2013

Student Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: A Quantitative Investigation from a Korean University

Bruce D. Barnes
Ewha Womans University, Seoul, barneseol@hotmail.com

Graeme Lock
Edith Cowan University, g.lock@ecu.edu.au

Student Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teachers: A Quantitative Investigation from a Korean University

Bruce D. Barnes
Ewha Womans University
South Korea
Graeme Lock
Edith Cowan University

Abstract: The present study uses a questionnaire instrument to measure the importance that students from a Korean university place on a wide range of effective foreign language teacher attributes. Respondents to the present study placed high importance on rapport attributes such as friendliness, care, and patience; and delivery attributes which included the provision of clear explanations, error correction, and a participatory mode of instruction. Impartiality, target language knowledge, and good preparation were attributes also rated highly. The results also provided insights into student opinions about various instructional issues, such as the selective use of the students' first language, explicit grammar instruction, and particular questioning techniques. This knowledge can be used by foreign language teachers and student teachers to improve the efficacy of their instruction.

Introduction

The present study aims to establish what value students from a Korean university place on the effective foreign language (FL) teacher attributes uncovered in a previous qualitative study in the same context (Barnes & Lock, 2010). While the study conducted by Barnes and Lock was effective in establishing a list of effective teacher attributes and some elaborations, no generalisations could be made about the importance placed on the attributes by the student body. Therefore, a quantitative study was called for that would test the values placed on these attributes from a proportional-stratified sample of the student population under study.

Investigations into student perceptions of effective FL teachers are necessary, so that teachers in training and practitioners can understand how to approach and improve their practice. When a teacher and his or her students have opposing views about what should occur in the classroom, the students may lack confidence in the teacher's ability. Without this confidence, motivation and effective learning are unlikely (Dörnyei, 2001; Horwitz, 1987). Therefore, in order to create and maintain an atmosphere of trust and support so necessary for effective learning, teachers need to discover areas of discord between what they do and what the students expect, and then address those areas of discord. However, in doing so, teachers should not merely pander to students opinions and use this knowledge as the deciding factor in classroom decisions. In some cases, teachers may find that they need to re-evaluate their teaching practice, but in other cases, teachers may aim to amend the views of their students. Either way, awareness of the areas of discord is necessary.

Unfortunately, students (and language students in particular) are not always willing or able to communicate their opinions freely to their teachers. This sometimes creates situations

where teachers remain oblivious to the fact that some of their teaching behaviours or practices are not favoured by their students. In some situations, teachers may be faced with unresponsive or uncooperative classes without knowing the reasons why. Therefore, platforms for the anonymous voicing of student concerns and opinions are necessary. An anonymous student evaluation is now an accepted way of obtaining specific course based feedback from students. However, these evaluations tend to be very specific to a course and an instructor, may not reveal more general opinions or concerns about widespread teaching behaviours, and are usually provided post-course when there is no opportunity for redress. Therefore, investigations that provide aggregated data into student perceptions of effective teachers (like the present study) are needed to fill this gap by providing preparing teachers with a broad base of information about student perceptions in different contexts.

Research into the importance that students ascribe to various attributes of teacher effectiveness comes from a variety of contexts outside of language teaching. Significant among these are studies conducted with business majors in the United States (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006; Clayson, 2005; Desai, Damewood, & Jones, 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Kelley, Conant, & Smart, 1991). Other studies of relevance include investigations of general undergraduate students in the United States (Emanuel & Adams, 2006), and Hong Kong (Kember, Jenkins, & Ng, 2004; Kember & Wong, 2000). Unfortunately rigorous quantitative data about student perceptions of a *comprehensive* range of the attributes of language teachers in particular have been difficult to locate. Of these, Brosh (1996) relate the results of a questionnaire administered to high school FL students and teachers in Israel, and Park and Lee (2006) report on the results of a questionnaire administered to Korean high school English as a foreign language (EFL) students and their teachers. Even though both studies emphasised comparisons between the views of teachers and students, they also include useful data of relevance to the present study which focuses on student views in particular. Reports of rigorous studies of student perceptions of a comprehensive range of FL teacher attributes from university settings in particular could not be located. However, although not comprehensive, a quantitative study by Thompson (2006) offers some information about Korean university student perceptions of a select range of EFL lecturer attributes. Also, specialised quantitative studies into student perceptions of specific areas of FL pedagogy come from university settings in the United States (Brown, 2009; Levine, 2003; Loewen et al., 2009; Schulz, 1996, 2001), and Columbia (Schulz, 2001) and migrant ESL learners in Australia (Lai, 2009). Although not focusing specifically on teacher attributes, some findings reported in Horwitz (1987, 1999) on student views about language learning have relevance to the present study.

Faranda and Clarke (2004) provided five categories of teacher attributes – Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organization and Preparation. See Table 1 for a description of the five categories. These versatile categories were used to frame Barnes and Lock's (2010) taxonomy of effective lecturer attributes and discussion of the literature. For consistency, the present study also frames discussion under these categories.

