

Australian Journal of Teacher Education

Volume 35 | Issue 1

Article 2

1-1-2010

The Attributes of Effective Lecturers of English as a Foreign Language as Perceived by Students in a Korean University

Bruce D. Barnes

Ewha Womans University, South Korea

Graeme Lock

Edith Cowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Barnes, B. D., & Lock, G. (2010). The Attributes of Effective Lecturers of English as a Foreign Language as Perceived by Students in a Korean University. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.2>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol35/iss1/2>

The Attributes of Effective Lecturers of English as a Foreign Language as Perceived by Students in a Korean University

Bruce D. Barnes

Ewha Womans University, South Korea

Graeme Lock

Edith Cowan University

barneseol@hotmail.com

Abstract: This study, conducted in a Korean university setting, examines student beliefs about the attributes of effective lecturers^[1] of English as a foreign language. Student opinions about rapport and delivery type attributes are particularly informative. Rapport attributes were the major focus of discussion and viewed as particularly important in Korean university contexts where student anxiety about interacting in English often inhibits effective English language learning. Discussion about delivery attributes was generally supportive of participatory modes of instruction, but contained different views about how aggressively lecturers should enlist participation. The beliefs of Korean university students revealed in this study can, if seen as appropriate, be used by existing practitioners and teachers in training to guide instructional approaches.

Introduction

If lecturers are to be responsive to student needs and improve the effectiveness of student outcomes, they must first understand what students define as effective lecturing. Horwitz (1987) warned of the dangers of ignoring student beliefs about language learning: “When language classes fail to meet student expectations, students can lose confidence in the instructional approach and their ultimate achievement can be limited” (p. 119). However, far from advocating that lecturers use information about student beliefs to pander to student wishes, we suggest that the information may be used for self reflection and/or for identifying specific areas which require attitude change among the student body.

Despite the importance of knowledge about student perceptions as an informant to effective lecturing and teaching, there is a lack of studies in the field of English language teaching, especially in the Korean context. In fact, we have not been able to locate any research into Korean university student perceptions of effective lecturers of English as a

^[1] In the present study, lecturers are defined as class teachers or instructors at university level.

foreign language (EFL). The present study, therefore, addresses this deficiency. In particular, the present study identifies the attributes of effective EFL lecturers from the Korean university student perspective, and investigates why these attributes were chosen and how the students think they could be implemented. The outcomes of this investigation provide fresh insights into Korean university student views about effective EFL lecturing which should be particularly informative to teachers and lecturers working in Korea and student teachers bound for Korea. Additionally, the research may provide useful information for teacher trainees, teachers, and lecturers in other contexts.

Literature Overview

Numerous accounts of studies into student perceptions of effective lecturers from various settings outside of English language teaching (ELT) have been published. Prominent among these are studies involving general university student populations (Emanuel & Adams, 2006; Griemel-Fuhrmann & Geyer, 2003; Kember, Jenkins, & Ng, 2004; Kember & Wong, 2000), and business students in the USA (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006; Desai et al., 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Clayson, 2005; Kelley, Conant, & Smart, 1991). The few studies from the field of EFL are quite scattered and scarce. Chen's (2005) study of Chinese tertiary EFL students and Park and Lee's (2006) report on Korean high school student views provide some information related to the context of the present study. Despite the dearth of literature from the EFL field, information from studies conducted on general students and business students are informative to the present study, as attributes uncovered in these studies are often applicable to all disciplines.

Table 1 lists the attributes of effective teachers and lecturers identified in the studies reviewed. This table is organised under the five categories employed by Faranda and Clarke (2004): Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organisation and Preparation. In the course of reviewing literature in this study, these categories also seemed to apply to the attributes uncovered by other researchers. Attributes marked "ELT" in Table 1 are those particular to English language teaching contexts.

