classes]; alongside the stigmatized accents [of Kenyan English].

For their part, Kioko and Muthwi (2001), who, at the beginning of their paper note that "[t]here exists a discrepancy between the theoretical norm and the actual language behaviour […]" (p. 201) in the Kenyan education system, end it by saying that "[i]t is time in Kenya, therefore, that serious debate and research is done with a view to formally adopting for use in the education system the nativised Kenyan educated variety of English instead of imposing the external varieties with their standards and norms on students" (p. 211). These views and similar ones have not had any noticeable effect yet. That is perhaps why more recently, Itumo (2018), who recommends what he has termed the "non-ethnically marked KenE", expressed the hope that "[…] the KICD [Kenyan Institute of Curriculum Development] will be able to develop syllabuses based on KenE for both primary and secondary schools in Kenya", and commented that "[t]his will undoubtedly ensure continuity and entrench Kenya's endonormative variety of English, which unlike the 'exornormative' RP, is more realistic and has sufficient and accessible role models" (p. 370).

But while the authors mentioned above (and some other educated people in Kenya) will, seemingly, not hesitate to advocate the teaching of English pronunciation based on a "local" accent, there are still many English language purists (a colleague of mine calls them "gate-keepers") in the country who are adamant that the British model, specifically RP, as we have it in a typical Oxford English dictionary for learners, is and should remain the model to strive to imitate. In this regard, one of the most watched TV stations in Kenya has enlisted the services of an English pronunciation expert to "correct" specific instances of deep-rooted, typical KenE pronunciation, such as pronouncing *word* as /wɜ:d/ (which is almost impossible for the vast majority of KenE speakers) instead of the typical KenE pronunciation /wad/.[1] (Itumo 2018: 369 gives details of this hopeless enterprise by the TV station in question.) It seems that this TV station wants to play the role which the BBC played, "before the Second World War" (Macaulay 1988: 120), to popularise RP in Britain and still plays today by broadcasting it "all over the world" (1988: 115)[2]. This caused some linguists to call it "BBC accent" (see e.g. Roach 2004: 239) or "BBC English" (see e.g. Crystal 2008: 404). However, as Crystal remarks, "[t]hese days, the BBC […] displays considerable regional variation, and many modified forms of RP exist (**modified R**P). RP no longer has the prestigious social position it once held" (p. 404). This is what the English language purists in Kenya do not seem to be aware of. This paper aims to shed more light on how RP has over the years been viewed rather negatively in Britain (but certainly not in Kenya!) and to make a case for a "re-baptised" RP, since there are Kenyan linguists and teachers who still feel strongly attached to the magical label "RP".

2. BRITISH RP: ITS MANY NAMES AND ITS CONFUSING INVENTORY OF VOWEL PHONEMES

[1] On 25 Nov 2021, at a symposium to celebrate Prof Okoth Okombo's legacy, one such purist told the audience how he had reminded participants in a seminar at which he was an expert consultant that the word v*erbatim* had a diphthong in it, and, hence, should be pronounced as /vɜ:ˈbeɪtɪm/, rather than as /ˈvabatim/. What this expert needs to know is that this specific diphthong /eɪ/ is absent in KenE pronunciation not just from *verbatim*, but, seemingly, from the vast majority of words (*face*, *Jane*, etc.) in which it occurs in RP.

[2] However, Cruttenden (2014: 77) informs us that "[t]he BBC has never explicitly advocated a standard such as RP".

The word *received* in "Received Pronunciation" refers to the idea that this pronunciation was "generally accepted" initially by the Court and the learned and educated people in and around London as a "regionally neutral ACCENT in British English, historically deriving from the prestige speech of the Court and the public schools" (Crystal 2008: 404). (Note in passing that *public school* in British English means 'private school' in Kenyan and many other varieties of English around the world.) However, its acceptance waned over the years among British linguists, and many of them deemed it appropriate to replace the name *RP* with a "more appropriate" one. In this regard, note what Cruttenden (2014), while introducing the eighth edition of his book, says: "This eighth edition [describes] what is now termed General British (GB) as the accident of principal consideration and [relinquishes] the outdated expression 'RP' […]" (2014: i). Later, Cruttenden explains why he opted to drop the term *RP*:

> [I]t remains true that many people, laymen, linguists and phoneticians, object to the term in a variety of ways: either it is posh, it is an imposed standard, it is too regionally limited, or it is outdated. If we accept that the accent we are describing is one which we feel should continue to be the standard, can we call it something else? (pp. 78-79).

It is worth pointing out, though, that in the sentence just preceding this quotation, Cruttenden acknowledges that "RP is not dead but very much alive, provided we understand by RP [its successor GB]" (p. 78).

However, for Macaulay (1988) RP is already dead, as can easily be deduced from the title of his paper, "RP R.I.P". And, indeed, the very last phrase of the paper is an explicit "*requiescat in pace*" (1988: 123). In fact, from the outset the author makes it clear that ultimately the aim of his paper is to "suggest why [the use of the term *RP*] should be discontinued" (1988: 115). But since there are linguists in Britain who have chosen to continue using *RP*, it is useful to describe the distinction that has been made between different varieties of this accent, which has had the effect of producing a bewildering terminology hardly known to linguists and teachers of English in Kenya.

2.1 The many names of RP in England

Many linguists and teachers of English all over the world know that RP has also been referred to variously as "the Queen's (or King's) English", "BBC English", "Oxford English", and "Southern (Standard) British English". However, most of them are most probably not aware of the wide varieties of RP, reflected in phrases where *RP* is premodified by the relevant adjective. The quotation above from Crystal (2008) talks of "Modified RP" because many forms of RP now exist resulting from considerable regional variation. Even Cruttenden (2014), despite having abandoned the use of *RP* for *GB*, speaks of and describes (on p. 78) "Modern RP", which is the "considerably changed" RP which developed in "the latter half of the twentieth century". He further talks of "Regional RP", which refers to the Modern RP "with the admixture of a limited number of regional features […]" (p. 78).

