Indian English in the EFL Context: Claims and Facts

Sami Ali Nasr Al-wossabi
English Department
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
Jazan University, Jazan
Al-Swais Area – Jazan City
P.O. Box: 2281
Zip Code- 45142

Abstract

This paper investigates the extent to which EFL Yemeni teacher trainees are exposed to Indian English at the English departments, Hodeidah University. It reviews different distinctive features of Indian English in terms of phonology, syntax, lexis, pragmatic and sociolinguistic aspects. An observation checklist was developed to examine the presence of Indian English features in the speech of Indian language educators in the Yemeni EFL academic context. Further, a five-point likert scale was carried out to elicit 60 teacher trainees' perceptions of how they viewed their Indian teachers' English. Although, the observation checklist revealed clearly the occurrence of some persistent phonological instances of Indian English, Indian educators predominantly incorporated linguistic and pragmatic native-like features of British English. The questionnaire findings revealed that teacher trainees positively perceived and appreciated their teachers' knowledge of the subject area and the way they instructed language in the classroom.

Keywords: Indian English, teacher trainees, Yemeni EFL teaching situation

1. Introduction

Although there are almost two hundred local languages spoken in the Indian subcontinent, there are only a few languages that are considered official. Interestingly, English along with Hindi and Urdu are the most official widely used languages all over the subcontinent of India. Indian speakers of English speak English intelligibly enough even much better than other European or Asian non- native speakers of English. English is spoken in almost all educational, public and governmental settings, media, etc. It is also used as the written medium in many local newspapers. In some areas of India, it is even safer to speak English rather than to speak local languages because of ethnical and religious issues. Many Indians friends admit that they feel more comfortable speaking English than any other local Indian languages.

In fact, Indian English is regarded as a dialect of English just as British or American English. It has its own distinctive phonological, lexical and syntactic features. For instance, Indian English is still holding some old usages that were inherited from the British during the colonial period. The phrase "*your obedient servant*" is still used while exchanging formal emails or letters among some Indians. Although, native speakers of English might consider such usage as antique, it is still a correct usage of English. Such features do not in fact lessen its status as an intelligible variety of English or mark it as a different language.

Despite the fact that many language educators in the Yemeni EFL situation share the same L1 Urdu and/or Hindi, English is still their preferable tool of communication inside and outside the academic and educational settings. Being taught by many Indian educators for almost four years in my undergraduate degree course and working with them for four other years, I found that English has indeed a distinctive status in their daily communication. They are very well informed and have tremendously contributed to the field of teaching English in Yemen.

Yet, some EFL learners embrace the belief that native teachers of English are genetically better than non-native teachers. Such belief is intuitive and usually based on the observable difference in pronunciation between native and non-native speakers. Few researches have examined such claims (Benke & Medgyes, 2005; Canagarajah, 1999a, 1999b; Phillipson, 1992).

Benke and Medgyes (2005) conducted a questionnaire composed of two sets of items on 422 Hungarian learners of English to elicit their responses about NESTs in comparison to NNESTs. Interestingly, they found that the majority of learners would like to have a combination of both NNESTs and NESTs in their learning context. Other researches that tackled this issue asserted that competence in the target language is essential for language educators and constitutes a key success to productive classroom practices (Medgyes, 1992, 1994; Cook, 1999, 2005).

The present paper is an attempt to formulate a positive theory of Indian teachers' efficacy in the EFL classroom. It looks at how Indian teacher educators use and teach English in the Yemeni EFL situation and the extent to which they incorporate aspects of IE at their academic teaching settings. For this purpose, phonological, morphological, lexical variations, pragmatic and sociolinguistics aspects of Indian English were discussed and then compared to the type of English used by Indian teacher educators in the Yemeni EFL academic setting. The paper also conducted a questionnaire to speculate on teacher trainees' perception of their Indian teacher's English in terms of comprehensibility of teachers' accent, presentation skills of the subject area and instructional delivery in the classroom.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Phonological Features

With regard to the phonological aspects of IE, it has been noticed that there are some phonological aspects that distinguish Indian English from other varieties of English. For example, speakers of Indian English use dental and retroflexes instead of inter-dentals and alveolars, epenthesis into consonant clusters, r-pronunciation and the use of [v] for [w], (Chaudhary, 1993; Pickering & Wiltshire, 2000). Chaudhary (1993) noted that there are many lexical items that are accented differently in Indian English from the way they are accented in other varieties of English. For instance, an Indian English speaker says DEfence instead of deFEnce and that American and British speakers might hear the word *difference* instead of *defense*.

