2020. Т. 30. вып. 3

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

# Методика преподавания филологических дисциплин

УДК 811

Elena Yakovleva [Е.Л. Яковлева]

### FEATURES OF LOCAL VS FOREIGN ENGLISH TEACHERS: CASE STUDY IN TAIWAN

The article proves the stereotypical thinking of Asian students that the native English speakers are better than the non-native teachers of English. The study results conform to most research results of numerous works that both kinds of teachers have their advantages in certain areas. For example, foreign teachers are good role models for correct pronunciation, extensive and proper vocabulary use and competent cultural mediators, whereas the local teachers facilitate the English learning of grammar, teach translation skills, prepare for domestic exams and others using linguistic-analytical approach. For the effective English class what should count is the valuable linguistic and pedagogical proficiency of both NNESTs and NESTs. So, for the balanced teaching and better learning outcome, it is advisable to implement both kinds of teachers who should often collaborate and complement each other.

*Keywords*: intercultural communicative competence [ICC], lingua franca, linguistic-analytical approach, [non-] native English speaking teachers, nativeness.

DOI: 10.35634/2412-9534-2020-30-3-540-550

### INTRODUCTION

Teaching English in Asia is a very common issue supported by the governmental policies. Every country wants to become globalized in political, economic, and societal areas through English as **lingua franca**; therefore many Asian countries started to foster the English education, especially the oral communication skills, already from the primary school. It is often taught not only by local teachers, also called non-native English speaking teachers [further referred as NNESTs], but also by native speakers or foreign teachers of English, who are near native speakers [further referred as NESTs]. This study focuses on teaching English by NNESTs and NESTs for Taiwanese English-major students of different higher educational systems in one of the universities in Southern Taiwan.

## PURPOSE & METHODOLOGY

The comparison between local and foreign teachers on teaching English to Asian students has been a research topic for a while. Our study discusses the advantages and disadvantages of employing foreign or local teacher in terms of their linguistic and cultural knowledge, and teaching method. For the purpose of the study, the questionnaire was conducted on all three higher educational systems in Taiwan, namely five-year college [further education after junior high school [six years of primary school and three years of junior high school] to obtain the degree "Associate of Arts"], two-year college [further education after five-year college to obtain the degree "Bachelor of Arts"], and four-year-college [further education after senior high school [twelve years of compulsory education] to obtain the degree "Bachelor of Arts"]. In the survey, the students' explanations with different wording but similar meanings presented one category and were counted roughly. The most common results are presented in percentage in the table below. Applying primarily the qualitative approach rather than the quantitative one, the students' answers to the open-ended questions will assumingly provide a deeper understanding of this contrastive issue. It means the results of the survey will provide an indepth view on teaching English in Taiwan for English-major students, indicating their preferences, their common strength and weakness in English proficiency, as well as the benefits and drawbacks of teaching English by NNESTs and NESTs. Subsequently, the evaluation results can provide an impetus for the teachers to improve their instructional practices according to the students' needs, interests, learning strategies and others. Furthermore, the instructors could pertinently modify the objective of their classes to effectively develop the English proficiency of the students and their intercultural competence. As Byram [4] noticed correctly, the intercultural communicative competence [ICC] should emphasize more the differences between cultures and accept them.

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

2020 Т 30 вып 3

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Before discussing the teaching features of local and foreign teachers, it is important to understand the peculiarities of Taiwanese (or even most Asian) students based on the researcher's long-term teaching experience and observation. Those students prefer a lecture instead of discussion, so being silent in the class without asking or answering questions or having a discussion is normal for the Taiwanese students [12: 15: 31]. It could be explained due to their fear of failure giving the wrong answer and by thus "losing the face" in front of others, also due to their shyness and resistance towards communication or public speaking. Besides, the role of the teacher is considered authoritative that requires the students' respect and their total obedience. Such asymmetrical relationship produces a certain way of teaching that differs from the commonly adapted teaching way in western countries where critical thinking of the students is highly emphasized. The education in many Asian countries focuses mostly on the [written] examinations that serve to select appropriately the students for further learning. Therefore, the students are examination oriented, i.e. they study mostly for the exam and the score. It often leads to the fact that the input of knowledge does not retain for a longer period of time, but it is often forgotten after the exam. By thus, the learning process often loses the continuity of the knowledge for the interrelated disciplines. It means the students do not follow the interconnectness between the subjects, so not using the previous knowledge that might impede their further learning process.

Many Asians with the governmental support pursue the view that the native English speaker is the ideal teacher, especially for the development of communicative and intercultural competence [21, 28]. Subsequently, the native English speakers are considered by Asians as superior while non-native teachers of English are positioned as inferior [cf. 27, p. 171]. Unfortunately, native-speakerness is often enough, especially in Asia, to be hired as a teacher without considering the pedagogical, professional qualifications related to the teaching performance. As a result, the NNESTs are often discriminated in the employment decisions due to their non-ideal proficiency and pronunciation of English. The common opinion that native speakers are better teachers is often a fiction that positions them as superior and the non-native speakers as inferior. Liu wrote about inferiority complex of the NNESTs that some might believe about their inadequate knowledge of the foreign language [16, p. 109]. Therefore, those teachers need to work harder to meet the high expectations of the students. Phillipson's term "native speaker fallacy" [1992] is commonly used in applied linguistics with the claim that non-native speakers can also gain abilities similar to native-speakers, e.g. in terms of fluency, correct usage of idioms, cultural competence, and others [cited in 21, p. 97]. Widdowson [1994] indicated that native speakers might have an advantage in the "context of language use" but not necessarily in the "context of language learning" [cited in 3] because they are usually not familiar with the local curriculum and requirement; therefore the main load of teaching lies still on the NNESTs to prepare the students for several local English tests. In fact, some native speakers as teachers do not actually feel their superiority; on the contrary, they feel themselves isolated and marginal, especially in the high(er) school educational system. Therefore, many NESTs desire for more integrity and collaboration with NNESTs that could make teaching more effective and possibly improve the class management to discipline students with the support of NNESTs [see above p. 173ff.]. In her article, M. Jeon [in 27] addressed an important issue of dichotomization of the native speakers of English as superior teachers from the governmental and parental perspective, and on the other hand, the [partial] illegitimacy of these native speakers of English from the local Korean teachers' and students' view that is also a common viewpoint in other Asian countries.