Category	Attribute: Effective teachers ...
Rapport (sociability, empathy, personality, receptiveness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop interpersonal relationships (Chen, 2005; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Xiao, 2006) • are congenial (Chen, 2005; Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • share personal and professional life experiences (Chen, 2005; Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • listen to students (Desai et al., 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Park & Lee, 2006; Rammal, 2006) • care (Desai et al., 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • make themselves accessible for consultation (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • have a sense of humour (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • are patient (Desai et al., 2001; Kutnick & Jules, 1993; Payne, 1978; Rammal, 2006) • have a positive attitude towards students (Desai et al., 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Park & Lee, 2006; Rammal, 2006)

<p>Delivery (personal style, communication, methodology, content)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • are enthusiastic (Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Kelley et al., 1991; Palmer, 2000) • give clear explanations (Griemel-Fuhrmann, 2003; Kember & Wong, 2000; Kutnick & Jules, 1993) • use good examples (Griemel-Fuhrmann, 2003; Palmer, 2000) • use the students' native language selectively (ELT) (Auerbach, & Burgess 1985; Chen, 2005) • vary their delivery methods (Chen, 2005; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Gorham, 1987) • encourage group work and participation (Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Kelley et al., 1991; Reid, 1987) • provide interesting and meaningful activities (ELT) (Park & Lee, 2006) • emphasise error correction (ELT) (Nunan, 1989; Rammal, 2006; Yorio, 1989) • provide pronunciation practice (ELT) (Nunan, 1989; Rammal, 2006) • teach grammar rules (ELT) (Horwitz, 1987; Yorio, 1989) • emphasise vocabulary (ELT) (Horwitz, 1987; Nunan, 1989; Yorio, 1989) • prepare students for examinations (ELT) (Rammal, 2006; Xiao, 2006) • tailor content to the students' English levels (ELT) (Park & Lee, 2006)
<p>Fairness (impartiality, examination preparation, grading, transparency, workload)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • treat all students impartially (Desai et al., 2001; Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • produce examinations which closely relate to work covered in class (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • make examinations which allow students to express their knowledge freely (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • give prompt assignment feedback (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • provide pre and post examination reviews (Kelley et al. 1991) • provide clear grading guidelines (Desai et al., 2001) • articulate policies regarding attendance and late assignment submissions (Desai et al., 2001) • are flexible with grading (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • impose a balanced workload (Faranda & Clarke, 2004)
<p>Knowledge and Credibility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have sound content knowledge of their discipline (Chen, 2005; Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Kutnick & Jules, 1993; Xiao, 2006) • go beyond the textbook (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • are able to answer complex questions (Faranda & Clarke, 2004) • use relevant real world examples in lessons (Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Kelley et al., 1991) • are proficient in English (ELT) (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Park & Lee, 2006; Rammal, 2006) • have a sound knowledge of grammar (ELT) (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005; Park & Lee, 2006) • are able to teach study techniques (Chen, 2005; Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005)
<p>Organisation and Preparation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a comprehensive syllabus with content and methodology (Kelley et al., 1991; Xiao, 2006) • communicate clear course objectives (Kember & Wong, 2000; Kelley et al., 1991) • stick to the syllabus (Kember & Wong, 2000; Rammal, 2006) • lay out all the materials needed for assignments (Kember et al., 2004) • provide original supplemental material (Kember et al., 2004; Yorio, 1989) • provide prompt feedback on assessment (Desai et al., 2001) • prepare each lesson well (Park & Lee, 2006)

Table 1: Attributes of effective lecturers and teachers identified in the literature

The literature identified effective lecturer and teacher attributes in various contexts and some elaborations are offered, particularly by qualitative studies such as that reported by Faranda and Clarke (2004). Rapport attributes identified in the literature indicate that students appreciate lecturers and teachers who take an interest in their students and in developing classroom atmosphere. Delivery attributes were generally discipline specific, with studies from ELT contexts producing useful data about the mode and content of instruction. Literature about Fairness emphasised lecturer and teacher impartiality of classroom interaction and grading, and transparency of curricula and methodology. Knowledge and credibility attributes revealed that students wanted lecturers and teachers to be competent scholars or experienced practitioners in their subject area. Discussion of organisation and preparation attributes indicated that students from all disciplines wanted serious and dedicated lecturers and teachers.