Pickering and Wiltshire (2000) compared the phonetic realization of accent for both American English and Indian English by studying the phonetic correlates of stress and accent for both varieties. They also investigated the influence of three Indian first languages (Bengali, Tamil, and Hindi-Urdu) on the production of Indian English. In this study, the participants were six male teaching assistants in an American University. They were all in their late twenties. Three of the teaching assistants were Indian English speakers from three different L1 backgrounds: (Bengali, Tamil, Hindi-Urdu). The other three participants were English speakers of American English. The six subjects were videotaped and audiotaped for four minutes of discourse while teaching a regular lesson in the classroom. In addition, the three Indian English speakers were asked to produce sentences in their native languages and to mark where they thought they stressed the words.

In examining the data, only two and three syllable words were analyzed. Pickering and Wiltshire (2000) analyzed the frequency of accented and unaccented syllables of English words produced by native speakers of English and those produced by Indian speakers of English. Then they compared the frequency of stressed syllables of the English words produced in the Indian language context with native Indian words produced in the Indian language context. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in word accent between American English and Indian English. They found that while there was a tendency of Indian English speakers to drop in frequency in accented syllables in Indian English showing no increase in amplitude in a particular context, American English speakers raised frequency and amplitude on the accented syllable in the same context. They also found that there was a significant correlation between the drop in frequency on accented syllables in Indian English and Tamil and Bengali Indian languages, indicating a possible transfer from L1 into IE. Through many statistical procedures used in their study, Pickering and Wiltshire concluded that American English is a stress-accent language that relies on amplitude, duration and frequency. In contrast, Indian English is a pitch-accent language that relies greatly on the frequency to show an accented syllable. Moreover, while American English indicates an accented syllable in particular contexts with a high frequency, Indian English indicates it with a low frequency.

Another phonological feature of IE was mentioned by Avery and Ehrlish (1992) and has to do with intonation. For example, some Indian English speakers have difficulty in using the falling intonation pattern in yes/no questions and consequently, as Avery and Ehrlish suggested, cause them to appear abrupt or even rude to the English ear. Many Indian teachers unconsciously use their native patterns of intonation and rhythm while speaking in English. This is also the case when Indian teachers who know Arabic produce Arabic discourse.

That is, they clearly use their native patterns of intonation when they speak Arabic. In fact, the patterns of intonation of Indian languages' and rhythm as in the case of Hindi and Urdu are very clear to the ear and can be noticed even without knowing these languages.

Considering the Yemeni EFL situation, some Indian language educators, as shown later, unconsciously incorporated phonological features of Indian English into their speech. The influence of their L1 on their pronunciation of English cannot be avoided. However, as academicians, they are in fact aware of such phonological differences. For instance, whenever students are taught a course in pronunciation, the Head of the English Department, who is also an Indian teacher, usually assigns a teacher who has a good linguistic ability of producing native-like pronunciation. Nevertheless, the phonological features of Indian English still appear in other English classes such as teaching methods, testing, curriculum development, etc. What worsen this problem is that the system, degree, placement types, and location of stress in Arabic differ completely from that of English. Additionally, Arabic usually has equal stress on most of its words and therefore students remain unconscious of how and where to place correct stress within individual words as well as within sentences (Davis, 1995; Kharama & Hajjaj, 1989; Watson, 2011).