The term "foreign teachers" refers mostly to the English native speakers as well as to the non-native speakers of English who are usually from Western countries as the researcher herself. The definition of 'foreign teacher' is not highly elaborated whereas the native speaker is defined someone who learned the language from the childhood, can comprehend and produce fluent, spontaneous discourse and idioms, and understand regional and social variations within the language [10]. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy [2] referred 'nativeness' to a social rather than a linguistic category, i.e. what native speaker should look like or sound like. They also defined two main approaches to NNESTs in terms of 'nativeness', namely the dominance approach and the difference approach. The former focuses on the linguistic weakness of the NNESTs, and the latter on their strength like valuable linguistic and pedagogical proficiency. Medgyes [20] emphasized the advantages of the NNESTs who can address the needs and problems of the students in their mother tongue. Seidlhofer [24] called non-native teachers as 'double agents' who mediate between the different languages and cultures to facilitate the learning process of the students.

2020. Т. 30. вып. 3

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

English is taught by more than 80 % non-native speakers worldwide [17]. Therefore, this topic on teaching English by NESTs and NNESTs has been studied mostly by non-native teachers of English. Llurda [17] stated that such research revealed lower language proficiency of the non-native English speakers and their different teaching behavior. Referring to Chiu's study [2008], the NESTs employ an intuitive-imitative approach with no explicit explanation of linguistic features because they are often not familiar with how languages are learned, while the NNESTs take usually a more linguistic-analytical approach with clear clarifications [cited in 9, p. 180].

The table below summarizes the main characteristics of both kinds of teachers and subconsequently compares their teaching style [cf. 12; 15; 23].

Characteristics	NNESTs	NESTs
Relationship	Asymmetrical: respect teacher	Superficially symmetrical:
		ask teachers questions
		& make appropriate jokes
Common way of teaching	Lecture	Discussion
Common teaching tools	Textbook	Hand-outs & supplementary
		reading
Organization of the class	Clear structure: review previous lecture,	Non-fixed structure of the class
	introduce new contents with detailed expla-	with possible related sidetracks
	nations emphasizing important points, then	
	summarize the lecture at the end	
Working procedure	Listening to the lecturer	Pair works & discussions
of the students	and take notes	
Teacher's focus	Teach for exam and knowledge	Teach primarily for knowledge
Teacher's role	Students' guide; teacher-centered	Students' facilitator of learning;
		student-centered

The study results collected from different reliable sources on teaching by NNESTs vs. NESTs in different Asian countries could be applied to the situation in Taiwan. According to some international studies [20; 14; 13; 18; 29], the native speakers are valued mostly for their pronunciation, correct language use and cultural competence, whereas the local teachers are preferred for their explanation of grammar in the local language, for their shared cultural understanding, for their easier comprehension, and for exam preparation. In addition, Chang's study pointed out that due to the local teacher's multicompetence they develop the translation skills, provide more exam preparation, have more severe managing of error problems explaining the rules of the target language, and are aware of the students' difficulties whereas the native speakers will often disregard those errors as long as they do not impede comprehension [6, p. 6]. Some researchers [V. Cook] emphasized that the NNESTs should be aware of their strength and build up their confidence. In fact, many of them feel themselves at disadvantage in terms of their accent or possible mispronunciation. Chang [6] also figured out that the learners consider the native speakers friendlier and their lessons are lively and colorful. However, the communication gap also happens due to the different language and cultural backgrounds. Based on some studies and the researcher's personal experience, the students might change their mind and have a positive attitude towards non-native speakers if they can prove their professionalism. Based on the Andrew's study [2003], the teacher's competence consists of "subject-matter cognitions [i.e. knowledge about language], language proficiency [knowledge of language], knowledge of learners, knowledge of pedagogy, knowledge of the curriculum, and knowledge of the context" [cited in 9, p. 179]. If the teacher is competent in these areas, this will create own teacher's identity and s/he will be enthusiastic about teaching, then it should be irrelevant whether it is a native speaker or not. As the results of the extended Tsou's study [26] showed, the teacher's qualification and experience have been considered as an important feature for being a good teacher, regardless of his mother tongue. Sung's study [25] on the perspectives of the Hong Kong's students revealed that these students prefer both NNESTs and NESTs, while the former are preferred due to their grammar competence and the latter due to their competent oracy in English and interesting and varied teaching methods in contrast to the less diverse teaching methods of the local teachers. Mahboob's study [19] on ELT students in the U.S. did not show any preference towards two types of teachers and confirmed the same tendency that NESTs are good at teaching oral skills, vocabulary and culture, whereas NNESTs are good at teaching literacy and grammar meeting the students' needs. Similar