Wells (1982: 279-285) presents four "varieties of RP": **"mainstream RP", "U-RP", "adoptive RP",** and **"Near RP".** He refers to *mainstream RP* as "a central tendency" accent, associated with the "middle class". *U-RP* is an abbreviation for "upper-crust RP" and is associated with by the upper class. "*Adoptive RP* is that variety of RP spoken by adults who did not speak RP as children" (1982: 283). As for *Near-RP*, the author also calls it "quasi-RP" (1982: 285) and later defines it the following way: "The term **Near-RP** refers to any accent which, while not falling within the definition of RP, nevertheless includes very little in the way of regionalisms which would enable the provenance of the speaker to be localized within England (or even as Australian, New Zealand, or South African)" (1982: 297). Wells (1982) also presents three other "distinctions within RP […] proposed by Gimson (1980)", namely:

> **conservative RP**, "used by the older generation and, traditionally, by certain professions or social groups" [;] **general RP**, "most commonly in use and typified by the pronunciation adopted by the BBC" [;] and **advanced RP** "mainly used by young people of exclusive social groups – mostly of the upper classes, but also, for prestige value, in certain professional circles" (pp. 279-280).

It should be added that Wells (1982) cautions the reader that "these varieties or tendencies within RP" are "like RP itself [,] abstractions, not objectifiable entities [and] represent areas within a multidimensional continuum" (p. 280).

Upton (2008: 239-240) also mentions some other labels of RP: "**diluted**" RP, which refers to the same thing as "modern RP" as defined above by Cruttenden (2014); **"traditional RP"** and "Refined RP", which the author does not define clearly but says are "outmoded" and associated with the "older speakers". Upton (2008: 240) even mentions "speculative RP", without giving any detail about it. The form of RP he describes in his chapter is "simply labelled 'RP'", as "an accent that will not be the object of comments as regards elevated upbringing or social pretension" and one that "is not associated with any geographical region in England" (p. 239).

In Kenya, where RP seems to be one and indivisible, arguably in its "mainstream" form, that array of varieties/tendencies/types/forms of RP would only be confusing if those who are taught RP were to have to worry about them. Fortunately, they do not have to, because "simply RP" is taught. Unfortunately, even the details of this mainstream RP can be confusing, depending on which phonology book (or other publication) or which dictionary one uses as the reference.

2.2 The confusing inventory of RP phonemes

Of particular interest here are the vowel phonemes since it is they that present significant variation across varieties of English around the world. The traditional inventory of RP vowels that seems to have always been used by Kenyan schools and universities as the model of English pronunciation is composed of the following 12 monophthongs and 8 diphthongs: /ɪ, e, æ, ʌ, ɒ, ʊ, ə, iː, ɑː, ɔː,uː, ɜː, eɪ, aɪ, ɔɪ, ɪə, eə, ʊə, əʊ, aʊ/. This is the list appearing under the heading "Symbols for phonemes", in Roach (2009: x) and its previous editions, a book which has for many years served as a course book for many lecturers of English Phonetics and Phonology at Kenyan universities. These same symbols are the ones given (but slightly in a different order and with different illustrative words), under the heading "Sounds of English", on

page xi of *Integrated English: A Course for Kenya Secondary Schools, Students' Book 1*, published by the Kenya Institute of Education in 1987.

But while the list of RP vowels seems to have remained static at Kenyan schools and universities, it has undergone changes in some accounts of British phonologists, a revised account which has led to changes even in some dictionaries, prominent among them being the Oxford family of dictionaries, whose *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (hereafter *OALD*) is the most widely (if not the only one) used in Kenyan secondary schools. Thus, while in the early editions of the *OALD* the list of RP phonemes was that above of 20, in recent editions of the dictionary (starting with its 8th edition of 2010), two more phonemes have been added: /i/, as in ***happy*** /ˈhæp**i**/ and ***r**e**a**ct* /r**i**ˈækt/, and /u/ in ***act**u**al*** /ˈæktʃ**u**əl/and ***sit**u**ation*** /ˌsɪtʃ**u**ˈeɪʃ(ə)n/, making it 22 vowel sounds: 14 monophthongs and 8 diphthongs.[3] (See the dictionary's reference section.) It should be noted in passing, though, that the two vowels /i/ and /u/are also recognised by Roach (2009) and its previous editions, but as "non-phonemic symbols" (p. xi).

To compound matters, Cruttenden (2014), at the very beginning of the book, has a list of 21 phonemes: 14 monophthongs and 7 diphthongs. Regarding the latter, Cruttenden has removed the traditional /eə/ in *chair, dare, hair*, etc. To him and many other British English pronunciation experts, the vowel in those words is *no longer* a diphthong, but a long monophthong, /ɛː/. From the 14 monophthongs in the *OALD*, Cruttenden (2014) has removed the /u/ in ***act**u**al***, for which he simply uses /ʊ/.

To further complicate the picture, the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (hereafter *LDOCE*, 6th edition, 2014) lists (see the inside of the front cover) 24 (BrE) vowel sounds: 14 monophthongs, including the /i/ of ***happy*** and /u/ of ***actual***, and 10 diphthongs. This number of diphthongs is higher than that for any other list mentioned so far because the *LDOCE* distinguishes between /ɪə/ in ***real***

[3] It is the same list given even in the *Oxford Primary Dictionary for Eastern Africa* (see the inside of the front cover page for its 2nd edition of 2008 and p. viii of its 3rd edition of 2016).

/rɪəl/ and /iə/ in *peculiar* /pɪˈkjuliə/, on the one hand, and /uə/ in *actual* /ˈæktʃuəl/, vs /ʊə/ in *ensure* /ɪnˈʃʊə/, on the other hand.

Given the fact that the editors and publishers of the *OALD* and its smaller "sisters" – all of which are meant to be dictionaries for learners of English – are aware of the potential confusion created by the differences in the number of vowel sounds and, for some of them, in their phonetic quality, they have (so far) deliberately chosen to continue using the symbols used for the traditional RP as described e.g. in Peter Roach's book. Specifically, for diphthongs the smaller Oxford dictionaries use different phonetic symbols from those used by their larger counterparts, e.g. the *Oxford Dictionary of English* (*ODE*) and the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*: these latter use /ɛː/ for /eə/ (in *chair)* and /ʌɪ/ for /aɪ/ in *my*.[4] Indeed, Upton (2008: 239) informs us that it is "the larger native-speaker dictionaries of Oxford University Press" which use transcriptions that reflect the current pronunciations of BrE.