2.2 Lexical, Syntactical, and Stylistic Features of Spoken Indian English

Valentine (1991) collected formal and informal spoken data from female native speakers of Hindi. The participants were college students and their ages ranged between 19 and 60. She investigated how discourse markers operate in the Indian English verbal interaction context. One of the issues she examined was how discourse texts that she collected were linguistically marked, as Indian English, in terms of its formal characteristics of lexicon, syntax, and style. In terms of lexicon, using examples taken from the spoken data, she found that there was a kind of bilingual creativity that marked the discourse texts as Indian English. She found examples of the following (p.329-232)

- Derivation of new words
e.g. *night of stay, digloss*
- Semantic shifts
e.g., *passing off, out of order*
- Non-native collocations
e.g. coming going, out-station
In terms of syntax, the spoken data shows examples of the following,
- Pluralization of uncountable nouns
e.g. seek *advice* - many outside *works*
- An omission of definite and indefinite articles and new forms of quantifier collocations e.g. *"a lot of good time"- "very much famous"*
- New word orders
e.g. "They are making aware the women in villages of their own right; *what should they do"*
- Progressive stative verbs and uses of modals such as would and should, etc.
e.g. "she can *await* of that"- "what /how *would* you think"
- New combinations of verbs with particles and prepositions
e.g. "I generally *look up after* the school"

In terms of stylistic spoken conventions, the spoken data showed new metaphors and collocations used in Indian English. For example, in the sentence;

"How would you sort of balance the act and say give preference to any one of them?" the speaker was trying to describe the controversies of arranged versus love marriages equally by using the phrase of "*to balance the act*". Another example appears in the collocation of the word *bit* to nouns.

e.g., "*the marriage bit*"- "*the dowry bit*".

Another interesting example is that Indian speakers of English say the word "click" when two entities work compatibly.

e.g., "So I think if your feelings and your likings they *click* with an individual…

Valentine (1991) also identified many instances of conversational discourse markers in IE such as, *well, but, and, so, you know, I think*, etc.

She claimed that these markers not only function to link meaning to the content but also indicate an involvement of the speaker with the other interlocutors and the social act. An interesting observation of these discourse markers appeared in the use of the word "*and*". Valentine pointed out the word *and* was not always used by the speakers in the data as a conjunction. Rather, the word *and* was used to identify upcoming events, to continue action, and to contribute to the development of ideas. Valentine concluded that although Indian English conversational style has features of English discourse, the type of interaction is clearly Indian in terms of its syntactic, lexical, stylistic and pragmatic features.

2.3 Pragmatic and Sociolinguistic Features

Sridhar (1999) examined the use of speech acts (requests) among Indian speakers of English as a function of the degree to which the subjects were westernized. She gathered data through role-playing technique, choosing students from three Indian universities as participants in her study. Sridhar found that subjects who were from traditional background (non-westernized) used requests in the form of:

- Direct imperatives
e.g. *"Get me a glass of water"*
- Direct statement
e.g. *"I want five tickets"*
- Direct questions
e.g. *"what time is it?"*

Sridhar attributed this to the fact that direct imperatives and statement are not considered impolite in Indian English. Moreover, politeness is marked differently in Indian languages by verbal suffixes that can not be translated into English. With regard to the more westernized subjects, Sridhar found that those subjects used indirect speech acts (requests). For example, in making a request they used the formulaic expression: *"Could you give me (a glass of water?)"*. Sridhar concluded that, when using requesting strategies, the non-westernized Indians reflect the linguistic influence of their Indian languages, while those who are more westernized reflect the social-cultural influence of their westernized backgrounds.

Tinkham (1993) conducted a study to verify Sridhar's conclusion mentioned above. For this purpose, he compared the use of directives (commands, requests, suggestions, offers and invitations) to expressives (apology, and thanking) among westernized and non-westernized speakers of Indian English. The data, unlike Sridhar's controlled data, were four Indian novels and one collection of short stories written by Indian authors. Tinkham found that there were differences among speakers of Indian English and that can be attributed to socio-cultural differences. Westernized Indians were more likely to speak a western-like variety of English than those who were non-westernized and who had less contact with the western culture. For example, westernized Indians tended to use speech act strategies that are similar to those of native speakers of English, while non-westernized Indians tended to transfer Indian speech act strategies into their English discourse.

Thus, the purpose of the above two studies was to examine socio-cultural variations in the use of speech acts between two types of speakers of Indian English rather than variations among varieties of world Englishes. The two studies revealed clearly that the pragmatic ability of using speech acts in Indian English, either those which are directive or expressive, can be attributed to socio-cultural factors. These factors seem to direct speakers toward the target-like use by exhibiting formulaic formal expressions such as *"Could you..?"* or the non-target-like use by using informal directive expressions such as *"Get me a glass of water"*.