2020 Т 30 вып 3

results were found in the study by Lasagabaster and Sierra [14] on Basque students. The scholars figured out that university students prefer more the NESTs whereas the primary school students value more the NNESTs as imitable models. The Hong Kong students in the Cheung & Braine's study [8] showed a favorable attitude towards their NNESTs; even though they pointed their shortcomings such as examination-oriented teaching approach, limited use of English in class, and the tendency to over-correct students' work. The researchers also figured out that final-year students indicated a more positive attitude towards NNESTs than the newly recruited students. It implied that through several years of teaching NNESTs could prove their professionalism of being good teachers. To sum up, the most studies revealed the differences in the language competence and teaching behavior between NESTs and NNESTs from the students' and teachers' perspectives. Furthermore, Kasai [et al.] stated that the studies on students' perceptions of NESTs and NNESTs have produced inconsistent findings that could be explained through the fact that there are still less investigation on students' perspectives than teachers' perspectives [13, p. 276].

Based on the results of the studies mentioned above it could be inferred that both types of teachers need to collaborate with each other to improve the weaknesses. For example, NNESTs need to diversify their teaching materials to motivate students, be less strict and improve their language proficiency, whereas the NESTs need to pay more attention to grammar explanation as it is important for the students and control the classroom discipline more. It is also relevant to balance the students' perspective on the equality of both types of teachers because from both of them the students can benefit. Besides, the students need to understand that in the future they might use English as lingua franca, i. e. with different non-native speakers of English.

#### TAIWAN'S CASE STUDY

Several scholars conducted research on teaching English in Taiwan by NNESTs and NESTs from different aspects where some of them will be presented below.

As Liao and Yang claimed, the commonly applied grammar-translation and exam-oriented teaching in Taiwan causes the students' low speaking skills that have been tried to boost through hiring foreign English teachers [15, p. 151]. Those teachers need to develop the students' communicative and cultural competence in real-like situations. Besides, Paul [23] pointed out that choral drilling and mechanical pattern practice that are very common in Asian education are also less effective for communicative and spontaneous use of English. Parroting should be done but in a more meaningful way and with genuine emotions. By thus, the words and phrases could be applied by children in new situations [see above, p. 76]. As said, Taiwanese teachers focus more on complicated grammar and sentence patterns instead of different cultures, but some students like that those teachers can provide explanation in Chinese for better understanding [15, p. 156f.]. However, there is also some criticism from Taiwanese students towards foreign teachers, e.g. foreign teacher's instruction method is often non-systematic. Furthermore, for foreign English teachers, there is often a class management problem in over-crowded classrooms with over 50 students where the students do not have enough chance to practice speaking or are afraid of speaking in such big audience with different level of English [15, p. 158]. Besides, those teachers might lack understanding of diversified cultures that however, in our opinion, depends on very individual experience and understanding of each teacher [15, p. 159].

Wu conducted a similar study on Taiwanese non-English major students' belief about learning English. Her findings revealed as follows [30, p. 172ff.]. 55 % of students believe that English is difficult primarily because they need to learn a lot of vocabulary that is considered as the most important part together with the translation method and English grammar is difficult. Furthermore, 45.8 % do not like to practice speaking English with native speakers because they are afraid that they can't speak in English. However, 41.7 % like to practice English with native speakers predominantly because it helps them to learn English. The scholar concluded that the lack of confidence may impede students' English learning despite their high motivation. Therefore, the teachers need to build the students' self-confidence.

Cheng's study [2009] indicated that Taiwanese elementary school students prefer to have NESTs because of their American accent [cited in 7]. In the Wong's [2009] study, Taiwanese university students indicated that foreign teachers are more interactive in class and use different assessments, while Taiwanese teachers focus more on writing and reading. In addition, foreign teachers guide students in different ways while Taiwanese teachers tell them the instruction directly [cited in 7]. Chang and Chang's study on Taiwanese secondary school students [7] confirmed the idea that the students do prefer NESTs due to their better command of the English language. They also figured out that NESTs are considered to be better listening and speaking teachers while NNESTs are regarded better reading and writing teachers who share a common culture and learning experience and can foresee the learning difficulties.

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

# СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

The results of our data collection from university students are presented as follows (see Appendix I):