Attribute Category	Description
Rapport	friendliness, sociability, empathy, accessibility, receptiveness, attitude
Delivery	personal style, communication, pedagogy
Fairness	grading, impartiality, examination relevance, transparency, workload
Knowledge and Credibility	content knowledge, competence (skills), experience
Organization and Preparation	syllabus quality, clarity, and adherence; lesson preparation

Table 1: Description of Faranda and Clarke's (2004) Five Attribute Categories

Literature indicates that students place high value on teacher Rapport and Delivery. Knowledge and proficiency in the target language was selected as the most important factor by high school FL students in Korea (Park & Lee, 2006) and Israel (Brosh, 1996). The degree of importance ascribed to the fairness and organization and preparation attributes varied between studies. Factors found to contribute to different views among specific student populations have included students' learning style (Kember et al., 2004; Kember & Wong, 2000; Xiao, 2006), target language competence (Park & Lee, 2006), and educational experience (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006; Brown, 2009; Horwitz, 1987, 1999).

The present study contributes to the body of existing knowledge by investigating how these findings apply to FL students in a Korean university context. Also, the present study helps to address the apparent dearth of literature in the FL field about student perceptions of a wide range of teacher attributes. In addition, unlike previous studies of FL student perceptions of effective teachers, which involve questionnaire instruments with items based on attributes used by previous studies in other contexts (Brosh, 1996; Park & Lee, 2006), the questionnaire instrument items of the present study were informed by the attributes generated by a qualitative study of the same student population (Barnes & Lock, 2010). This has not only allowed specific testing of attributes particular to the context, but also highlights areas of concern to FL students that may apply to other contexts (like questioning style) and may not have been included in inventories based on the literature.

Context

The population under study consisted of 2,170 first year students enrolled in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes at a women's university in Korea. Most of the students had experienced six or more years of EFL instruction at middle and high school. Generally, their school-based instruction focused on examination preparation, by teaching grammar rules and vocabulary, and emphasising reading and listening.

The EFL classes at the university emphasised the development of academic English skills, with a concentration on higher level reading, writing, and discussion skills. The teachers were either native users of the target language (L2) or Korean nationals with native or near-native levels of L2 proficiency. The teachers generally supported the use of communicative modes of instruction.

The classes generally consisted of 30 to 35 students and were allocated according to major, rather than ability. Although most students within most classes seemed to exhibit similar L2 proficiency levels, many classes had some students at the two extremes of the proficiency continuum.

Methodology

A questionnaire was administered to a proportional-stratified sample of the population under study. The sample comprised 222 students (10.23 per cent of the population of 2,170 students) and was proportionally representative of the university colleges (pharmacy, health science, business administration, law, education, arts, engineering, natural science, social sciences, and liberal arts). Students from 11 classes (together representative of all colleges) were asked to participate and each class was taught by a different teacher who was a native English speaker.

The questionnaire was written in Korean rather than English so that all participants could fully understand and complete the questionnaire regardless of English ability. The questionnaire had three parts (see the Appendix for the English version). The first part consisted of 42 items requiring students to rate attributes of effective FL teachers on a seven point scale from '1' (*strongly disagree*) to '7' (*strongly agree*). These 42 items were based on the attributes listed in Barnes and Lock (2010). The second part asked respondents to rank the importance of Faranda and Clarke's (2004) five attribute categories: Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organization and Preparation. The third part elicited student profile information by asking students to nominate their major, L2 proficiency level, past English instruction experience, and learning style.

Before administration, minor improvements were made to the questionnaire's validity after obtaining opinions about questionnaire clarity and appropriateness from two academic colleagues who had expertise in quantitative methodologies, and piloting the questionnaire with six student volunteers. To measure the reliability of Parts 1 and 2 of the questionnaire, two types of questionnaires were designed, each with items written in the opposite order. The two form types were issued to students alternately. A comparison of the mean responses to items from the two types of forms provided a measure of reliability and also allowed the effects of survey fatigue to be checked.

The reliability of Part 1 results was found to be quite sound overall after comparing the results of the two forms for each item using two-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests. By contrast, some discrepancy was found with the ranking scale (Part 2) because the rankings of Rapport and Organization and Preparation from the two questionnaire forms (see Table 2) showed significant differences ($p < .05$) when two-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests were performed. Therefore, the rankings of these two categories could be called into question.

Item	Form A	Form B	Mean difference	*p*
Rapport (Relationship with Students)	$M*= 2.84$	$M*= 3.28$	0.44	.0109
Organization and Preparation	$M*= 3.48$	$M*= 3.09$	0.39	.0314

* mean rankings out of a possible 1-5 range

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics Comparing Rankings of Form A and Form B Responses

The responses to the 42 questionnaire items from Part 1 were analysed by calculating and comparing mean responses and the standard deviations. For selected items, one-tailed Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to test for significant differences between the responses of students from different profile groups: language ability, learning style, and past L2 learning experience.