3. Methodology

3.1 Observation

3.1.1 Procedure

An observation checklist was developed to investigate the extent to which linguistic aspects of IE were present in the speech of Indian educators in the Yemeni EFL teaching situation. The checklist comprised of phonological, lexical, syntactical, pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of IE. The linguistic features of IE used in the observation checklist were adopted from the studies of (Chaudhary,1993; Pickering & Wiltshire, 2000; Avery & Ehrlish, 1992; Valentine, 1991; Sridhar,1999; Tinkham, 1993). Five male teachers were observed throughout 10 consecutive lectures.

The presence of IE features was marked as *observed* and their absence was marked as *not observed*. A space for other linguistic features that might be observed in the classroom discourse was provided in the *comments* column.

3.1.2 Discussion of the Results

Classroom observations revealed the presence of some phonological aspects of IE, though at varying degrees, in the speech of all the observed Indian educators. With regard to segmental aspects, the use of alveolars, epenthesis, [v] for [w], and mispronunciation of speech sounds have been observed. Disyllabic words, in particular, were accented differently. Features of intonation and rhythm of IE were also present. One interesting feature that has been observed and not mentioned in studies addressing aspects of Indian English is that a few Indian teachers were not capable of pronouncing the alveo-palatal affricate / ʃ /; instead, they replaced it with the alveolar sound /s/ (relationship, / rilei ʃ'n ʃip/ becomes / rilei s'n sip/). This problem, as indicated by two Indian teachers, is a result of the absence of the alveo-palatal affricate / ʃ / in the phonological system of particular L1 Indian languages.

In the Yemeni EFL teaching context, mispronunciation of speech sounds may not constitute a major problem in terms of comprehensibility or intelligibility as students can get used to and even can be made aware of. Most non-native speakers in one way or another have foreign accent problems that are systematic and unavoidable (Coşkun &Arslan, 2011). However, suprasegmental aspects such as stress and intonation is crucially important as they can cause unintelligibility and misunderstanding if they are learnt or used differently. Such parameters of intonation and stress as prosody, rhythm, degree, placement and melody in a language are distinctive to each language and make each language different from one another. As pointed out by Demirezen (2008), such phonological parameters make the learning and teaching of a language a challenging job.

A question that poses itself here is; *"Is it fair to expose Yemeni teacher trainees to the type of English whose speakers may have phonological features that are non-native like; for instance features that are transferred from L1 into L2 as in the case of IE?"* One can argue that there is no harm since those students are not going to use English outside their national borders. Yet, we have to consider that it is the students' right to be exposed to native-like phonological features regardless of the fact that they might encounter and contact with native speakers or not. On the other hand, it is definitely difficult to consider a yes or no answer to the above argument. For one reason, it is evident that such phonotactic constraints in L1 appear to be persistent when producing output in L2 irrespective to the native language of the speakers (Flege, 1995; Odlin, 1989; Rochet, 1995; Sato, 1984; Tarone, 1987).

However, lexical, syntactical, and stylistic features of IE have not been considerably detected in the Yemeni EFL academic setting except for a few instances of semantic shifts of some English words. For instance, one teacher said to one of his students, *"you are out of order today"*, meaning that the student is present physically but not mentally. Such usage usually takes place out of the classroom context and is more likely used metaphorically referring to the concept of not functioning well. Such semantic change could also be structured by other non-native language educators because of different motivations such as, fuzziness, disguising language, flattery, insult, etc. (Blank, 1999; Sweetser, 1990)

Classroom observations also revealed that Indian language educators in the Yemeni EFL academic setting are westernized speakers of English in terms of pragmatic and sociolinguistic features. For instance, they usually produce speech acts in native-like formulaic style. This is because most of them had been in Britain for a period between three and five years pursuing their higher studies. Additionally, the nature of their jobs as university academics necessitates them to use such formulaic formal expressions. Hence, it can be concluded that Indian language educators do not exhibit distinctive lexical, syntactic, stylistic and pragmatic features of IE in the Yemeni EFL classroom except for the persistent occurrence of some phonological representations that are more likely the result of L1 transfer.