		university students are presen	
Q	5-year-college [70Ss]	4-year-college [24Ss]	2-year-college [23Ss]
1	10-12 years	14 years	12 years
2	99 % -Yes; 1 % – No	96 % – Yes; 4 % – No	91.3 % – Yes; 8.7 % – No
3	60 % – Yes; 40 % – No	75 % – No; 25 % – Yes	87 % – No; 13 % – Yes
4a	[102 answers]:	[37 answers]:	[35 answers]:
	1] 44.12 % – Listening;	1] 37.84 % – Listening;	1] 40 % – Reading;
	2] 26.47 % – Speaking;	2] 35.14 % – Reading;	2] 20 % <b>each</b> – Listening &
	3] 21.57 % – Reading;	3] 21.62 % – Speaking;	Speaking & Writing
	4] 7.84 % – Writing	4] 5.41 % – Writing	
4b	[82 answers]:	[36 answers]:	[35 answers]:
	1] 43.90 % – Writing;	1] 44.45 % – Writing;	1] 28.57 % <b>each</b> – Writing &
	2] 20.73 % – Speaking;	2] 25 % – Speaking;	Listening;
	3] 18.29 % – Reading;	3] 22.22 % – Listening;	2] 25.72 % – Speaking;
	4] 17.07 % – Listening	4] 8.33 % – Reading	3] 17.14 % – Reading
5	97.14 % -Yes;	91.67 % -Yes;	91.31 % -Yes;
	2.86 % – No	8.33 % – No	8.7 % – No
6	[70 answers]:	[25 answers]:	[21 answers]:
	1] 51.43 % -Yes;	1] 56 % -Yes;	1] 47.62 % -Yes;
	2] 45.72 % – No;	2] 44 % – No	2] 52.38 % – No
	3] 1.43 % <b>each</b> – Soso & Does	,	,
	not matter		
7	[69 answers]:	[21 answers]:	[19 answers]:
,	1] 92.75 % -Yes;	1] 90.47 % -Yes;	1] 89.47 % -Yes;
	2] 7.25 % – No	2] 9.53 % – No	2] 10.53 % – No
9	[71 answers]:	[21 answers]:	[22 answers]:
	1] 47.89 % – Foreign teacher;	1] 47.62 % <b>each</b> – Foreign	1] 45.45 % – Does not matter;
	2] 46.48 % – Does not matter;	teacher & Does not matter;	2] 36.36 % – Foreign teacher;
	3] 5.63 % – Taiwanese teacher	2] 4.76 % – Taiwanese	3] 18.18 % – Taiwanese
	-	teacher	teacher
1			teacher
10	[144 answers]:	[52 answers]:	[45 answers]:
10	[144 answers]: 1] 43.75 % – Hand-out;		
10		[52 answers]:	[45 answers]:
10	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out;
10	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT;
10	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio;
10	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video;
10	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video;
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]:	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]:	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]:
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video;
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT &	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game;
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio;
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio &	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out
	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio &	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]:	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]:
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discus-	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discus-	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % – Group Discus-
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % - Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % - PPT; 3] 13.33 % - Audio; 4] 11.11 % - Video; 5] 8.89 % - Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % - Video; 2] 25 % - Game; 3] 22.73 % - Audio; 4] 11.37 % each - Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % - Group Discussion;
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % – Game;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % – Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each – Game &
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game; 3] 13.62 % – Lecture;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % – Game; 3] 12.20 % each – Presentation & Exercise;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % – Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each – Game & Pair work;
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game; 3] 13.62 % – Lecture; 4] 11.74 % – Presentation;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % – Game; 3] 12.20 % each – Presenta-	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % – Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each – Game & Pair work; 3] 14.48 % – Exercise;
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game; 3] 13.62 % – Lecture; 4] 11.74 % – Presentation; 5] 9.39 % each – Exercise &	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % – Game; 3] 12.20 % each – Presentation & Exercise; 4] 10.98 % each – Lecture &	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % – Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % – PPT; 3] 13.33 % – Audio; 4] 11.11 % – Video; 5] 8.89 % – Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % – Video; 2] 25 % – Game; 3] 22.73 % – Audio; 4] 11.37 % each – Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % – Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each – Game & Pair work; 3] 14.48 % – Exercise; 4] 13.16 % – Lecture;
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others  [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others  [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game; 3] 13.62 % – Lecture; 4] 11.74 % – Presentation; 5] 9.39 % each – Exercise & Pair work & Role play;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % – Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % – PPT; 3] 17.31 % – Audio; 4] 9.62 % – Video; 5] 3.85 % – Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % – Game; 2] 19.45 % each – PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each – Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % – Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % – Game; 3] 12.20 % each – Presentation & Exercise; 4] 10.98 % each – Lecture & Pair work;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % - Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % - PPT; 3] 13.33 % - Audio; 4] 11.11 % - Video; 5] 8.89 % - Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % - Video; 2] 25 % - Game; 3] 22.73 % - Audio; 4] 11.37 % each - Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % - Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each - Game & Pair work; 3] 14.48 % - Exercise; 4] 13.16 % - Lecture; 5] 10.53 % - Role play;
11	1] 43.75 % – Hand-out; 2] 33.33 % – PPT; 3] 9.72 % – Audio; 4] 6.25 % – Game; 5] 5.56 % – Video; 6] 1.39 % – Others  [166 answers]: 1] 28.31 % – Video; 2] 24.70 % – Game; 3] 16.87 % – Audio; 4] 14.46 % – Hand-out; 5] 13.86 % – PPT; 6] 1.81 % – Others  [213 answers]: 1] 18.31 % – Group Discussion; 2] 17.37 % – Game; 3] 13.62 % – Lecture; 4] 11.74 % – Presentation; 5] 9.39 % each – Exercise & Pair work & Role play; 6] 7.51 % – Individual work;	[52 answers]: 1] 36.54 % - Hand-out; 2] 32.69 % - PPT; 3] 17.31 % - Audio; 4] 9.62 % - Video; 5] 3.85 % - Game  [36 answers]: 1] 27.78 % - Game; 2] 19.45 % each - PPT & Video; 3] 16.67 % each - Audio & Hand-out  [82 answers]: 1] 17.07 % - Group Discussion; 2] 13.42 % - Game; 3] 12.20 % each - Presentation & Exercise; 4] 10.98 % each - Lecture & Pair work; 5] 9.76 % - Individual work;	[45 answers]: 1] 37.78 % - Hand-out; 2] 28.89 % - PPT; 3] 13.33 % - Audio; 4] 11.11 % - Video; 5] 8.89 % - Game  [44 answers]: 1] 29.55 % - Video; 2] 25 % - Game; 3] 22.73 % - Audio; 4] 11.37 % each - Hand-out & PPT  [76 answers]: 1] 17.11 % - Group Discussion; 2] 15.79 % each - Game & Pair work; 3] 14.48 % - Exercise; 4] 13.16 % - Lecture; 5] 10.53 % - Role play; 6] 6.58 % - Individual work;