Student Profile
English Language Proficiency

Item 2 of Part 3 of the questionnaire (see Appendix) asked each respondent to rate her English ability as "below average," "average" or "above average" in comparison to other members of her class. Of the 222 respondents, 52 (23 per cent) classified themselves as below average, 132 (60 per cent) as average, and 38 (17 per cent) as above average. Students should have had enough information to make this judgment because the questionnaire was administered after the midterm examination results had been posted and because various assignments had been assessed and returned. Also, the university teachers usually make median scores available to students.

Past English Language Learning Experience

Item 3 of Part 3 of the questionnaire (see Appendix) asked students to characterise their past English language learning experience and 72 per cent claimed to have been exposed to instructional methods dominated by grammar instruction and rote learning.

Learning Styles

Item 4 of Part 3 of the questionnaire (see Appendix) asked respondents to categorise their learning styles as "passive" (chosen by 27 per cent), "half passive and half active" (61 per cent), or "active" (11 per cent). Despite initial concerns about whether the respondents would understand the terms, the pilot analysis revealed that no misunderstandings occurred and all students used in the pilot were clear about their choice.

Results

An analysis of the rankings from Part 2 of the questionnaire (see Table 3) provides a useful overview of the comparative importance placed on each of the five attribute categories.

Overall ranking	Attribute category (articulation of the category used in the questionnaire, if different)	Mean ranking
1	Delivery (Communication skill and teaching method)	2.21
2	Knowledge and Credibility (Knowledge of English)	2.90
3	Rapport (Relationship with students)	3.06*
4	Organization and Preparation	3.29*
5	Fairness	3.49

* low reliability indicated
Table 3: Overall Rankings of the Attribute Categories

Delivery was clearly considered the most important category, and its high importance is consistent with all the studies that quantified a comprehensive range of attributes. Knowledge of English (L2) was nominated the second most important category before Rapport. This was unexpected because earlier qualitative data collected from the same population of students (Barnes & Lock, 2010) were dominated by discussion about rapport attributes and were almost void of any mention of knowledge and credibility attributes. However, the result from the present study concurs with findings by Park and Lee (2006), who reported that Korean high school EFL students rank Knowledge of English above

Rapport. These results, together with findings in the present study, may indicate a particular preference given to knowledge of the target language among Korean FL students.

Data from Part 1 of the questionnaire reveal that in general, almost all the listed attributes were considered important, with 40 out of the 42 items on the questionnaire returning positive mean responses of over "4" on a 7-point Likert scale ("1" = *strongly disagree* and "7" = *strongly agree*). Of the 40 attributes that showed positive mean scores, 16 were in the 6-7 range, 27 in the 5-6 range, and only 3 in the 4-5 range. Analysis of the responses also indicates that the population was fairly homogeneous in its attitudes; most of the responses to individual items showed small variances and few significant differences according to student profile were found. Details of the results are presented under each of the categories: Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organisation and Preparation.

Rapport

Attributes in this category were all considered important by the respondents. Mean responses to eight of the 11 rapport attributes scored over 6 (see Table 4). The overall high level of importance placed on rapport attributes is generally supported by the literature.

Item Number and Description	*M*	*SD*
1. are friendly	6.29	0.73
2. develop good relationships with students	6.41	0.75
3. share personal experiences	5.46	0.73
4. care about students	6.37	0.72
5. are patient	6.05	1.04
6. listen to students	6.29	0.82
7. have a positive attitude in general	6.12	0.94
8. have charisma	5.19	1.30
9. understand the student's English education background	6.08	0.95
10. understand the different student levels	6.34	0.83
11. have a sense of humour	5.77	0.93

Table 4: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Rapport Items

The data lend support to the assertion by Barnes and Lock (2010) that attributes which allay levels of anxiety and build student confidence are particularly important to language students. These attributes – including friendliness, good relationships, care, patience, and receptiveness – all scored over 6. The highest level of importance among rapport items was awarded to developing personal relationships, with a mean score of 6.41. The strong support given to this attribute is consistent with the findings of Faranda and Clarke (2004) and Thompson (2006).

Teacher understanding of two context specific factors – students' educational history and level – were considered very important by respondents. The high importance ascribed to teacher understanding of students' educational history (Item 9) supports discussion reported in Barnes and Lock (2010). They suggest that teachers need to recognise that students had not received much instruction in the areas of writing and speaking. The other context-specific factor accorded a high level of importance was teacher understanding of different levels. The qualitative data from Barnes and Lock explain that this seems particularly relevant in this university context, where the classes are multi-level, and where some teachers may tend to favour the more advanced students.

Delivery

In the analysis of the quantitative data, responses to delivery attributes were varied (see Table 5). The mean responses helped to clarify the overall strengths of student feelings about certain teaching approaches and styles.