3.2 Likert Scale

3.2.1 Participants

The participants were 60 teacher trainees, 30 females and 30 males. Their ages were between 22 and 25. All of them were majoring in English language teaching and education at the Faculty of Education, Hodeidah University. They were fourth year students and were largely taught by Indian language educators. Their levels in English ranged between upper intermediate and advanced. They were randomly assigned to participate in the questionnaire and selected from almost two hundred students enrolled in the fourth year level.

3.2.2 Procedure

A five point likert-scale was conducted to determine the teacher trainees' perceptions of how they view their Indian teachers' English based on their learning experiences throughout the four years of their studies. The questionnaire was coined with some ELT concepts that teacher trainees were acquainted with to elicit practical values and views of their own teachers. Such task is unusual in the Yemeni EFL context. Therefore, all participants were asked to attend a workshop before undertaking the questionnaire. The aim was to lessen the pressure that could result from being involved in such task and to eliminate any feelings on their part of judging their own teachers. Indian language educators were also informed about the questionnaire to avoid any cultural or personal misunderstanding.

Such procedure is believed to be appropriate to reach a fair conclusion with regard to Indian educators' English efficacy in the Yemeni EFL classroom in terms of learners' comprehensibility of their teachers' accent, presentation of the content knowledge and instructional language delivery in the classroom. Sixty students were chosen randomly and were asked to reflect upon their personal learning experiences inside and outside the classroom settings with their Indian teachers. The questionnaire consisted of questions upon which the respondents can express either agreement or disagreement attitudes towards the item in question. Each statement was given a numerical score to reflect its degree of attitudinal approval. The likert scale included 18 items. The items were carefully stated to avoid any bias in favor of either sides of the likert scale. Students were previously informed that their identities would remain anonymous so that they can be able to clearly and confidently express their stand. It is believed that eighteen items would give a good picture of teacher trainees' perceptions considering that all students chosen to participate are two weeks away from graduation and as such, they are more capable to present informative views. Further, the researcher conducted group conferences with the participants after the questionnaire was carried out. The aim was to reduce leniency and bias on the part of the participants and to elicit more responses in case the questionnaire does not cover other informative aspects of students' learning experiences with their Indian teachers.

The purpose of conducting this type of methodology, as stated earlier, is to speculate on how Yemeni teacher trainees view their Indian teachers' accent. Another purpose is to urge officials to re-think of the claims for the need of native teachers of English in the Yemeni EFL context. Such claims are intuitive and might be due to the pressure that beginner students may encounter at the beginning of their degree course rather than the true and honest wish to reach native like proficiency. Officials need to understand that the presence of native teachers of English will not guarantee that students will acquire native-like proficiency considering that students have less opportunities to practice using English outside the classroom and that there are even lesser chances to send teacher trainees to English speaking countries to pursue their higher studies.

The questionnaire was distributed among respondents as one entity without the categorization into three parts as used specifically in this paper. The aim was not to create a feeling of judgment or evaluation among respondents of their teachers' performance. Rather, the questionnaire aimed at having a clear picture of students' beliefs and attitudes towards their language teachers and the extent to which they were learning without having problems of understanding their teachers and/ or the way the content was being delivered. The first category includes items that address issues of leaners' comprehensibility of their Indian teachers' accent. The second category includes items that address aspects of language presentation skills that encompass the ability to use the medium language to effectively present the subject area. The third category includes items that shed light on aspects of language delivery in the classroom and the type of language used to enhance learning of the content knowledge among students.

3.2.3 Discussion of the Results

 For the present study, in the three categories, higher means indicate students' agreement on teachers' efficiency in terms of language intelligibility, language presentation skills and language instructional delivery. Therefore, higher means show the positive side of the likert scale. In the first category, as shown in table (1), items from 1 to 4 address issues regarding learners' comprehensibility of Indian educators' accent considering that both teachers and learners do not share the same L1 background. As shown in table (2), items (1-2-3) constitute substantial significance as their means are (4.03 - 4.01 - 4.05) respectively. Item 4 has a mean of 2.73 which does not indicate substantial significance. It is apparent that most students can recognize the differences in terms of pronunciation between their non-native teachers and native speakers.