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

17	[146 answers]:	[56 answers]:	[60 answers]:
	1] 39.04 % – Speaking / Com-	1] 37.5 % – Speaking /	1] 28.33 % – Speaking /
	munication;	Communication;	Communication;
	2] 32.88 % – Critical Thinking;	2] 21.43 % – Critical Think-	2] 23.33 % – Critical Think-
	3] 10.96 % – Listening;	ing;	ing;
	4] 7.54 % – Writing;	3] 14.29 % – Listening;	3] 18.33 % – Listening;
	5] 4.80 % – Reading;	4] 12.5 % – Writing;	4] 15 % – Writing;
	6] 4.11 % – Grammar;	5] 10.72 % – Grammar;	5] 8.33 % – Grammar;
	7] 0.69 % – Others	6] 3.57 % – Reading	6] 6.67 % – Reading

Q1 indicated the years how long the students have been learning English. As can be seen, the duration span is very different from 5-19 years old. At average, learning English has been for 12 years for five-year college students and its continuation program of two-year college. However, the students of four-year college have learned English at average a bit longer for 14 years. During these years of learning English, almost all students [over 90 %] passed an English proficiency exam, e.g. TOEIC, but most of them passed GEPT [General English Proficiency Test] for English learners at all levels in Taiwan. This test corresponds to Taiwan's English education framework covering the four language skills of listening, reading, writing, and speaking. In Q4a, the students indicated their strength in English that was Listening of the five-year [44.12 %] and four-year [37.84 %] college students followed by Speaking [26.47 %] and Reading [35.14 %], respectively. Writing skills of the students of these two programs is the weakest part [with over 40 %] followed by speaking skills with approx. 25 % as indicated in Q4b. In contrast, the students of two-year college assessed their reading comprehension as the strength [with 40 %]. And interestingly, they distributed Writing, Listening and Speaking evenly with 20 % each. It shows that after six-seven years of college study the students acquired relatively stable skills of English.

Regarding Q3, most of the students of four-year college [75 %] and of two-year college [87 %] haven't been to any English-speaking country, so they have learned English only in non-authentic environment. However, 60 % of five-year-college-students went to English-speaking country usually during winter or summer vacation for 1 week to 6 months. Nevertheless, the majority of the students [over 90 %] of all programs have a chance to hear the native speaker's speech and communicate with NESTs as they teach the students but only once or twice a week for five-year college students and more frequently for other program students. Their foreign teachers come mostly from English speaking countries like the U.S., the U.K., Canada, but also from other countries as Philippines and Russia.

O6 explained the common teaching methods by NNESTs. Almost half of all students [ca.50 %] like the teaching method usually conducted in English such as reading articles with following discussion developing critical thinking, writing an essay, listening for filling out the blanks, presentations and quizzes, lectures, grammar that is taught only by local teachers who can explain it in Chinese. Those teachers provide additional knowledge through handouts, show them videos, interact with the students for problem solving tasks and sharing own experience of learning foreign languages and understand the students' weaknesses. Furthermore, the students value a step-by-step instruction, a lot of practice and creativity, e.g. in the poetry class. Above all, the teachers care about the comprehension process of the students. Similarly, Q7 emphasized the common teaching methods by foreign teachers. Astonishingly, the majority of all students [ca. 90 %] like the teaching methods of foreign teachers because it is more interactive and interesting through conversations, less tests on vocabulary, can improve listening and speaking skills, more playful way of learning through games, songs, videos, movies, challenging brainstorming with expressing own opinion in discussion, and diversified teaching materials. The teachers motivate the students giving them a free choice e.g. of a reading book, so the students can learn more. The independent learning through discussion is highly emphasized by students who by thus will become active learners. Furthermore, the teachers provide more useful information about other cultures that broaden the students' horizon. And creative thinking with imagination in the class is highly emphasized by foreign teachers. As for the **dislike** of teaching method by local teachers in Q6, almost a half of the students [ca. 50 %] do not like reading of unpractical articles and lectures because they think these methods do not develop their speaking ability in discussion. Besides, memorizing vocabulary is only for exam but not for real language use, so a lot of tests deprive students of practical oral communication. The students think that commonly applied reading, writing, and lecture are boring and unnecessary and do not stimulate much interaction with the critical thinking. Some students do not like the Taiwanese

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

546

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

accent of the teacher of English. Besides, NNESTs can also sometimes confuse between he/she as a common error of Taiwanese as Chinese language has only one pronoun [ta] for both forms. Interestingly, the ration between like and dislike is almost 1:1. It means some students prefer reading and some do not like it as well as writing an essay. It is to consider that reading is our knowledge input that is helpful for learning but should be balanced with other skills like speaking. The reading materials should contain useful and updated information. Besides, most students do not like tests that are indeed very common in Taiwan education [7-8 times per semester]. Some students consider the NNESTs' teaching stricter than by foreign teachers. However, a few students mentioned that the situation has been improving recently because young Taiwanese teachers who studied abroad often apply Western way of teaching described above. Q7 also indicated that a few students [ca. 10 %] dislike the teaching methods of NESTs because they speak too fast and the students cannot follow the teachers fully. Besides, there is no consistency in their teaching. The teachers do not teach much vocabulary and cannot explain grammar. As mentioned above, lecture is not very popular among students; however it is a very common teaching method at any university around the world. Based on my longterm teaching observation of Taiwanese students, it is to notice that some of them have a misconception about lecture that is an inevitable part of university study; some of those students expect more entertainment from the teacher that is often not common for college level. This fact says about the immaturity and wrong perception of college students. Only the small number of academic content courses also contributes to this problem. However, most students like the lecture held by foreign teacher. It is probably due to elaborated and diverse teaching with implementation of interaction and discussion.