There is no doubt that the details gleaned from the different books and dictionaries above will cause some degree of confusion to the teachers, linguists and policymakers in Kenya who are keen to stick to the RP model. One might argue that this is a case where ignorance is indeed bliss: things must be clear for those who only know of the list appearing in the Kenyan Institute of Education's (1987) book mentioned earlier or in the different editions of Peter Roach's book. It is indeed easy for them to recommend the twenty vowel phonemes and refer to them as those of RP. That would be a pragmatic approach, one taken by at least two prominent British English pronunciation experts, Roach (2004) and Wells (2014), who are very much aware of the differences pointed out above and even finer ones not touched on. Roach (2004), whose "own preference is the name BBC Pronunciation or BBC accent" (p. 239), defends the use of the traditional RP symbols on the grounds that they are already widely used around the world, in connection with English language teaching (ELT). That is the same line of

[4] To add even more confusion, an important dictionary like *Collins English Dictionary* uses the symbol /ɛ/ where the *OALD* and the *LDOCE* use /e/, as in *bed* and *red*. It also uses /ɪ/ where the latter use /ə/ in the pronunciation of e.g. *-less* and *-ness*, as in *hopeless* and *kindness*.

argumentation taken by Wells (2014), who writes: "But when I came to be a phonetics teacher myself, and to publish books, it seemed better to stick with the same transcription that other people use" (p. 60).

Such a pragmatic approach is defensible, and even recommendable. The only, and big problem, in the case of Kenya is that many of the "traditional" 20 vowel phonemes of RP have lost their quality in KenE pronunciation and can hardly be called RP proper anymore. This is what the next section aims to demonstrate.

3. RP HAS BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY SIMPLIFIED IN KENYAN ENGLISH (KenE) PRONUNCIATION.

RP has been simplified in KenE pronunciation in the following ways, all of which are separately discussed in the subsequent subsections: (i) the inventory of RP vowels has been reduced, (ii) several individual letters and letter sequences have been given simplified pronunciations, (iii) some vowel and consonant letters have been given a harmonised pronunciation, (iv) different pronunciations have been created to differentiate some homophones, (v) spelling closeness has led to identity in pronunciation in some cases, (vi) the past tense has been given its own pronunciation for some verbs, (vii) certain affixes and affix-looking letter sequences have acquired a word-stress pattern of their own, (viii) the complex rules of stress placement in compound words have been simplified, (ix) there is lack of stress-shift-related flexibility, (x) the list of stressed-based noun-verb contrasts has been made much longer, (xi) there is reduced use of contracted verb forms and lack of reduced vowels, (xii) there is little (or no) occurrence of assimilation, elision, r-linking, and r-intrusion, and (xiii) intonation patterns have been reduced.

3.1 The inventory of RP vowels has been reduced in KenE pronunciation.

Schmied (1991, 2004), Hoffmann (2011), Itumo (2018), and Buregeya (2019) have all proposed an inventory of KenE vowel phonemes.[5] Here are the numbers proposed

[5] The focus is on vowels because the consonants of KenE have been reported by different authors on KenE sounds to be the same as those of RP. Note, though, that Itumo (2018: 325) suggests that KenE does not seem to have the voiceless dental fricative /θ/ which, he claims,

by each one of these authors in lieu of the 12 RP vowels (both short and long): first, Schmied (1991) proposes only five: /i, e, a, o, u/, where /i/ replaces both /ɪ/ and /iː/; /a/ replaces /ɜː/, /æ/, /ɑː/, and /ʌ/; /o/ replaces both /ɒ/ and /ɔː/; and /u/ replaces both /ʊ/ and /uː/. (The schwa does not appear in Schmied 1991, p. 422, but it does, equally replaced by /a/, in Schmied 2004, p. 928.) Out of the 8 diphthongs, Schmied (1991, 2004) proposes six, with the two "left out" being /eɪ/ (replaced by /e/) and /əʊ/ (replaced by /o/). All in all, of the 20 traditional RP vowels, Schmied proposes 11. Hoffmann (2011) does not explicitly state how many vowels he established that there were in KenE. However, his acoustic analysis of the 12 monophthongs points to only 5 five vowels as well, although he concludes thus: "Nevertheless, the resulting system is not necessarily a five vowel one" (2011: 164). He acknowledges the possible existence of /uː/, but only when preceded by the glide /j/, as in the KenE pronunciation of past tense form *blew*. Regarding the 8 diphthongs, like Schmied (1991, 2004), he acknowledges only 6, with the same/eɪ/ and /əʊ/ being the two missing ones. All in all, of the 20 traditional RP vowels, Hoffmann (2011) proposes 11 or 12. For his part, Itumo (2018: 189) explicitly states that "KenE has eight monophthongs", namely /i/ (replacing both /ɪ/ and /iː/), /e/ (for *dress*), /a/ (for both *trap* and *start*), /aː/ (for both *strut* and *nurse*), /o/ (for *lot*), /oː/ (for *thought*), /u/ (for *foot*), and /uː/ for *goose*. In traditional terms, he acknowledges only two long vowels: /aː/ and /oː/. In terms of diphthongs, Itumo (2018: 358) also acknowledges the same six vowels, with the two missing ones being the same/eɪ/ and /əʊ/. All in all, for Itumo (2018) KenE has 14 vowels.

Buregeya's (2019) inventory proposes a total of 16 vowels (out of the 20 RP ones): 10 monophthongs and 7 diphthongs. In relation to the latter, the only one of the 8 RP diphthongs missing from it is the /əʊ/ of *goat* (replaced by/o/). In relation to monophthongs, the list contains all five vowels (namely /i, e, a, o, u/) around

tends to be replaced by its voiced counterpart /ð/. For his part, Buregeya (fc) suggests that the voiceless glottal fricative /h/, hardly occurs in KenE, where it tends to be replaced by the velar fricative /x/.

which there seems to be unanimity, plus the schwa /ə/, plus four long vowels (namely /iː, aː, oː, uː/. Only the short RP vowel /ɪ/ and only the long one /ɜː/ are missing from Buregeya's inventory. The schwa is much less frequent in KenE than in RP, but it is not absent, since it largely appears in the pronunciation of <*o*> of *lesso**n***, in some KenE speakers' pronunciation of the <*a*> of *illegal,* and in some other instances described in Buregeya (2019: 32-33). The long vowels are equally much less frequent in KenE, but they do appear in some words, especially utterance-finally, and in some cases apparently depending on their spelling. Examples are: *fee* and *nominee*, *far* and *star*, *form* and *four*, *blew* and *grew*. As for the diphthong /eɪ/, its realisation seems to be clearly dictated by spelling: while it does not tend to occur in words such as *face, save,* and *Jane*, it certainly does occur where it corresponds to spellings <*ei*>, <*ai*>, <*ay*>, and <*ey*>, as in *eight*, *aid, gain, pain, wait, said, say, Jayne,* and *survey*.