However, such agreement does not negatively contribute to the overall impression of learners with regard to their teachers' intelligibility. This is evident considering the higher means of the other seventeen items which lead to the conclusion that fourth year students have positive attitudes towards their teachers' English in the classroom.

Table (1): Items Showing the Extent to Which Learners Can Comprehend Their Teachers' Accent

(Comprehensibility)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1. I have no difficulty understanding the speech of their Indian teachers.					
2. I can clearly hear most of the words in their speech.					
3. I don't have difficulty following their speech					
4. There are no serious differences in their pronunciation with that of native speakers					

Table (2): Descriptive Statistics of 5-Point Likert-Scale Items from item 1 to item 4: (n:60)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	4.03	0.72
2	4.01	0.56
3	4.05	0.69
4	2.73	0.96

The second set of items in table (3) addresses aspects of language presentation skills of Indian educators. Including such items is also an attempt by the researcher to observe if students positively perceive and appreciate their teachers' knowledge of the content and their teaching style.

In table (4), as shown above, the average means of items, 5,6,7,8, 9, 10 and 11 respectively have higher means and as specified above constitute substantial significance. The means in this category are between 4.0 and 4.65 and thus represent the positive side of the likert scale. The specified items are concurrent with the efficiency of Indian educators in the Yemeni EFL setting.

Table (3): Showing the extent to which Indian educators, as perceived by their students, use the medium language effectively to present the subject area

Language presentation skills	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
5. Indian Language educators present information in multiple formats.					
6. They clarify content before students ask questions					
7. They use effective strategies and techniques for making content accessible for English language learners					
8. They are not confused with students' questions					
9. It is easy to follow the sequence and the development of their ideas					
10. They show great confidence about their knowledge of the subject area					
11. They demonstrate an adequate knowledge of the content of lessons					

Table (4): Descriptive statistics of 5-point likert-scale items from item 5 to item 11: (n:60)

Item	Mean	Standard deviation
5	4.18	0.61
6	4.33	0.59
7	4.28	0.55
8	4.65	0.51
9	4.0	0.80
10	4.6	0.48
11	4.5	0.5

In the third category, as shown table (5), items 12 to 18 address the strategies used by Indian educators to deliver classroom instructions in English. Likewise, all items in this category represent the positive side of the likert scale with means between 3.85 and 4.71 (table 6). The higher means in this category reflect clearly that there is a good communicative and academic rapport between students and their teachers. Further, it indicates that students feel the tangible effect of the way English is delivered in the classroom on their understanding of the subject area.

Table (5): Showing the Extent to which Indian Language Educators Effectively Support Students' Language Growth, Expand Learning through Feedback, and Stimulate Students' Language Use

Language Instructional Delivery	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
12. They deliver complete, clear and logical explanation of the subject matter					
13.They don't spend much time in responding to students' questions					
14. They can skillfully clarify misunderstanding					
15. They use language that engage students					
16. They have positive rapport with students					
17. They encourage students' independent and creative thinking using stimulating language					
18. They usually avoid using language that is difficult, leading to confusion or limiting discussion.					

Table (6): Descriptive Statistics of 5-point likert-scale Items from Item 12 to item 18: (n:60)

Item	Mean	Standard deviation
12	4.53	0.5
13	4.16	0.71
14	4.71	0.45
15	4.26	0.65
16	4.5	0.5
17	3.85	0.77
18	4.26	0.70

Upon group interviews, most fourth-year teacher trainees showed positive attitudes about their Indian teachers' language efficacy in the classroom. They also described their teachers as more experienced and knowledgeable than their non-native counterparts. A few respondents were a little concerned about the prolonged exposure to phonological aspects of IE. They thought that their accent would have been better if taught by native teachers of English.