Q8 summarized the results of two previous questions in several categories, namely language use, teaching method, learning atmosphere, class management, and cultural differences. Foreign teachers usually improve the listening and speaking ability, and pronunciation of the students, while they offer more discussions letting the students express their thoughts without refuting them. The self-expression is highly valued by students. It creates livelier atmosphere. Before the lecture, the teachers often do warm-up activities that the students prefer to have more practice where the students need to figure out answers by themselves, i.e. active way of learning with critical thinking. Furthermore, the students also value authentic accent of the foreign teachers and the introduction of the culture of other countries. On the contrary, local teachers can teach better grammar, writing, poetry, linguistics and reading explaining vocabulary in Chinese. They also do more lecturing and exams that is often considered negatively by the students. Besides, NNESTs are more serious and stricter. Due to the reasons above, Q9 revealed that on average a half of the students [over 40 %] prefer to have a foreign teacher, while another half chose "does not matter", and only a few students [approx. 5 %] and more students with 18 % from two-year college prefer to have a local teacher. The latter can be explained probably through the fact that those students had already many foreign teachers in the past seven years of study and their speaking ability is already quite high, so they might be less interested in having a foreign teacher to improve their pronunciation and speaking skills. In general, the students' preference depends on the subject, e.g. grammar and writing is advisable to be taught by local teachers, and speaking courses are better to be taught by foreign teachers.

According to Q10, most NNESTs use following teaching materials and methods: handouts and PPTs, and far behind audio & video multimedia, as well as a few games for all programs. In contrast, the foreign teachers use mostly videos, games, and audios [with ca. 20 %] followed by handouts and PPTs [with over 10 %] [see Q11]. It seems both teachers use different teaching materials. Handouts often used by NNESTs may indicate that reading activity will be practiced. On the contrary, video, audio and games employed by NESTs provide more interaction and discussion opportunities making the class more lively as previously indicated by some students. Implementation of media [e.g. video, PPTs, etc.] is a common trend that attracts and motivates many students as it is proven through many studies [ref. 1; 11; 22]. The multiple-choice Q12 indicated the preference of the students' teaching methods and materials. In general, the favorite is group discussion [more than 17 %] because students can know about others' thinking and discussion is often used by NESTs. Next is games [with about 15 %], followed by exercises [more than 13 %]. Surprisingly, that 13 % of five-year college students prefer lecture probably because they are used to it since junior high school. Less than 10 % chose role-play, individual work, or quizzes.

The open-ended Q13 indicated what the students like in the class of NNESTs. The most common aspects here are easy to communicate with the teacher in Chinese and get explanation in Chinese, especially for grammar. The teachers prepare the students effectively for exam and force them to study harder. Surprisingly, some like the lecture because they just need to listen and it is not challenging for students. However,

2020 Т 30 вып 3

as Q14 showed lecture is also not popular among many students as it does not provide practical experience. The students also do not like that they lack communication and the class is test-oriented with many exams and quizzes. So, they do not like this traditional way of teaching, including reading textbooks. Besides, several students do not like the accent of local teachers. As for NESTs' teaching in Q15, they like mostly the group discussion and the pair work with developing critical thinking and the [cultural] knowledge they get not only from textbooks. They like the learning atmosphere that is vivid, creative, humorous and free. Especially they like speaking in English. However, based on Q16, they do not like too relaxing atmosphere in the class and the miscommunication that sometimes happens due to language barrier and cultural gap. These are the obstacles that need to be overcome.

Q17 introduced the changes students like to see in the English class, namely they want to have more discussion, speaking and communication with critical thinking, and then more focus on listening and writing. And last, the students wrote the comments that are similar to those in Q17, i.e. more focus on critical thinking and less focus on tests and score, develop more discussion and pair work. Through different but similar questions the students gave always similar answers; it proves the authenticity of their answers.

As we can see, the students want to learn how to think in English. For that, they want to practice more impromptu writing and speaking. The students do not get enough chance to speak English due to a big size of the class [ca. 60 students]. However, it is to state that Taiwan's education institutions do provide good teaching materials and facilities [e.g. with internet access and projector in each classroom] that effectively contribute to the learning process. Furthermore, to improve the teaching style of both NNESTs and NESTs, they could collaborate together exchanging the experience and balancing different aspects through learning from each other. The role of NNESTs cannot be undermined as they speak slower than NESTs and it facilitates the students' English comprehension. Besides, the students feel less inhibited to speak English with possible mistakes to the NNESTs [5, p. 200]. Furthermore, their cultural thinking will be similar that may provide a smooth communication in English. Therefore, the status of NNESTs and NESTs should be equal due to their different competence in various aspects.

### CONCLUSION

To sum up, teacher's effectiveness does not depend on being a native English speaker. It depends primarily on the professionalism of the teacher such as pedagogical expertise, metalinguistic knowledge, and interpersonal skills. Intercultural learning and understanding of the local culture by native speakers is highly important in the successful learning. Besides, the collaboration via reflection, learning and team teaching between NNESTs and NESTs is required for the total effective teaching process. It is advisable that NESTs will have a basic knowledge of language and culture in the country where they teach for a better understanding of the students' background. Despite the fact that this small-scale study focused only on one university with different educational programs, it can reflect a better understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of NNESTs and NESTs from the Taiwanese students' perspective. Even though the results of the study provide an understanding of the issue only in Taiwan, but the findings can be applied and compared in other countries in the world as well.