The present study contributes to the small pool of ELT related studies by investigating the perceptions of Korean EFL university students. As in the literature overview, the results of the present study are framed under the five categories employed by Faranda and Clarke (2004): Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organisation and Preparation. This consistent framing allows for easy cross referencing between the present

study and the literature. These five categories are also quite suitable because they allow easy classification of the attributes uncovered in this investigation.

The Context

The population under study were first year students taking EFL classes at a women's university in Korea in 2007. Although students were allocated EFL classes according to their major, this division tended to correspond with ability. Therefore, within most individual classes, the majority of the students exhibited similar levels of English proficiency. Classes and curricula were classified as pre-intermediate, intermediate, or high-intermediate.

Method

The present study employed a free writing instrument which asked respondents to write, in their own language, about the attributes of effective EFL lecturers. The population under study comprised 2170 first year students from a variety of majors. A sample of 105 students was invited to participate. To draw diverse views, four classes were selected, with each class representing one of four ability profiles: 30 pre-intermediate (arts), 15 intermediate (science), 30 high-intermediate (social science), and 30 high-intermediate (humanities).

The responses were first analysed by listing attributes identified by two or more respondents and discarding attributes only identified by only one respondent (an approach also adopted by Faranda & Clarke, 2004). Following compilation of the list, the responses were translated into English and further elaborations were collated under each attribute. These elaborations contained information about why certain attributes were selected or suggestions about how they could be demonstrated by lecturers.

Results

In total, 38 responses were received and most of these were presented either as lists or as essays. Analysis of the data produced a list of 40 attributes of effective EFL lecturers, after discarding 12 single response attributes. The number of respondents who identified each of the attributes was tallied. This tally by attribute category is summarised in Table 2.

Attribute category	Frequency of attribute identification	Percentage representation
Rapport	80	37.2
Delivery	78	36.3
Fairness	21	9.8
Knowledge and Credibility	16	7.4
Organisation and Preparation	20	9.3
Total	215	100.0

Table 2: Frequency of identification of attributes by category

This section presents the attribute lists and the elaborations under each of Faranda and Clarke's (2004) attribute category headings: Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organisation and Preparation. For ease of reporting, each respondent was given a reference number: for example, respondent number 6 is referred to as "R6."

Rapport

Rapport was one of two categories which dominated discussion in the data. There were 11 different rapport attributes identified by two or more respondents (listed below). Most of the attributes were also found in the literature. The exceptions, those attributes which appear to be unique to this study, are charisma (item 8), and understanding of student educational background and levels (items 9 & 10).

Students approve of EFL lecturers who:

1. are friendly
2. develop interpersonal relationships
3. share personal life 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 students educational background
10. understand the different student levels
11. have a sense of humour

The analysis of comments in this category revealed that respondents perceived Rapport as useful in reducing fear (fear of making mistakes, fear of foreigners), making students feel valued, promoting learning, and making students feel understood.

A common theme among the responses was the importance of Rapport in reducing student fear. Several respondents claimed that they, as Korean students, were not generally confident around foreigners and were even afraid of foreigners because of a lack of previous exposure to people from other races. R26 wrote that an authoritarian lecturer served to deepen this fear and caused many students to drop EFL courses. In contrast, friendly foreign EFL lecturers encouraged students to overcome fear, become comfortable, and participate more, which then motivated students to continue studying English. R35 wrote that lecturers who were friendly and who were willing to listen and speak to students tended to encourage more interaction, which then helped students to practice their English more. R26 opined that students want to be able to talk to their lecturers about personal problems and felt comfortable doing so when lecturers were also willing to reciprocate by talking about their own personal experiences. The importance of lecturers sharing personal life and experiences was also discussed extensively in the literature (see for example Chen, 2005; Faranda and Clarke, 2004).