Many learners admitted that they had problems understanding their teachers often at the beginning of their degree course. However, it was interesting that during the interviews most learners speaking English at varying degrees showed no evidence of IE influence on their accent. This indicates that they had been able to detect the differences in accent between Indian English and Standard English. Such noticing is most probably evident due to the easy access to the widely English media and internet of today. Yet, teacher trainees' oral discourse do have serious problems in particular with stress within words. This should not only be attributed to the exposure to IE. It is also the result of the vast differences in the system, degree, placement types, and location of stress between Arabic and English.

Two respondents have made one interesting remark about their teacher' speech rate. They revealed that one difficulty that they faced at the beginning of their degree course was that their Indian teachers used to speak too quickly. As a result, they paid more attention on what they say rather than how they say particular chunks of speech. Such remark explains, though partially, the linguistic deficiencies that teacher trainees could have developed throughout the construction of their interlanguage system.

4. Conclusion

The research findings clearly revealed that features of IE are not predominantly incorporated in the Yemeni EFL context except for the occurrence of some deep-rooted phonological features. It appears that it is difficult for some Indian teachers, as it is the case with other non-native teachers of English, to avoid particular phonological problems in stress, intonation, and pronunciation of speech sounds. Pickering and Wiltshire (2000) asserted that even Indian teachers who are working in American universities have many phonological problems, particularly, in stress and intonation. One possible reason for such condition is that their L1 phonological system is greatly different from that of English.

Since Yemeni EFL learners are taught by non-native speakers; Yemenis, Iraqis and mostly Indians, it will be more practical to expose them via intensive listening to authentic materials that address both segmental and suprasegmental aspects of English pronunciation and thus students can have the proper realization of English accent, intonation and stress. Although, the majority of fourth year teacher trainees do not manifestly indicate unintelligibility or incomprehensibility of their teachers' speech, non-native like stress patterns are more likely to be transferred into their speech. Teacher trainees are prepared to be teachers of English at schools and universities, and the risk is that they might erroneously and unconsciously follow non-native like phonological patterns. Therefore, the call for incorporating authentic native-like listening materials is to avoid not only the phonological problems that some non-native teachers may exhibit in their oral discourse but also the negative transfer from Arabic into English as Arabic is not clearly a stress accent-language nor a pitch-accent language.

With regard to the claims of the need for native teachers of English, 4th year teacher trainees indicated that such claims are temporary and they disappear as students get used to their teachers' accent. In addition, the belief that native teachers are capable of helping students reach the end of the native target-like continuum is not necessarily true particularly if we consider the limited L2 environment and the artificiality of the EFL classrooms.

Hence, it might not be fair to conclude that students in the Yemeni EFL situation are indeed unfairly exposed to a variety of English that is not supposed to be taught to them. With the exception of phonological problems that some language educators may exhibit, it is obvious that Indian teachers are verbally skillful and more able to ensure the efficient communication of information of the content knowledge in the Yemeni EFL academic settings.

References

Avery, p. & Ehrlish, S. (1992). Teaching American English pronunciation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benke, E. & Medgyes, P. (2005). Differences in teaching behavior between native and non-native speaker teachers: As seen by the learners. In E. Llurda (Ed.), Non-Native

Language Teachers.Perceptions, Challenges, and Contributions to the Profession (pp.195-215). New York: Springer.

Blank, A. (1999). Why do new meanings occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change.In A. Blank & P. Koch (Eds.), Historical Semantics and Cognition (pp. 61–90).Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999b). Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2005). Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chaudhary, S., C. (1993).Issues on Indian English phonology: A rejoinder.World Englishes, 12(3) 375-383.http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1993.tb00035.x.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 33 (2), 185–209. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.2307/3587717.

Cook, V. (2005). Basing teaching on the L2 user.In E. Llurda (Ed.), Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession (pp. 47–61).New York, NY: Springer.

Coşkun, A. &Arslan, A. (2011).EIL and Foreign Accent in ELT. English for Specific Purposes, 31(10), 1-6.

Davis, S. (1995). Emphasis spread in Arabic and grounded phonology. Linguistic Inquiry, 26, 465-498.

Demirezen, M. (2008). The recognition and the production of question Forms of English intonation by Turkish first year students, Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture- Putting Theory into Practice: Teaching for the Next Century, 4-5 December, Rome-Italy.

D' Souza J. (2001).Conceptualizing range and depth in Indian English.World Englishes, 20(2), 145-160.http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/1467-971X.00207.