Item Number and Description	*M*	*SD*
12. are enthusiastic about teaching	6.30	0.74
13. give clear explanations	6.49	0.64
14. use good examples	6.46	0.67
15. use a variety of teaching methods	5.46	1.14
16. use Korean (L1) selectively	3.80	1.64
17. correct writing errors	5.91	0.84
18. correct speaking errors	5.86	1.04
19. teach grammar	4.37	1.42
20. use group work	5.09	1.37
21. encourage student participation in class	6.06	0.89
22. encourage participation of students with low confidence	5.99	1.03
23. talk slowly in the target language	5.15	1.38
24. use easy words	5.14	1.30
25. ask questions frequently	5.31	1.15
26. ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	3.83	1.34
27. ask individual students to answer questions	4.60	1.38
28. give students plenty of time to answer questions	5.75	0.92

Table 5: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Delivery Items

The importance of teacher enthusiasm was confirmed by the responses to Item 12 (*are enthusiastic about teaching*), which recorded a mean score of 6.3. The importance of enthusiasm is also consistent with studies conducted with American business students (Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Desai et al., 2001; Kelley et al., 1991).

The data provided useful information about aspects of teacher communication. Item 13 (*give clear explanations*) and Item 14 (*use good examples*) had mean scores of 6.49 and 6.46 respectively. These were the second and third highest mean scores in the delivery category and no students responded negatively to either item. Other clarity attributes including Item 23 (*talk slowly in the target language*) and Item 24 (*use easy words*) were also seen as important, albeit slightly, with mean scores of 5.15 and 5.14 respectively. The respondents who declared themselves as below average on the questionnaire agreed more with the idea of talking slowly in the target language (*M* = 5.52) than the self-declared above average students (*M* = 4.84). Student requests for clarity of communication did not extend to the use of Korean (L1) in the classroom. Students in the present study were generally not supportive of the selective use of L1 in the classroom (Item 16), with a mean score of 3.8. This tends to counter the views of participants in various studies (see for example Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; Lai, 2009). Moreover, the Auerbach and Burgess (1985) and Levine (2003) findings that students of lower L2 ability have higher preference for the selective use of L1 than students of higher L2 ability was not supported by the present study, which found non-significant differences (*p* > 0.05) between respondents of low and high English proficiency levels.

The data provided useful information about methodological preferences. Generally, respondents were supportive of participation, which was directly tested through questionnaire Item 21 (*encourage participation in class*) and Item 22 (*encourage participation of students with low confidence*). In both cases, responses were positive, with mean scores of 6.06 and 5.99 respectively, with general approval from respondents from all student profile groups. This result counters earlier observations by Li (2001), which suggests that Korean students are generally resistant to participation. However, the more recent study by Park and Lee

(2006) concurs with the present study. These results indicate that Korean students may be much more receptive to participatory modes of FL instruction than they once were.

The data provided useful insights into the use of questioning. The responses to Item 25 (*ask questions frequently*) showed that students, and especially the active learners, generally wanted teachers to use questioning ($M = 5.31$). Although students were generally supportive of questioning per se, opinions differed about how the questions should be asked. Item 26 (*ask questions then wait for volunteers*) received a slightly negative response ($M = 3.83$), with only seven participants agreeing strongly. This response was representative of all student profile groupings. By contrast, responses to Item 27 (*ask individual students to answer questions*) were more positive ($M = 4.6$). The factor analyses of responses to this item revealed that respondents from all profile groups recorded positive mean scores, although there was slightly less support for this mode of questioning from students with lower language proficiency levels ($M = 4.46$, $p = .0179$), students whose past language learning experience was dominated by memorization and grammar ($M = 4.45$, $p = .0085$), and students who classified themselves as passive ($M = 4.34$, $p = .0015$). Despite these small differences, all respondent profiles clearly prefer questioning directed at individual students than at the whole class. The other attribute connected to questioning was tested through Item 28 (*give students plenty of time to answer questions*). The mean response to this was fairly high, at 5.75. This is related to a complaint often aired by FL students that teachers do not wait long enough for responses to questions.

The final area of focus in the delivery category was lesson content. Informants in the present study were generally ambivalent about the inclusion of explicit grammar instruction ($M = 4.37$), with responses to Item 19 (*teach grammar*) showing few strong responses either way. Despite the neutral stance toward grammar instruction, respondents expressed a general desire for error correction with mean scores of 5.91 and 5.86 respectively to Item 17 (*correct writing errors*) and Item 18 (*correct speaking errors*). Although the respondents generally agreed with the use of correction, the desired level and type of correction are not clear from the data.

Fairness

Mean scores for fairness attributes were all positive (see Table 6). Teacher impartiality (Item 29) was highly valued by respondents, with a mean score of 6.26, with almost half the respondents giving this attribute a score of 7. Impartiality was particularly important in the context of the present study because ability levels varied within classes and some students felt that preferential treatment was often given to the more advanced students.

Item Number and Description	M	SD
29. treat all students fairly	6.26	0.91
30. prepare students well for examinations	5.27	1.32
31. give students clear grading guidelines	5.98	0.92
32. require students to work hard during class	5.70	1.04
33. require students to do homework	5.19	1.20

Table 6: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Fairness Items

Students generally agreed that teachers should give clear grading guidelines, but opinion about the importance of preparing students for examinations was not so positive. However, support for examination preparation was significantly stronger among students who had learned English mainly through memorisation and grammar instruction ($M = 5.46$) than among those who had experienced more communicative modes ($M = 4.45$). This is not surprising because classes using these methods are often focused on examination preparation.