3.2 Some letters and letter sequences have been given "simplified" pronunciations in KenE.

It needs to be pointed out from the outset that these simplified pronunciations are mostly manifested in spelling pronunciations. However, probably the most wide-ranging difference between RP and KenE pronunciation is not a spelling pronunciation proper; it instead consists in using /a/ in KenE to replace RP /ɜː/ and /ə/ as an "umbrella" pronunciation of four pairs of a vowel letter + <*r*>. The four are: <*er*> as in *p**er**fect* and *prosp**er**ity*, <*ir*> as in *girl,* <*or*> as in *word*, and <*ur*> as in *burden*. One could add the <*ear*> in *heard* (but not *hear*/*hears*), *hearse*, *learn*/*learner*/*learning, search*, and *research*.[6]

Turning to spelling pronunciations, the first thing to say is that almost all of them involve vowels. The most conspicuous of such pronunciations concerns the letters <*au*>, as in *applaud, applause, clause, fraud, laud, launch,* and *laundry*, in which <*au*> is realised as /aʊ/. (There are exceptions, though; that is those pronounced the RP way, like *laugh, pause,* and *gauge*.) Less conspicuous, but more

[6] The exception to this pattern is the <*eur*> in words of French origin like *entrepreneur*, which is realised as /ua/ in KenE, vs /ɜː/ in RP.

pervasive, are the spelling pronunciations related to the single vowel letters <*e*>, <*a*>, <*o*>, <*i*>, and <*u*>. Seemingly more than for any other letter, it is <*e*> that is overwhelmingly pronounced as /e/ in KenE pronunciation while it is either /ɪ/ or /ə/ in RP. This concerns the bold-faced <*e*> in *arr**e**ars, brok**e**n, coll**e**ge, cru**e**l, d**e**cision, d**e**velop, **e**ndorse, **e**lect* (v), *e**n**sure, **e**state, **e**mploy, **e**xcuse, proph**e**t, r**e**cord* (v), *r**e**ligion, r**e**store, tak**e**n, th**e**,* and many more. Although so many words are involved, there does not seem to be an obvious reason for this spelling-pronunciation pattern, especially since there are also cases of <*e*> pronounced (in KenE) more or less the RP way, as in ***E**nglish, **e**vent, **e**vil*, *fr**e**quent*, and *syst**e**m*. There are even unexpected (?) cases of <*e*> pronounced with an /i/ in KenE, unlike in RP: *d**e**cade, pr**e**position, r**e**commend*, and *r**e**presentative*.

The letters <*a*> and <*o*> are the next most involved in spelling pronunciations. The letter <*a*> is typically pronounced as /a/ in KenE, as opposed to /ə/ in RP, in individual cases such as *p**a**rticular* and generalizable cases such as the word-ending <*ance*> and <*ant*>, as in *signific**a**nce*, *domin**a**nt, vibr**a**nt*, etc. It is also pronounced as /a/ in KenE, as opposed to /eə/ in (traditional) RP, in words such as *p**a**rent, sc**a**rce*, and *v**a**ry*, and instead of /eɪ/ in ***oasis*** and *s**a**cred*. But, once again, it is hard to discern a pattern (except in the <*ance*> and <*ant*> cases), since the letter <a> is not pronounced as /a/, in KenE, in many other words, among which are *c**a**re, f**a**re, all, b**a**ll,* and *st**a**ll*. The letter <*o*> is realised as an /o/ sound in KenE seemingly in most cases where the schwa is expected in RP (in unstressed positions), as in *p**o**lice*, and in the following words where /ʌ/ is expected in RP: *am**o**ng, c**o**mfort, covenant, eyebr**o**w, fishm**o**nger, fr**o**nt, **o**nion, sh**o**ve, sp**o**nge, st**o**mach, warm**o**nger, w**o**n,* and ***worry*** (n). Note, though, that even to this apparently long list there is a non-negligible list of exceptions where the letter <*o*> is, like in RP, <u>not</u> pronounced with an /o/ sound in KenE: *brother, money, mother, none, other, power, shower,* and *son*.[7]

[7] KenE seems to have borrowed the American English pronunciation of <*o*> as /a/ for only (?) the word *committee*, and for the prefix *non-*, as in *non-committal*, *non-issue*, and *nonsense*.

The letters <*u*> and <*i*> are the least involved in spelling pronunciations. To start with <*u*>, it is predictably pronounced as /u/ in KenE in the suffix *-ful*, as in *successful*, while it is pronounced as a schwa in RP. It may also be pronounced as /u/ in several words, but the present author is only aware of *jumbo* ('elephant'), though, surprisingly, not commonly in *jumbo jet*. As for the letter <*i*>, on its own it does not seem to be involved in spelling pronunciations, the only obvious exception being the second <*i*> of *divisive*, since the word is pronounced as /diˈvisiv/ in KenE, versus /dɪˈvaɪsɪv/. However, as the first one in the sequences <*ia(l)*> and <*ious*>, <*i*> is systematically realised as /i/, thus causing e.g. *parliament, official,* and *gracious* to be pronounced as /ˈpaliament/, /ˈofiʃio(l)/ and /ˈgreʃias/, where the entire sequence would be realised with just a schwa in RP (e.g. /greɪʃəs/.

In terms of spelling consonant-based pronunciations, one case stands out: that involving the final <*b*> in *bomb, dumb, climb, lamb, limb, numb, plumber, tomb*, *womb*, and their derivatives such as *bombing* and *climber*. But there is also the realisation, in some words, of the aitch (i.e. the letter <*h*>), where it is silent in RP: in the words *honest, honour*, and their derivatives such as *honesty* and *honourable*, such that honour in KenE tends to be pronounced as /ˈhona/.