Flege, J. E. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings and problems.In W. Strange (Ed.), Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research (pp. 233-277). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Kharma, N. & Hajjaj, A. (1989).Use of the mother tongue in the ESL Classroom.IRAL, 27 (3), 223-235.

Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native teacher.London, UK: Macmillan.

Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? ELT Journal, 46 (4), 340 349.http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1093/elt/46.4.340.

Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic imperialism. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Odlin, T. (1989).Language transfer: cross-linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rochet, B. L. (1995). Perception and production of L2 speech sounds by adults. In W. Strange (Ed.), Speech perception and Linguistic Experience: Theoretical and Methodological Issues (pp. 379-410). Timonium, MD: York Press.

Sahgal, A. (1991). Patterns of language use in a bilingual setting in India. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), English around the world: Sociolinguistic Perspectives (pp. 299-306). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sato, C. J. (1984). Phonological processes in second language acquisition: Another look at interlanguage syllable structure. Language Learning, 34(4), 43-57. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00351.x.

Sridhar, K. K. (1991). Speech acts in an indigenized variety: sociocultural values and language variation. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), English around the world: Sociolinguistic Perspectives (pp. 308-318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, E. (1990). From etymology to pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tarone, E. (1987). Some influences on the syllable structure of interlanguage phonology. In G. Ioup & S. H. Weinberger (Eds.), Interlanguage phonology: The acquisition of a second language sound system (pp. 232-247). New York: Newbury House.

Tinkham, T. (1993). Sociocultural variation in Indian English speech acts. World Englishes, 12(2), 239-247.http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1993.tb00024.x.

Watson, JCE. (2011). Word stress in Arabic. In: The Blackwell companion to phonology. Wiley- Blackwell.

Valentine, T., M. (1991).Getting the message across: Discourse markers in Indian English. World Englishes, 10(3), 325-334. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1991.tb00167.x.

Wiltshire, C., & Pickering, L. (2000). Pitch accent in Indian-English teaching discourse. World Englishes, 19(2), 173-183.http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1111/1467-971X.00167.

Participant ID No.:_____

Items	Strongly Disagree (1)	disagree (2)	Undecided (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)
1.Students have no difficulty understanding the speech of their Indian teachers.					
2. Students can clearly hear most of the words in their speech.					
3. Students don't have difficulty following their speech					
4. There are no serious differences in their pronunciation with that of native speakers					
5. They accurately anticipate confusion by presenting information in multiple formats.					
6. They clarify content before students ask questions					
7. They use effective strategies and techniques for making content accessible for English language learners					
8. They are not confused with students' questions					
9. It is easy to follow the sequence and the development of their ideas					
10. They show great confidence about their knowledge of the subject area					
11. They demonstrate an adequate knowledge of the academic content of lessons					
12. they deliver complete, clear and logical explanation of the subject matter					
13.They don't spend much time in responding to students' questions					
14. They can skillfully clarify misunderstanding					
15. They use language that engage students and that is appropriate to the content					
16. Most of them have positive rapport with students and demonstrates respect for and interest in individual students' experiences, thoughts and opinions.					
17. They encourage students' independent and creative thinking using stimulating language					
18. They usually avoid using language that is developmentally difficult, leading to confusion or limiting discussion.					

Linguistic Features	Observed	Not observed	Comments
Phonological Features: 1. Speech sounds features -use of dental and retroflexes - Use of alveolars, epenthesis - use of [v] for [w], -mispronunciation of speech sounds 2. Stress: Words accented differently 3. Intonation: use of L1 patterns of intonation and rhythm			
Lexical Features: - derivation of new words - semantic shifts - non-native collocations			
Syntactic Features: -Pluralization of uncountable nouns - An omission of definite and indefinite articles - new forms of quantifier collocations - new word orders - Progressive stative verbs - New combinations of verbs with particles and prepositions			
Stylistic Features: - new metaphors and collocations -Use of discourse markers to identify upcoming events, to continue action, or to contribute to the development of ideas			
Pragmatic & sociolinguistic features Using requests in the form of; - Direct imperatives - Direct statement - Direct questions			