Students may come to expect what they are accustomed to.

The data gave some information about the levels of class-work and homework. Generally, students moderately approved of hard work during class and slightly agreed with the requirement to do homework.

Knowledge and Credibility

The three knowledge and credibility attributes all scored highly (see Table 7). Item 34 (*are well qualified for FL teaching*) returned a mean score of 6.44. There were no negative responses to this attribute and 129 respondents (58 per cent) gave it a value of 7. This high value corresponds to the high ranking given to knowledge of the target language in the ranking scale used in Part 2 of the questionnaire.

Item Number and Description	M	SD
34. are well qualified for FL teaching	6.44	0.76
35. have a good knowledge of grammar	5.89	1.10
36. have a good knowledge of vocabulary	6.30	0.90

Table 7: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Knowledge and Credibility Items

Responses to the other two questionnaire items under Knowledge and Credibility showed that students expected teachers to have a sound knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. The response was particularly strong with regard to vocabulary ($M = 6.3$). Grammar was less important, especially with the active learners.

Organization and Preparation

The analysis of the quantitative data revealed that organization and preparation attributes were viewed positively (see Table 8). Students overwhelmingly supported the general attribute of teacher preparation and the mean response was the highest of all the 42 attributes tested in this questionnaire ($M = 6.51$).

Item Number and Description	M	SD
37. are well prepared every lesson	6.51	0.69
38. provide a syllabus detailing course content week by week	5.48	1.21
39. explain the instructional methods to the class	5.84	1.08
40. tell students the lesson objectives each lesson	5.72	1.15
41. stick to the syllabus	4.75	1.17
42. make their own supplemental material.	5.41	1.24

Table 8: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Organization and Preparation Items

The mean scores indicate that students appreciated a detailed syllabus and information about teaching methodology and objectives. Barnes and Lock (2010) revealed that students believed information about the syllabus allowed them to prepare for lessons, and information about instructional methods and objectives helped students to understand the purpose and context of lessons. Of the three attributes, opinion about getting explanations of the teaching methods (Item 39) was strongest, with the majority of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing.

Adherence to the syllabus was not considered particularly important by respondents to the present study. Research among mainstream tertiary students in Hong Kong (Kember & Wong, 2000) indicated that passive learners were strongly in favour of this. However, the statistical analysis of the quantitative data shows non-significant differences in the levels of support among the passive and active learners in the present study.

The last attribute tested in the quantitative section of the study was Item 42 (*make their own supplementary material*). Respondents were generally positive ($M = 5.41$), which shows that students wanted teachers to go beyond the textbook.

Implications

The present study was a quantitative follow-up to a previous qualitative investigation by Barnes and Lock (2010), which identified student perceptions of the attributes of effective FL teachers from a Korean university. In general, the findings of the present study confirm that the student population ascribes importance to most of the attributes identified by the qualitative study. In addition, the present study exposes some student preferences not previously revealed by Barnes and Lock (2010). These findings have implications for teachers in training and practitioners in a variety of contexts, but particularly to those involved in FL instruction.

The findings confirm that practising and prospective teachers should be aware of the importance of building the classroom rapport necessary to weaken the affective filters that interfere with language acquisition (Krashen, 1982). Students appreciate teachers who exhibit the attributes required to negate the classroom anxiety that foreign language students feel when functioning in the target language. In this vein, students specifically wanted teachers to be friendly, caring, attentive and patient, and to develop personal relationships.

Students appreciate teachers who make special allowances for different learning levels. The requirement to provide comprehensible input (Krashen, 1982) is particularly challenging in many FL settings where multi-level classes exist. Accordingly, teachers of multi-level classes may wish to provide a variety of input material, and/or create tasks and activities that help students of lower ability to comprehend more difficult texts.

The findings have implications for participatory modes of instruction. Generally, the findings confirm that respondents with all profiles are appreciative of participatory modes of instruction, so teachers favouring participation should not have to spend much time justifying this approach. The need for teachers to encourage participation of all students, including those with low levels of confidence, was also considered important by most respondents. One way of ensuring equal participation is to adjust the questioning style. The present study explored student preferences for two options: eliciting responses from volunteers (Item 26) or nominating respondents after asking the questions (Item 27).

The data indicate a tendency to disapprove of teachers eliciting responses to questions from volunteers (Item 26). This disapproval could be explained by the cultural context from which the respondents come. Even when they know the answer, Korean students may be reluctant to volunteer answers to questions for fear of appearing immodest – a quality shunned in collectivistic cultures (Jackson, 2002; Mori, Gobel, Thepsikik, & Pojanapunya, 2010). Another possible explanation may be from the teaching context of the present study, where teachers often report that calls for volunteer responses are typically met by silence or by responses from the same one or two students. The ineffectiveness of this approach to questioning may compound its unpopularity. In light of its apparent ineffectiveness, teachers in collectivistic cultural contexts are advised to use this approach sparingly, or avoid it altogether.