The fear of making mistakes was also addressed in five responses. R9 explained that students had an inbuilt fear of making mistakes and so did not try out new language. According to R9, this is a problem because trying out new language (and making mistakes) is

the only way to improve language production. She pointed out that a lecturer should always be patient, so students do not worry about making mistakes and trying new language. The importance of patience in allaying fear was underscored by R25 who wrote that an EFL lecturer who lost patience even once permanently harmed student confidence.

Attentive listening was listed in eight responses as a way of making students feel valued. R13 wrote: "Listening shows that the lecturer is trying to understand the student." R19 complained that EFL lecturers sometimes did not pay due attention when a student could not articulate properly. This affected student pride and confidence.

Another related attribute was the care that lecturers show towards students and their learning. This attribute and its importance was also emphasised by Auerbach and Burgess (1985) who warned against the damaging effects of teachers and lecturers being condescending towards students, as often happens in EFL situations. In the present study, respondents suggested that care could be demonstrated when lecturers used student names, made overt efforts to help students, and checked student understanding. These specific behaviours and their effectiveness in showing care were also discussed by Desai et al. (2001) and Faranda and Clarke (2004).

Rapport was seen by some students as having a significant effect on learning. Consistent with Krashen's (1982) affective filter hypothesis, respondents to the present study thought that Rapport affected class atmosphere, which in turn affected motivation and learning. Humour was an attribute mentioned in three responses as a useful tool to promote class atmosphere and combat boredom. There was also discussion about lecturer use of humour, and its direct benefits on learning. R1 wrote that a lecturer who used jokes, role plays, and amusing gestures helped students to understand and remember.

R14 explained that a lecturer who had charisma could control the class atmosphere. She wrote that in the large classes that exist at her university, there were always going to be a few students with negative attitudes. But if the lecturer had charisma, then the majority of the students would have positive attitudes towards the lecturer and class. She went on to explain that in this environment, individual students who harbour negative thoughts would be unlikely to act on those thoughts as such actions would be unpopular and go against the social norm.

Five respondents expressed the need for lecturers to understand students as Koreans and as students of a foreign language. They expressed the view that EFL lecturers should understand how difficult it is to learn a foreign language. R2 and R14 wrote that they really appreciated lecturers who shared their own language learning experiences with the class as it showed them that the lecturer empathised with the students.

Five respondents wrote that lecturers should understand students' levels better. The classes at the university under study were comprised of mixed ability students and R6 complained that lecturers tended to favour the students exhibiting high levels of English speaking proficiency. R21 advised lecturers to adjust the teaching to suit all levels.

The point was also made that prior to university entrance, most Korean students learned English with a focus on grammar and vocabulary. The EFL lecturers needed to understand that writing, speaking and listening did not come easily to most Korean students because of the lack of training in these areas.

Delivery

Delivery is inclusive of personal style, communication, methodology, and content. Along with Rapport, Delivery dominated discussion in the data. The high focus on Delivery was consistent with all the literature reviewed. There were 15 different delivery attributes identified (listed below). Most significantly, 12 respondents emphasised the need for lecturers to vary teaching methods and 15 respondents wanted lecturers to employ group work. All but five of the attributes were found in the literature. Items relating to slow and simple speech by lecturers and questioning styles (items 12-16) seem to be unique to the present study.

Students approve of EFL lecturers who:

1. are enthusiastic about EFL lecturing
2. give clear explanations
3. use good examples
4. use a variety of lecturing methods
5. use Korean selectively
6. correct all writing errors
7. correct all speaking errors
8. provide grammar instruction
9. use group work
10. encourage student participation in class
11. encourage participation of students with low confidence
12. talk slowly in English
13. use easy words
14. ask questions to individual students
15. ask questions to the whole class, then wait for volunteers to answer
16. give students plenty of time to respond to questions

The data provided extensive information about why and how delivery attributes should be implemented. Delivery attributes were seen by the respondents as being helpful in maintaining interest, getting the message across, fostering improvement, and promoting participation.