3.3 Some vowel and consonant letters have been given a "harmonised" pronunciation in KenE.

This harmonisation involves the vowel letters <*i*> and <*u*> and the consonant letters <*g*>, <*h*> and <*y*>. The letter <*i*> in the root of many nouns ending in <*ation*> (e.g. *admiration, combination,* and *immigration*) tends to be pronounced as /aɪ/, just like the <*i*> of the verbs from which they were derived (*admire*, *combine,* and *migrate*). The <*i*> in the ending <*mine*> in verbs such as *determine* and *examine* tends to be pronounced as the noun (or pronoun) *mine*, that is with an /aɪ/ sound. The <*i*> in the <*ice*> ending in words such as *cowardice* and *prejudice* is typically pronounced like *rice,* that is with an /aɪ/ sound as well. The <*i*> in the <*ite*> ending

in *favourite* and *requisite* tends to be pronounced as /aɪ/, like the ending of *contrite* and *polite*. In all four cases the <*i*> is realised just as /ɪ/ in RP. The <*u*> in the ending <*ude*> in verbs such as *include* and *conclude* tends to be pronounced as /juː/ (compared to just /uː/ in RP), like the endings <*ute*> and <*use*> in the verbs *compute* and *confuse*. The consonant letter <*g*> tends to be pronounced as /dʒ/ in KenE (compared to just /ʒ/ in RP) in the following words (all of which are of French origin): *barra**g**e, bei**g**e, gara**g**e, massa**g**e, mira**g**e, presti**g**e*, and *re**g**ime*. Thus, with the /dʒ/ pronunciation, there is harmonisation with the pronunciation of <*g*> in words like *ag**e**, cabba**g**e, messa**g**e*, and many others, where the letter is realised as /dʒ/ in both KenE and RP. The case of the letter <*h*> is in fact that already mentioned in the previous subsection: its realisation, where it is silent in RP, is in harmony with the very many words where the aitch is indeed realised both in RP and in KenE, such as *harm, hello, hike, how, humanity,* and *humble*. The letter <*y*> is realised as /aɪ/ in KenE (compared to just /ɪ/ in RP) in *s**y**cophant* and (to a lesser extent) *t**y**ranny*, most likely on the analogy of words like *type* and *tyrant*. However, in most other words (e.g. *typical*), <*y*> is realised as an /ɪ/ in KenE, as it is in RP, starting with the final <*y*> in *tyrann**y*** itself.

3.4 Different pronunciations have been created to differentiate homophones in KenE.

This phenomenon concerns the nouns *flour* vs *flower* and the verbs *to sew* vs *to sow*. While in RP there is only one pronunciation for each pair, namely /flaʊə/ for both nouns and /səʊ/ for both verbs, in KenE *flour* is /fla/ and *flower* is /flaʊa/, while *sew* is /sju/ and *sow* is /so/.

3.5 Closeness in spelling has led to identity in pronunciation in KenE.

This seems a reverse phenomenon relative to that in the preceding subsection. It involves *cattle* vs *kettle* – both of which are realised as /ketl/ in KenE (as opposed to /kætl/ vs /ketl/ in RP), and *sever* (v) vs *severe* (adj.) – both of which are realised

as /siˈvia/ in KenE (as opposed to /ˈsevə/ vs /sɪˈvɪə/ in RP). The phenomenon possibly also involves *cap* vs *cape* – both of which are realised as /kep/ in KenE (as opposed to /kæp/ vs /keɪp/ in RP).[8]

3.6 A grammatical meaning has been given a distinct pronunciation in KenE for some verbs.

A further simplification of RP in KenE pronunciation lies in the fact that a grammatical meaning, namely the simple past tense of the verbs *run* and *have* on the one hand, and that of *blow, grow* and *fly* on the other hand, has been given a distinct phonetic form in KenE: /e/, instead of /æ/ for *ran* and *had*, and /juː/, instead of /uː/ for *blew, flew*, and *grew*. A possible reason for the latter case is overgeneralisation of the past tense *knew* (of *know)*. This may seem straightforward for *blew* and *grew*, whose present tense forms are *blow* and *grow*, thus ending in <*ow*> like *know*, but not for *flew*, from *fly* (rather than from *flow*, whose past tense, as a regular verb, is *flowed*). The past tense pronunciation /ren/, for *ran*, has, anecdotally, been justified by the present author's informants as the result of a conscious effort at school on the part of teachers to avoid confusion between the form *run* (for present simple and present perfect tense) which is pronounced as /ran/ in KenE, and its past tense equivalent, *ran*. This account seems plausible given that the past tense forms *began, sang*, and *rang*, for example, are pronounced with an /a/ in KenE, not with the /e/ of *ran*, because there would be no confusion in pronunciation between them and their respective present equivalents, namely *begin, sing*, and *ring*. As for the pronunciation of *had* as /hed/, there does not seem to be an obvious plausible explanation for it, since the past tense *had* would have been different from its present counterpart *have*, anyway.

[8] Zipporah Otiso, a lecturer of English language and skills at the University of Nairobi, has an equally (if not more) plausible explanation for the pronunciation of *cap* as /kep/: to differentiate it from *cup*, which is pronounced as /kap/ in KenE (pc. 4 March 2022).

3.7 Some affixes and affix-looking letter sequences have acquired a KenE word-stress pattern of their own.

There is perhaps no better illustration of the simplification of RP features in KenE than the stress placement on the verbs ending in <*ate*>, such as *inflate, calculate, discriminate*, and *congratulate*. In RP (and, more generally, in international English dictionaries), the rule is that when such verbs contain only two syllables the stress falls on the final one (i.e. the <*ate*> syllable itself), but when they contain three or more, the stress falls on the third one from the end (i.e. the antepenultimate syllable). However, in KenE there is one simple rule: place the stress on the <*ate*> syllable irrespective of the number of syllables involved. This rule is systematic, contrary to what Schmied (2004: 929) claims; no exception to it has been attested by the present author so far. The same rule applies, but this time apparently with some exceptions, to the verbs ending in <*ify*> (like *intensify*) and those ending in <*ise/ize*> (like *analyse*).

KenE has also simplified the stress placement on adjectives ending in <*able*>, like *admirable* and *comparable*: it systematically places the stress on the syllable preceding <*able*>, which happens to be the last one of the stem, like this: *ad*ˈ*mirable* and *com*ˈ*parable*. Cruttenden (2014: 247) informs us that this KenE-like stress placement sometimes occurs in RP, but that typically the stress in those adjectives is placed on the first syllable of the stem, like this: ˈ*admirable* and ˈ*comparable*. (The present author is aware of only one adjective stressed this RP-way in KenE, namely ˈ*preferable*.) Similarly, KenE has simplified the stress placement on adjectives ending in <*ative*>, such as *qualitative* and *quantitative*: it places the stress on the very first syllable of this ending, like this: *qualit*ˈ*ative*. In RP the stress on such adjectives is placed on an earlier, but not fixed, syllable: on the first one in ˈ*qualitative*, on the second in *au*ˈ*thoritative*, and on the antepenultimate in *argu*ˈ*mentative*.