The alternative to this style of questioning – to seek responses from nominated students – seemed to be much more popular with the student population under study. However, although still preferred, this option was not as popular with respondents who were classified as passive learners, were of lower language proficiency, and had had limited exposure to communicative language learning. Therefore, when adopting this approach, teachers need to be sensitive to feelings of anxiety students may feel when being called upon. Much of this anxiety may stem from content or linguistic limitations, or from a culturally

determined fear of losing face when an "incorrect" answer is provided (Bailey, 2005; Robinson, 2003). Here, the teacher needs to be especially patient, accept a variety of answers (Tsui, 1996) and, as the present study affirms, give adequate response times. Teachers need to remember that students are operating in a foreign language and need more time to understand questions and then prepare responses. Also, teachers may wish to use buzz group approaches (Bailey, 2005; Liu & Littlewood, 1997; Tsui, 1996) where students are afforded the opportunity to confer with other classmates before being called upon to answer questions. This gives students time to come up with and/or confirm the content and language needed to form responses before being required to respond.

Teachers wishing to be understood should pay careful attention to the clarity of their explanations of new language and instructions. Students thought it was very important to use good examples when explaining a new language. Furthermore, respondents felt that foreign language teachers need to appreciate how difficult language learning is, and choose the level and pace of their language carefully so that all students can follow. This was particularly important with lower level students. This desire for clarity among students did not, however, extend to the use of Korean (L1) in the classroom. Counter to several studies of student views about L1 use (Auerbach & Burgess, 1985; Lai, 2009), respondents in the present study tended to disagree with the selective use of L1 regardless of language level or past language learning experience. This difference may be due to the learning context. First, the students under study were undertaking their second semester of EFL taught by monolingual native English speakers and this experience and familiarity may have made the students comfortable with this approach. Secondly, students may have been averse to any use of L1 as a reaction to their high school experience of English language classes which, in most instances, were largely taught in Korean. Thirdly, the teachers in the EFL classes in this context employed methodologies largely akin to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), so the classroom language tended to be of a practical (and useful) nature. If the classes had been more focussed on language analysis, the students may have appreciated the use of Korean metalanguage.

The implication of this finding for teachers in similar contexts is that the decision to use L1 may be met with opposition unless the rationale is explained to the students. The tenet that L1 should only be used sparingly and for very limited tasks is well supported, even by educators who support L1 use (Bailey, 2005; Cook, 2001; Levine, 2003).

The respondents in the present study placed a very high value on EFL teachers' English language proficiency and teacher qualifications. These attributes were considered more important than Rapport and second only to Delivery. This is contrary to findings in other contexts which indicated that students placed higher importance on rapport attributes than on knowledge and credibility attributes (Beishuizen, Hof, van Putten, Bouwmeester, & Asscher, 2001; Clayson, 2005). However, the priority and high importance placed on knowledge of the target language and teacher qualifications is supported by Park and Lee (2006), which is the only other publication we have been able to locate which explores the importance of this attribute in a Korean context and which is based on rigorous quantitative research. The findings of Park and Lee, coupled with the present study, suggest that a teacher's knowledge of the target language and teacher qualifications are very important among Korean students in particular. Accordingly, teachers in similar contexts may wish to establish student trust by assuring students that they are competent enough to teach them.

The present study has implications for grammar instruction and correction for teachers in Korean universities or in similar FL contexts. Informants in the present study were generally ambivalent about the inclusion of explicit grammar instruction ($M = 4.37$), with responses to Item 19 (*teach grammar*) showing few strong responses either way. This is counter to the findings of the small pool of published reports into student attitudes toward grammar instruction, including those targeting groups of FL students in the USA (Brown, 2009; Loewen et al., 2009; Schulz, 1996, 2001) and EFL students in Columbia (Schulz, 2001). One notable exception can be found in Horwitz's (1999) cross-cultural study of

student beliefs, which concluded less support for grammar instruction among Korean EFL students in particular. The fact that this one exception has been found with Korean students and that the finding concurs with that of the present study, leads to the cautious suggestion that explicit grammar instruction is less welcomed in Korean university contexts than in others. However, as Horwitz points out, this difference is most likely due to contextual rather than cultural differences. In the context of the present study, most of the target population had experienced six years of secondary school EFL instruction which was largely based on the learning of grammar rules. The Korean students may feel that they have had enough grammar instruction in their middle and high school EFL classes and that there is no longer a need for this at the university level where the focus is more on building communicative skill.

Even though the respondents in the present study were not particularly supportive of explicit grammar instruction, responses to Items 35 and 36 of the questionnaire indicate that students expect teachers to have a good knowledge of target language vocabulary and grammar. For teachers, this indicates that any approach to grammar instruction (whether task-based or focus-on-form), would not face much opposition from students, but that students in all learning situations expect the teacher to have the grammatical knowledge to be able to explain a language point when required.