Two respondents felt that effective EFL lecturers maintained interest of the class by being enthusiastic. R25 wrote: "From the moment the lecturer walks into the room, we know whether s/he wants to be here or has to be here. From then on, the atmosphere is set." Similarly, R38 wrote that a "gloomy character . . . makes the class hard and boring."

Several respondents reported that a variety of instructional methods really helped to make English lessons interesting. R14 commented that the use of "newspapers and magazines rather than text books makes everything real and encourages us to participate more." R22 and R14 wrote that films could be used to provide interesting foci for discussion, and R1 and R4 thought that instructional tools like pop songs and soap operas could be used to learn a variety of language expressions.

R34 wrote that EFL lecturers who used easy language when speaking to students encouraged students to speak more. When students could follow and join in on a conversation, it gave their confidence a remarkable boost and gave them the desire to engage in further conversations.

The responses contained five references to the importance of lecturers giving clear explanations and five references to lecturer use of good examples. R29 complained that difficult words and idioms used by EFL lecturers often led to misunderstandings. Slow speech and easy words were attributes each cited as important in five responses. These respondents wrote that lecturers should remember that English was not the students' first language and, therefore, lecturers should slow down and not use difficult words or idioms. Two respondents expressed the view that lecturers should use Korean occasionally to explain meanings of words when English explanations were unclear. This suggestion concurs with other studies lending support for the use of first language – especially with beginners (Chen, 2005; Auerbach & Burgess, 1985).

When commenting on the sufficiency of explanations, R28 claimed that further explanations were often necessary. She complained that EFL lecturers often offered explanations which were too short and sometimes wrongly assumed that students already knew answers to questions. "Please, always explain," she advised.

There were a total of six comments about EFL lecturers correcting writing and speaking errors. Four respondents felt that correction was necessary to make their writing better. R14 wanted correction of all writing (not just the class essays done as part of the program) and more opportunities for one-on-one conferencing. R6 specifically wanted corrections to go beyond simple editing and to include grammar explanations. While these respondents called for comprehensive language correction, R18 preferred selective grammar correction and a focus on essay structure. Two respondents who wrote about error correction of speech indicated that although this may help students to speak better, EFL lecturers had to be very careful and selective when correcting speech to avoid embarrassing or intimidating students, as this could then discourage them from speaking. R22 advised lecturers to avoid correcting every mistake.

Respondents wrote that variations in instructional media also help to enhance learning. Exposure to a variety of instructional media, particularly soap operas, was cited as being helpful to improve English. R1 wrote that soap operas were useful for learning everyday language.

The data indicates general support for a participatory approach to instruction. The literature contains contrasting views about Korean high school student acceptance of participatory modes of EFL instruction; while Li (2001) reported general resistance among students, Park and Lee (2006) reported that their informants were supportive. The present study, along with the more recent findings by Park and Lee, tend to support the notion that Korean students are now more receptive to a participatory style than they used to be.

Despite the general acceptance of participation, respondents cautioned that care was required when implementing activities. Following on from the earlier discussion regarding the natural shyness that students feel when operating in a foreign language with a foreigner, two responses contained explicit advice about the need for EFL lecturers to be very supportive and encouraging when requiring participation. R25 wrote that lecturers should praise student participation even if their contributions were full of mistakes. She also wrote that Korean students were not accustomed to participatory learning so lecturers must work hard to establish a participatory environment.

Four respondents indicated that questioning was an effective way to encourage participation. However, two respondents suggested that EFL lecturers give students enough time to answer questions and complained that lecturers often require immediate responses. They viewed that as unreasonable in a language classroom.

Although there were no objections to lecturers using questioning per se, there was discussion about whether or not questions should be directed to individual students. R1 thought that directing questions to individual students created an uncomfortable atmosphere because many students were afraid of answering. R4 wrote: "I do not think asking individual students questions is good because students feel pressure to answer quickly, it wastes time, gives stress to the students, and answers seem too short." In contrast, two respondents opined that asking individuals to answer questions was a way of encouraging students with low confidence to speak. They wrote that lecturers should give these students equal chance to speak by selecting students to answer questions making sure that all students are called on from time to time. R30 suggested that calling on students to answer questions is the only way to force participation.