As to the limitations of the study, the further research could prove and compare the presented results from the teachers' perspective [not only from the students' viewpoint] through interviewing NNESTs and NESTs about their teaching style. It is also of interest to conduct a contrastive collaborative study of this research topic between Asia and Europe, namely between Taiwan and Russia. It could also investigate whether the teaching of NESTs is somehow influenced by local culture and, if yes, to which extend. Besides, the factors of gender and study major of students can be considered as it might also influence their responses.

### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Berk, R.A. (2009). Multimedia teaching with video clips: TV, Movies, YouTube, and mtvU in the college class-room. In *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 5(1)*, p. 1-21.
- 2. Brutt-Griffler, J., Samimy, K.K. (2001). Transcending the nativeness paradigm. World Englishes, 20(1), p. 99-106.
- 3. Butler, Y.G. (2009). Issues in the assessment and evaluation of English language education at the elementary school level: Implications for policies in South Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. In: *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, Vol. 6(2), p. 1–31.
- 4. Byram, Michael. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd. 124p.
- 5. Chang B.M. (2011). The roles of English language education in Asian context. In: *Journal of the Pan-pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, Vol.15, No.1, p. 191–206.

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

### СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

- 6. Chang C.W. (2013). Exploring the beliefs of native and non-native English speaking kindergarten teachers in Taiwan. In: *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, Vol. 2(5), p. 3-16. Retrieved from: http://www.consortiacademia.org/index.php/ijrsll/article/view/171.
- 7. Chang, Jia-Ni, Chang, Jackie (n.d.). Taiwanese senior high school students' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers. *National Pingtung University of Education*. Retrieved from: http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:http://140.127.82.166/retrieve/14849/45.pdf&gws\_rd=cr&e i=dYxPWROCxNIEkYWsmAo.
- 8. Cheung, Y.L., Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. In: *RELC Journal*, 38(3), p. 257-277.
- 9. Chien, Chin-Wen. (2014). Non-native pre-service English teachers' narratives about their pronunciation learning and implications for pronunciation training. In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, Vol. 3(4), p. 177-190.
- 10. Davies, A. (2004). The native speaker in applied linguistics. In: A. Davies & C. Elder (eds.). *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, p. 431-450.
- 11. Duxbury, J., Yakovleva, E. (June, 2012). The Junior High School Project. In: *Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice*, Vol. 3, Gramota: Tambov (Russia), p. 8-12.
- 12. Huang, Jinyan & Brown, Kathleen (2009). Cultural factors affecting Chinese ESL students' academic learning. In: *Education*, Vol. 129, No. 4, p. 643-653.
- 13. Kasai, M., Lee, J.-A., Kim, S. (2011). Secondary EFL students' perceptions of native and nonnative English-speaking teachers in Japan and Korea. In: *The Asia EFL Journal*, Vol. 13(3), p. 272-300. Retrieved from: http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/September-2011.pdf.
- 14. Lasagabaster, D., Sierra, J.M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native speaker teacher. In: E. Llurda (ed.). *Non-native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession*. NY: Springer, p. 217-241.
- 15. Liao, Hsien-Chung & Yang, Cheng-Cheng. (Oct 2012). Teaching Practice and Cultural Difference of an English as Foreign Language Classroom in Taiwan. In: *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 5, No. 11, p. 151-160.
- 16. Liu, Jun. (2007). Empowering non-native English-speaking teachers through collaboration with their native English-speaking colleagues in EFL settings. In: Jun Liu (ed.). English Language Teaching in China: new approaches, perspectives and standards. NY: Continuum, p. 107-126.
- 17. Llurda, E. (2006). Non-native language teachers. Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession. In: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 16, No. 3, p. 434-437.
- 18. Ma, L.P.F. (2012). Perceived teaching behavior of native and non-native English speaking teachers in Hong Kong: are there any differences? In: *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), p. 89-108.
- 19. Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or nonnative: What do students enrolled in an intensive English program think? In: L. Kamhi-Stein (ed.). *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking profession-als.* Michigan: Michigan University Press, p. 121-147.
- 20. Medgyes, P. (1992). Native or non-native: Who's worth more? In: ELT Journal, 46(4), p. 340-349.
- 21. Meadows, B., & Muramatsu, Y. (2007). "Native speaker or non-native speaker teacher?" A report of student preferences in four different foreign language classrooms. In: *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching*, Vol. 14, p. 95-109. Retrieved from: http://slat.arizona.edu/sites/slat/files/page/awp14muramatsu.pdf.
- 22. Najjar, L.J. (1996). Multimedia information and learning. In *Journal of EducationalMultimedia and Hypermedia*, 5(2), p. 129-150.
- 23. Paul, David. (2003). Teaching English to Children in Asia. Hong Kong: Longman Asia ELT.
- 24. Seidlhofer, B. (1999). Double standards: Teacher education in the expanding circle. In: *World Englishes*, 18(2), p. 233-245.
- 25. Sung, C.C. (2010). Native or non-native? Exploring Hong Kong students' perspectives. In: G. Bota., H. Hargreaves. (edts.). *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching*, Vol. 4, p. 1-18.
- 26. Tsou, Shih-Yun. (2013). Taiwanese university students' perceptions toward native and non-native English-speaking teachers in EFL contexts. Unpublished dissertation. University of Idaho.
- 27. Vaish, Viniti (2010). (ed.). Globalization of Language and Culture in Asia. The Impact of Globalization Processes on Language. London, NY: Continuum. 245p.
- 28. Walkinshaw, I. (2012). Native- and non-native speaking English teachers in Vietnam: weighing the benefits. In: *TESL-EJ*, 16(3). Retrieved from: http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume16/ej63/ej63a1/.
- 29. Walkinshaw, I., & Oanh, D. H. (2014). Native and non-native English language teachers: Student perceptions in Vietnam and Japan. In: *SAGE Open*, Vol. 4(2), p. 1–9.
- 30. Wu, Hui-Ju. (Nov 4, 2010). Beliefs about learning English: a study of non-English majors from a university in Taiwan. In: *The International Journal of Learning*, Vol. 17, No. 4, p. 166-177.
- 31. Young, S.S.C. (2003). Integrating ICT into second language education in a vocational high school. In: *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, Vol. 19, p. 447-461.