Teachers should know that students value teacher preparation very highly. Good preparation builds an atmosphere of mutual respect and motivates the students. A well-prepared teacher has clear lesson objectives and procedures, and ensures that all the materials are ready and prepared so that each lesson runs smoothly. Such teachers also complement the use of any text with their own supplementary materials. Not only do supplementary materials help lecturers meet the special needs of all students, but the materials represent teacher effort and dedication in the eyes of the students.

Students expect a week-by-week syllabus, and need to understand the lesson objectives and the instructional method rationale. Providing this information helps to empower students by making them privy to decisions about their education. In addition to providing a whole course syllabus before the semester, students would appreciate a short explanation of content and objectives at the start of each lesson. Some respondents, especially the passive learners, wanted teachers to adhere to the syllabus. Accordingly, teachers who want to diverge from the syllabus might want to keep their students informed of any changes.

In conclusion, the presents study confirmed that students were supportive of generally accepted standards of effective teaching. The importance of principles like setting up supportive classroom atmospheres, allowing for different levels of proficiency, preparing well, encouraging participation, and providing clear and comprehensive syllabi are all well accepted teaching behaviours, so it is not surprising that students also have these expectations. However, the present study draws some conclusions which some teachers may not expect:

- Students in the context of the present study clearly favour a mode of questioning where teachers direct questions to nominated students rather than relying on volunteer responses.
- The finding that many students of all levels were not supportive of L1 use in the classroom tends to counter the perception of some educators that students (and beginners in particular) are frustrated by an inability to obtain L1 explanations.
- The present study indicates that teacher qualifications and target language proficiency are considered more important than rapport attributes.
- Even though teachers are expected to have a high degree of grammatical knowledge, they are ambivalent about the use of explicit grammar instruction.

Further Research

Although this investigation provided valuable suggestions about foreign language teacher effectiveness, more in-depth studies are merited. First, a qualitative follow-up would add significantly to the findings of the present study. This would include investigations into why certain teacher attributes are considered important or unimportant and preferences for different styles of implementation. For example, although the present study indicates mixed feelings about the importance of the use of explicit grammar instruction, qualitative follow-up would provide insights into why students agree or disagree with its inclusion and what kind of grammar instruction (if any) they prefer. Second, although the quantitative data provided some measures of attribute importance, some additional information could be gleaned from more detailed or specialised questionnaire items. For example, Item 34 (*are well qualified for FL teaching*) could have been broken up to investigate the importance of the different elements such as language proficiency, academic qualifications and teaching experience. Also, more specialised investigations into error correction would reveal student preferences about the type and extent of correction.

If further in-depth and focused investigations into student perceptions of effective FL teachers are carried out in various settings, greater understandings will develop. These understandings will help teachers in training and practitioners as they strive to deal with the challenges of instructing students of different races, backgrounds, and attitudes.

References

Appleton-Knapp, S.L., & Krentler, K.A. (2006). Measuring student expectations and their effects on satisfaction: the importance of managing student expectations. *Journal of Marketing Education, 28*, 254-264.

Auerbach, E., & Burgess D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(3), 475-95.

Bailey, K.M. (2005). Practical English language teaching: Speaking (D. Nunan, Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Barnes, B.D., & Lock, G. (2010). The attributes of effective lecturers of English as perceived by students in a Korean university. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 35*(1), 139-152.

Beishuizen, J.J., Hof, E., van Putten, C.M., Bouwmeester, S., & Asscher, J.J. (2001). Students' and teachers' cognitions about teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 71*. 185-201.

Brosh, H. (1996). Perceived characteristics of the effective language teacher. *Foreign Language Annals 29*(2), 125-136.

Brown, A.V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern language Journal, 93*, 46-60.

Clayson, D.E. (2005). Within-class variability in student-teacher evaluations: Examples and problems. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education, 3*(1), 109-124.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402–423.

Desai, S., Damewood, E., & Jones, R. (2001). Be a good teacher and be seen as a good teacher. *Journal of Marketing Education, 23*(2), 136-144.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation.* London: Longman.

Emanuel, R., & Adams, J.N. (2006). Assessing college student perceptions of instructor customer service via the Quality of Instructor Service to Students (QISS) questionnaire. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(5), 535-549.

Faranda, W.T., & Clarke I. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing educators. *Journal of Marketing Education, 26*(3), 271-281.

Horwitz, E.K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-129). Edgewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Horwitz, E.K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: a review of BALLI studies. *System, 27*(4), 557-576.

Jackson, J. (2002). Reticence in second language case discussions: Anxiety and aspirations. *System, 30*, 65-84.

Kelley, C.A., Conant, J.S., & Smart, D.T. (1991). Master teaching revisited: Pursuing excellence from the students' perspective. *Journal of Marketing Education, 13*, 1-10.

Kember, D., Jenkins, W., & Ng, K.C. (2004). Adult students' perceptions of good teaching as a function of their conceptions of learning – Part 2. Implications for the evaluation of teaching. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(1), 81-97.