Further, KenE has <u>partially</u> simplified the stress placement on nouns ending in <*ism*>, such as *albinism, colonialism, imperialism, nationalism, pragmatism*, *mechanism,* and *professionalism*: it places the stress on the last syllable of the

stem, that is the one directly before <*ism*>, like this: *mech*ˈ*anism* and *profession*ˈ*alism*. In RP, for almost all such words the stress is placed on the antepenultimate syllable, thus: ˈ*mechanism* and *pro*ˈ*fessionalism*. However, the number of "exceptions" to the KenE pronunciation pattern is almost as large as that of the words which fit into it: words such as *capitalism, communism, journalism, pessimism*, and *optimism* are stressed, in KenE, the way they are in RP, that is on the first syllable. (It should be added in passing that the KenE-like stress patterns affecting the <*ate*> verbs, the <*ative*> adjectives, and *the* <*ism*> nouns have been reported in other African varieties of English, such as Nigerian, Ghanaian, and Cameroonian. See Buregeya 2019: 47-48 for details.)

3.8 The complex rules of stress-placement in compound words have been simplified.

KenE pronunciation has simplified the very complex rules, in RP, for placing the stress on compound nouns (like *junk food* and *black magic*) and compound adjectives (like *deep-seated*): typically, the stress in both types of compounds falls on the first element of the compound in KenE (thus: ˈ*junk food*, ˈ*black magic* and ˈ*deep-seated*), while in the case of RP that depends on many complex rules with many exceptions (discussed in detail in Cruttenden 2014: 248-251), although for the three examples given here RP places the stress on the second element of the compound, thus: *junk* ˈ*food, black* ˈ*magic* and *deep-*ˈ*seated*.

3.9 There is a lack of stress-shift-related flexibility in KenE.

As further simplification of RP's features, KenE pronunciation has not copied the stress shift that occurs in native speech "to avoid adjacent [stressed] syllables" (Cruttenden 2014: 307). For example, while the nationality words ending in <*ese*> (like *Chinese*) will be stressed on the last syllable in isolation (as in the dictionary), an RP speaker (and, broadly, a speaker of a native variety of English) will readily say ˈ*Chinese* ˈ*students*, rather than *Chi*ˈ*nese* ˈ*students*, while a KenE speaker is

expected to say the latter. KenE thus typically lacks this flexibility that often distinguishes between connected speech and words pronounced in isolation.

3.10 KenE has created stress-based noun-verb contrasts of its own.

Arguably, one of the strongest forms of KenE simplifying RP features lies in the extension of the stress-based contrast between nouns and verbs, of the type ˈ*export* (n) vs. *ex*ˈ*port* (v), from a comparatively small (however sizable it may appear to be) number of nouns and verbs in RP, to a much larger number of them in KenE. All the following (three dozen, and possibly more) words constitute an additional list, in KenE pronunciation but not in RP, of words that are stressed differently depending on whether they are nouns or verbs: *abuse, access, address, advance, alarm, amount, approach, assault, assist, cement, comment, consent, deposit, disguise, effect, excuse, exchange, implement, manifest, mistake, neglect, outline, paraphrase, perfume, purchase, recruit, register, regret, request, respect, review, supply, support, surprise, witness*. In KenE, when they are nouns the stress tends to fall on the first syllable and when they are verbs it tends to fall on the second, or third. All those words are stressed on the same syllable in RP whether they are nouns or verbs. To them can be added, still in KenE, the following verb-noun contrasts which do not share the spelling but are otherwise obviously related: *advise* vs *advice, agree* vs *agreement, complain* vs *complaint, intend* vs *intent,* (and, less systematically, *succeed* vs *success*). The only exception attested (by the present author) so far, is the word *transfer*: this is stressed on the second syllable in KenE, whether it is a verb or a noun. (It is stressed differently in RP.)

3.11 There is a reduced use of contracted verb forms and a lack of reduced vowels in KenE.

Buregeya's (2019) section 6.4 (pp. 202-207) examines the "written" nature of spoken KenE, reflected in the use of much fewer contracted verb forms in KenE

than in British English (BrE).[9] The key finding is that contracted forms are much less used in KenE than in BrE, with six contracted forms not appearing even once in spoken ICE-K. Those are: *could've, would've, should've, must've, shan't* and *mightn't*. Table 6.3 in Buregeya (2019: 203) also shows how the contracted forms involving *'d* (namely: *I'd, you'd, she'd, he'd, it'd, they'd*) are also extremely rare in KenE pronunciation. (Impressionistically, for a KenE speaker to utter *what'd happened* would be a real tongue-twister. Yet this is an utterance that is common in native speech, as in *The police wanted to know what'd happened*.) In fact, based on ICE-K figures, only two contracted forms can be said to be frequent in KenE: *it's* and *don't*. But even these occur less frequently in ICE-K than in ICE-GB: at a ratio of 1 in every 302 words in ICE-K against 1 in every 153 words in ICE-GB for *it's*, and at a ratio of 1/426 words against 1/328 words, respectively, for *don't*. Conversely, their non-contracted counterparts, namely *it is*/*it has* and *do not* appear much more frequently in ICE-K than in ICE-GB: at a ratio of 1/434 against 1/966 for *it is*; of 1/3,910 against 1/5,531 for *it has*; and of 1/2,747 against 1/11,175 for *do not*.