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

Received 09.01.2020

Yakovleva E.L., Ph.D., Associate Professor at Department of English Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, Mintzu 1<sup>st</sup> Rd., 900, Sanmin District, Kaohiung city, Taiwan (Republic of China), 80793 E-mail: elena.yakovleva75@gmail.com; 98002@mail.wzu.edu.tw

### Е.Л. Яковлева

# ОСОБЕННОСТИ МЕСТНЫХ И ИНОСТРАННЫХ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЕЙ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ В ТАЙВАНЕ

DOI: 10.35634/2412-9534-2020-30-3-540-550

В статье проверяется стереотипное мнение азиатских студентов, считающих, что носители английского языка преподают его лучше, чем местные учителя английского языка. Результаты исследования показывают, что те и другие имеют свои преимущества в определенных областях обучения языку. Например, преподаватели, для которых английский является родным языком, хорошо обучают правильному произношению, добиваются от учеников широкого и правильного использования словарного запаса, являются компетентными культурными посредниками, тогда как местные преподаватели, используют лингвистически-аналитический метод преподавания, способствуют изучению грамматики английского языка, обучают переводческим навыкам, готовят к сдаче экзаменов и др. Для эффективного и сбалансированного обучения английскому языку необходимо учитывать ценные лингвистические и педагогические знания преподавателей обеих категорий (носителей английского языка как родного и не родного), которые должны сотрудничать и дополнять друг друга.

*Ключевые слова*: межкультурная коммуникативная компетентность [ICC], лингва франка, лингвистическоаналитический подход, преподаватели как [не] носители английского языка, нативность.

Поступила в редакцию 09.01.2020

Яковлева Елена Леонидовна, кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры английского языка Венцао Урзулин Языковой Университет, 80793, Тайвань, г. Гаосюн, р-н Санмин, ул. 1-ая Минтзу, 900 E-mail: elena.yakovleva75@gmail.com 98002@mail.wzu.edu.tw

Appendix I

Study program: □ 5-year college□ 4-year college□ 2-year college Sex: □ Male □ Female
1. How long have you been learning English?years
2. Did you pass any English test? $\square$ No / $\square$ Yes $\rightarrow$ $\square$ TOEIC $\square$ GEPT $\square$ IELTS
□ Other Score: (of max)
3. Have you been in any English speaking country? $\square$ No $/\square$ Yes $\longrightarrow$ How long?
4a. What is your strength in English? □ Reading □ Writing □ Listening □ Speaking
□ Others
4b. What is your difficulty in English? □ Reading □ Writing □ Listening □ Speaking
□ Others
5. Did you have some <b>foreign</b> teachers of English? $\square$ No $/$ $\square$ Yes $\longrightarrow$ If yes, how often and how many of them
(also write their nationality if known)?
6. What is the common teaching methods (e.g. lecture, reading, conversation etc.) in English class applied by
<b>local</b> (Taiwanese) teachers. Describe some classes! Do you like it? □ No / □ Yes Why?

550 Е.Л. Яковлева

2020. Т. 30, вып. 3

СЕРИЯ ИСТОРИЯ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

7. What is the common teaching methods in English class applied by <b>foreig</b> n teachers. Describe some classes!
Do you like it? □ No / □ Yes Why?
8. What are the differences between English class taught by local and foreign teacher?
9. Do you prefer English class taught by local or foreign teacher? <b>Why?</b> □ Taiwanese teacher / □ Foreign
teacher □ Doesn't matter
10. Which supplementary materials do <b>local</b> teachers mostly use in the English class?
□ Hands-out □ Video □ Audio □ PPT □ Games □ Others, e.g
11. Which supplementary materials do <b>foreign</b> teachers mostly use in the English class?
□ Hands-out □ Video □ Audio □ PPT □ Games □ Others, e.g
12. What kind of teaching methods do you prefer? <b>Why?</b> (Rate some according to your preference) □ Lec-
ture □ Exercises □ Group Discussion □ Pair work □ Individual work □ Presentation □ Role play □ Games □
Quizzes  Others, e.g.
13. What do you like in English class taught by <b>local</b> teacher?
14. What you don't like in English class taught by <b>local</b> teacher?
15. What do you like in English class taught by <b>foreign</b> teacher?
16. What you don't like in English class taught by <b>foreign</b> teacher?
17. What skills should be more emphasized in English class in Taiwan? Why?
□ Reading □ Writing □ Listening □ Speaking/Communication □Grammar □ Critical Thinking □ Others
18. What would you change in English class in Taiwan?

Comments (about English teaching/learning in Taiwan):