Kember, D., & Wong, A. (2000). Implications for evaluation from a study of students' perceptions of good and poor teaching. *Higher Education, 40*, 69-97.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* London: Pergamon.

Lai, P.F. (2009). Attitudes of adult Chinese-background learners and an ESL teacher towards L1 use in an Australian AMEP class in Australia. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 4*, 57-84.

Levine, G.S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*, 46-60.

Li, D. (2001). Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. In D.R. Hall and A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching* (pp. 149-166). New York: Routledge.

Liu, N., & Littlewood, W. (1997). Why do many students appear reluctant to participate in classroom learning discourse? *System, 25*(3), 371-384.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukash, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Modern language Journal, 93*(1), 91-104.

Mori, J., Gobel, P., Thepsikik, K., & Pojanapunya, P. (2010). Attributions for performance: A comparative study of Japanese and Thai university students. *JALT 32*(1), 5-28.

Robinson, J.H. (2003). Teaching Koreans within their own linguistic and cultural contexts. In S. Oak & V.S. Martin (Eds.), Teaching English to Koreans (pp. 213-228). Elizabeth, N.J.: Hollym.

Park, G.P. & Lee, H.W. (2006). The characteristics of effective English teachers as perceived by high school teachers and students in Korea. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 7*(2), 236-248.

Schulz, R.A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals 29*(3), 343-365.

Schultz, R.A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 244-258.

Thompson, T. (2006). Examining Korean university students' expectations of native-speaker English teachers. *Proceedings of the 14th Annual KOTESOL International Conference,* Korea, 195-206.

Tsui, A.B.M. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey, & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the Language Classroom* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Xiao, L. (2006). Bridging the gap between teaching styles and learning styles: A cross-cultural perspective. *TESL-EJ, 10*(3). Retrieved March 14, 2007, from http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej39/a2.htm

Appendix One: English Version of the Questionnaire

PART 1: ABOUT ENGLISH TEACHERS - DETAILS
For each item, please check one box which best matches your feelings.

Effective English teachers:	strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	no feelings	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
1. are friendly							
2. develop good relationships with students							
3. share personal experiences							
4. care about students							
5. are patient							
6. listen to students							
7. have a positive attitude in general							
8. have charisma							
9. understand the student's English education background							
10. understand the different student levels							
11. have a sense of humour							
12. are enthusiastic about EFL teaching							
13. give clear explanations							
14. use good examples							
15. use a variety of teaching methods							
16. use Korean selectively							
17. correct writing errors							
18. correct speaking errors							
19. teach grammar							
20. use group work							
21. encourage student participation in class							
22. encourage participation of students with low confidence							
23. talk slowly in English							
24. use easy words							
25. ask questions frequently							
26. ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer							
27. ask individual students to answer questions							
28. give students plenty of time to answer questions							

Effective English teachers:	strongly agree	agree	slightly agree	no feelings	slightly disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
29. treat all students fairly							
30. prepare students well for exams							
31. give students clear grading guidelines							
32. require students to work hard during class							
33. require students to do homework							
34. are well qualified for EFL teaching							
35. have a good knowledge of grammar							
36. have a good knowledge of vocabulary							
37. are well prepared every lesson							
38. provide a syllabus detailing weekly course content							
39. explain the instructional methods to the class							
40. tell students the lesson objectives each lesson							
41. stick to the syllabus							
42. make their own supplemental material.							

PART 2: ABOUT ENGLISH TEACHERS – BROAD VIEW

Rank the following general factors of effective English teachers from the most important (1) to least important. If you feel one or more are of equal importance, then just give them the same value.

☐ Relationship with students (personality, care, understanding)
☐ Communication skill and teaching method
☐ Fairness (regarding general treatment of students and assessment)
☐ Knowledge of English
☐ Organization and preparation

Go on to the next page >>>>>>>>>>

PART 3 - ABOUT YOU

1. Check the name of the college you are enrolled in.

☐ Pharmacy/ Health Science
☐ Business Administration/ Law

☐ Education
☐ Arts
☐ Engineering
☐ Natural Sciences
☐ Social Sciences
☐ Liberal Arts

2. Compared to the other students in your class, how would you rate your English ability?

☐ Below average
☐ Average
☐ Above average

3. Before coming to university, the English instruction I experienced at school and at private institutes generally included:
(Check only one answer)

☐ memorization and grammar ***always***
☐ memorization and grammar ***mostly***
☐ *some* memorization and grammar and *some* communicative activities   (involving games and pair and group tasks)
☐ communicative activities ***mostly*** (involving games and pair and group tasks)
☐ communicative activities ***always*** (involving games and pair and group tasks)

4. In general, in all areas of study (not just English), my learning style tends to be:
(Check only one answer)

☐ passive
☐ about half passive and half active
☐ active

Now that you have completed the survey, just place it in the box at the front of the room. THANK YOU VERY MUCH!!!!!