In addition to the reduced use of contracted forms, KenE is also marked by a lack of reduced vowels, with the little use of the schwa /ə/ talked about earlier being a quintessential illustration of this. As Buregeya (forthcoming) points out, the lack of reduced vowels is typically manifested in the "lack of contrast between weak and strong forms of personal pronouns like *he, her, him,* and *them*, prepositions like *to* and *for*, and auxiliary verbs like *can, could, has, had, have, will,* and *would*, all of which are typically pronounced in their strong form everywhere" in KenE. A dictionary like the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (*OALD*) tells us that the pronoun *he* can be pronounced in the following 4 ways, depending on the phonological context around it: /hi/, /iː/, /i/ and in its strong form /hiː/. Similarly, the *OALD* tells us that *her* can be pronounced in the following four ways: /hə(r)/, /ɜː(r)/, /ə(r)/ and in its strong form /hɜː(r)/. In KenE, *he* is

[9] In that section KenE is represented by the spoken component of the Kenyan sub-corpus of the International Corpus of English (ICE), abbreviated as ICE-K, while British English is represented by the spoken component of the British sub-corpus of ICE, abbreviated as ICE-GB. Spoken ICE-K is 304,967 words-long, while spoken ICE-GB is 547,585 words-long.

probably always pronounced simply as /hi/ and *her* probably always pronounced as /ha/.

3.12 There is little (or no) occurrence of assimilation, elision, r-linking, and r-intrusion in KenE.

All these four phenomena are typical of RP but certainly not of KenE pronunciation. Two of them (assimilation and r**-linking**) do occur in it, but only occasionally. Assimilation of the type *this year* /ðɪʃɪə/, *good girl* /gʊgɜːl/, *good boy* /gʊb bɔɪ/, and *would you* /wʊdʒuː/, which "is more likely to be found in rapid, casual speech and less likely in slow, careful speech" (Roach 2009: 110), occurs very little in KenE pronunciation. Buregeya (2019: 59) suggests that it occasionally occurs in *good night* /gun naɪt/ and *let me* /lemmi/. As for elision, which too is "typical of rapid, casual speech" (Roach 2009: 113) and typically happens at the end of words, it seems to be even rarer in KenE. A frequent occurrence of it in RP involves dropping the /t/ of *but*. In KenE it is the opposite phenomenon that tends to occur, instead: the final /t/ tends to be supported with a schwa-like sound, like this: /batə(əə)/, when the speaker is hesitating about what to say after *but*.

Regarding r-linking, which "is a normal feature of Received Pronunciation" (Upton 2008: 249), it is not characteristic of KenE either. While a sentence such as *soccer is soccer* is expected to be uttered as /ˈsɒkər ɪz ˈɒkə/ in RP, it is expected to be uttered as /ˈsoka iz ˈsoka/ in KenE. However, as Itumo (2018: 360) reports from his acoustic analysis, r-linking seems to occur in KenE when an /o/ sound is involved, as in ***for ever*** /foˈreva/ and ***later on*** /letaron/.

Closely related to r-linking is r-intrusion, typified by the pronunciation of *law and order* as **/**lɔːrənɔːdə/ and of *I saw it* as /aɪˈsɔːrɪt/ in RP. But, unlike r-linking, r-intrusion has not been attested by the present author yet. In KenE, instead of the

/r/ intruding to link /ɔː/ with the following vowel, it is the glide /w/ that is likely to be inserted between the two vowels, to produce something like this: /aɪˈsowit/.[10]

3.13 Intonation patterns have been reduced in KenE.

This reduction consists mainly in two phenomena: one, replacing the falling tone and the rising tone by a level tone in some cases; two, avoiding the use of the rising tone. Regarding the first phenomenon, the level tone is used in KenE to answer a question like *Are you coming with us?* with a definite *No*, where, according to Roach (2009: 121), a falling tone would be used in RP. Buregeya (2019: 54) claims that such a use of the level tone in KenE tends to be associated with young female speakers.[11] Further, the level tone is often used in KenE instead of the rising tone in *yes-no* questions, whether they lack subject-auxiliary inversion, as in the typical KenE question *You get?* ('Do you get my point?'), or they contain it, as in another typical KenE question: *Are you getting me?* ('Do you get me'?).

Concerning the avoidance of the rising tone, this happens, in KenE, particularly in (expected) *Yes* or *No* answers to certain questions, when the addressee, answering with a *Yes* or a *No*, wants the addressor to give more information, as in the following two examples (taken from Roach 2009: 123-124):

Example 1:

A. *Do you know John Smith?*

B. *Yes.*

Roach (2009: 124) comments that if the answer *Yes* is said with a rising tone, B is "inviting A to continue with what [he/she] intends to say about John Smith after establishing that B knows him".

Example 2:

A. *Have you seen Ann?*

B. *No.*

---

[10] Zipporah Otiso (pc, 7 Apr 2021) disagrees: she maintains that no /w/ gets inserted, in which case the KenE pronunciation will be /aɪˈso it/. That is, still without r-intrusion, but with some hiatus between the two vowels.

[11] This claim was supported by Jane Oduor, a phonology lecturer at the University of Nairobi (pc, 4 Jan. 2017).

Still according to Roach (2009), if this *No* is said with a rising tone, B will be "[inviting] A to explain why [he/she] is looking for Ann, or why [he/she/ does not know where she is" (p. 124). In KenE, neither answer (be it *Yes* or *No*) is likely to be said with a rising intonation: either of them is likely to be a level tone or a falling one.

One more instance where a rising tone is expected in RP but not in KenE has to do with question tags that seek information from the addressee, as in *You said you know his accomplice, didn't you*? Even if *didn't you?* was meant to request more information from the addressee, it is unlikely that it would be said with a rising intonation in KenE. Question tags in KenE (which, incidentally, all tend to be replaced with *isn't it*?, as in *You said you know his accomplice, isn't it?*) are typically uttered with a falling tone. (It is worth adding in passing that even the greeting question *How are you?* is uttered with a level tone in KenE, while in RP it is uttered with a rise-fall tone.)

4. CONCLUSION: A CASE FOR "KENYAN-INDIGENISED RP"

Against the backdrop presented in the preceding sections, what is left is for me to join the Kenyan authors mentioned in the Introduction (namely Okombo 1987, Ragutu 1993, Kioko and Muthwi 2001, and Itumo 2018) in making a plea to the very many Kenyan linguists, teachers of English, and decision-makers who are yet not ready to accept (and be proud of) a nationally representative (i.e. mainstream) KenE pronunciation to do so. Before justifying my plea, though, three points need to be kept in their right perspective: first, Macaulay (1988) seems to have expected the "non-rhotic quality of RP" to be a learning difficulty, which might have led to foreigners being hostile to RP. The author writes: "The non-rhotic quality of RP is a contributor to [not fostering widespread intelligibility] and it is interesting that the majority of English varieties are rhotic" (1988: 119). Yet it can be confidently asserted that if there is one feature of RP that has been fully learnt by KenE speakers and, quite meaningfully, one which is indeed the living and indelible mark par excellence of RP on KenE pronunciation, it is well and truly RP's non-rhoticity. (Why virtually only this aspect of RP was acquired perfectly while so many of its other aspects became impossible to acquire would be a complicated topic to

research beyond the scope of this paper.) Second, much as Macaulay (1988) considers RP "dead" in the UK, it is still alive and well in Kenya, at least as an ideal, theoretical reference. The only strange thing about it is that the term RP (or its full name) is not explicitly mentioned in the textbooks that are designed to teach its sounds as the model. This lack of explicit mention of it reinforces the wrong view in Kenya that RP is a universal thing that does not even need to be specified. Third, Abercrombie's (1963) predicted hostility towards RP outside Europe did not materialise in Kenya. This is how the author put it, as quoted in Macaulay (1988: 119):

> [RP's] peculiar social position, which makes many people hostile to it, should not be forgotten, particularly by learners outside Europe, where this hostility is likely to be strong. It is phonetically a difficult accent, moreover, and other accents—Scots for instance—are undoubtedly easier for most foreigners". (Abercrombie 1963: 55)

The key comment to make about this quotation is that in the Kenyan situation there are no visible signs of a "strong hostility" towards RP. Even the advocates of teaching a KenE accent referred to earlier in the introduction are "against" RP not because of hostility as such, but for purely practical considerations: RP has simply been an unachievable educational goal so far, and there is no chance that it can be achieved in the future. This is because the pronunciation features of KenE are too entrenched to change. For instance, it is hard to imagine KenE speakers abandoning the KenE rule of stressing the last syllable of the <*ate*> verbs, or them adopting the /gɜːl/ and abandoning the /gal/ one, or them no longer pronouncing *ran* as /ren/. After all, though only impressionistically so far, the young generation of KenE speakers seem to be proud of the /gal/-like pronunciations. Anecdotally, students from successive classes taught by the present author have told him that pronunciations such as /eg'zel/ and /spondʒ/ are more pleasant to the ear than their RP equivalents /ek'sel/ and /spʌndʒ/. But establishing this requires a formal study of the type of what Ugwuanyi (2020) did in the case of Nigeria, a study which found that Nigerians from various ethnic groups had positive attitudes towards the Nigerian English accent.

Now, since, as Buregeya (2019: 244) asserts, "[t]he roots of KenE are now too deep to be uprooted" (which means that it does not make much sense, as just one

example, to test speaking in the school-leaving examinations with British RP sounds as the reference model), only two options make much sense. The first is for Kenya's Ministry of Education (through the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development, KICD – formerly Kenya Institute of Education, KIE) to be realistic enough to recommend the teaching of KenE pronunciation features, in which case the accent to be taught could simply be called "(mainstream) Kenyan accent" and the sounds to be taught called "Kenyan English sounds", instead of just "the sounds of English". The second option is for the Kenyan linguists and teachers who still find RP so mythical that they cannot abandon it to re-baptise "Kenyan-indigenised RP", "indigenised" in the sense that it has been significantly simplified in both its segmental and suprasegmental features. Given that the first option hinges on somewhat political decisions, it is the less likely one in the near future. So, in the meantime, let us talk of and teach our Kenyan-indigenised RP, mainly for the prestige and the mystique which the label *RP* still holds (and which make it indeed rather well received) not where it originated from, but where it was exported to.

Now, if we accept to teach this proposed "Kenyan-indigenised RP", the problem that remains is to select the inventory of vowel phonemes to teach, from among the several proposals made by the different authors mentioned in this paper. The present study would recommend Buregeya's (2019) inventory because, based on the evidence adduced, it is larger than the others proposed so far, as it contains sounds like the schwa or the diphthong /eɪ/ which are claimed in those other proposals to be absent from KenE pronunciation.

References

Buregeya, Alfred. 2019. *Kenyan English*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Buregeya, Alfred. (fc). "Kenyan English". In Kingsley Bolton (ed.), forthcoming, *The Wiley Encyclopdedia of World Englishes*. Oxford: Wiley.

Cruttenden, Alan. 2014. *Gimson's Pronunciation of English,* 8th edn. London and New York: Routledge.

Crystal, David. 2008. *A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics*, 5th edn. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoffmann, Thomas. 2011. The Black Kenyan English vowel system: An acoustic phonetic analysis. *English World-Wide,* 32(2). 147-173.

Itumo, Joshua. (2018). *Acoustic Features of the Non-ethnically Marked Kenyan English in the Speech of Selected University Lecturers*. Nairobi: Kenyatta University PhD thesis.

Kenya Institute of Education. 1987. *Integrated English: A Course for Kenyan Secondary Schools – Students' Book 1*. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.

Kioko, Angelina and Margaret Muthwi. 2001. "The demands of a changing society: English in Education in Kenya today". *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 14(3): 201-213.

Macaulay, Ronald. 1988. "RP R.I.P.". *Applied Linguistics*, 9(2): 115-124.

Okombo, D. Okoth. 1987. *Study of English 1, Section C, Lecture 5: Kenyan English*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi Lecture Notes.

Ragutu, Maurice. 1993. *The Phonological Features of Non-stigmatized Accent of Kenyan English*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi MA Thesis.

Roach, Peter. 2004. British English: Received Pronunciation. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 34(2). 238-245.

Roach, Peter. 2009. *English phonetics and phonology: A practical course,* 4th edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmied, Josef. 1991. National and subnational features in Kenyan English. In Jenny Cheshire (ed.), *English around the World: Sociolinguistic properties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 420-432.

Schmied, Josef. 2004. "East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): Phonology". In Edgar W. Schneider, Kate Burridge, Bernd Kortmann, Rajend Mesthrie, and Clive Upton (eds.), *A handbook of varieties of English. Vol. 1: Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 918-930.

Ugwuanyi, Kingsley. 2020. "Nigerian English and national identity". Talk presented at SOAS, University of London, 11 August 2020. Available on YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hrBBNJfs8qo

Upton, Clive. 2008. Received Pronunciation. In Bernd Kortmann & Clive Upton (eds.), *Varieties of English 1: The British Isles*, 237-252. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wells, John C. 1982. *Accents of English, volume 2: The British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wells, John C. 2014. *Sounds interesting: Observations on English and general phonetics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author's email address:

Email: aburegeya@uonbi.ac.ke