Group work was another area discussed by many of the respondents. Not all were in favour, with two respondents stating that they preferred a lecture style. However, the other students who commented on group work praised its use as a way of promoting participation. R32 was particularly fond of group work involving games and projects as ways of encouraging class participation. R10 liked group work and partner work, but thought the lecturer should participate as well.

Fairness

Fairness is inclusive of attributes relating to equity, examinations, grading, and workload. In this category, five different attributes were identified (listed below). Of these, impartial treatment of students was the most common attribute with nine responses containing discussion about this.

Students approve of EFL lecturers who:

1. treat all students impartially
2. prepare students well for examinations
3. provide clear grading guidelines
4. require students to work hard during class
5. require students to do homework

Within the fairness category, respondents offered elaborations only about impartiality. A common complaint was that EFL lecturers sometimes focused their attention on a few students with high levels of English proficiency and gave them preferential treatment. To demonstrate impartiality, R23 advised lecturers to maintain eye contact with all students during class and R37 suggested that lecturers give all students equal chances to talk.

Knowledge and Credibility

There were three different attributes listed in this category (listed below). No useful elaborations were offered by respondents about this category.

Students approve of EFL lecturers who:

1. are well qualified for EFL lecturing
2. have a good knowledge of grammar
3. have a good knowledge of vocabulary

Organisation and Preparation

There were five different attributes identified (listed below). Of these, seven respondents mentioned that they wanted a comprehensive syllabus with content and methodology.

Students approve of EFL lecturers who:

1. are well prepared every lesson
2. provide a syllabus detailing course content and methodology
3. tell students the lesson objectives each lesson
4. stick to the syllabus
5. make their own supplemental material

The data did not offer much elaboration of attributes in the category related to Organisation and Preparation. Comments about access to information were particularly brief. R20 wrote that she appreciated the communication of objectives so she knew why they needed to study. R8 believed that effective lecturers should stick to the syllabus because students needed to know how to prepare for the next class.

Although lecturer preparation was an attribute discussed in only three responses, these responses proved interesting. In general, the comments were that students were impressed by lecturers who had everything ready for class and this inspired students to work hard. R13 wrote, "If we see the lecturer working hard, we will work hard also. The lecturer sets an example." R2 wrote, "We know if the lecturer has prepared or not."

Discussion

This investigation established what the students felt were the attributes of effective EFL lecturers. The explanations of why such attributes were identified and how they could be implemented were also quite informative and useful for gaining deeper insights into the motivations behind the student perceptions. These findings have specific implications for existing and prospective EFL lecturers and teachers.

First, the present study indicates that students feel that lecturer to student rapport is essential to build atmospheres of respect and understanding in EFL classes. Respect may be conveyed by listening, using student names, making overt efforts to help students, and checking student comprehension. Understanding may be demonstrated by being sensitive to

factors specific to EFL contexts. The debilitating effect of anxiety that students experience when operating in a foreign language and with foreign EFL lecturers was a very prominent topic of concern among respondents in the present study. The respondents suggest that the best way to allay this anxiety is for lecturers to be consistently friendly and patient; even one isolated display of anger or impatience may permanently harm classroom atmosphere. In addition, students feel more relaxed with lecturers who are willing to share personal experiences, especially stories about a lecturer's own difficulties of learning a foreign language. Allowing for disparities in English proficiency levels and specific characteristics of the students' educational backgrounds are also important. Care should be taken not to favour the students of high proficiency, which some respondents thought tends to occur in EFL classes. Lecturers should also understand that students do not generally have much training in productive skills of writing and speaking, so activities should be pegged at the appropriate levels.

Second, existing and prospective EFL lecturers should know that the degree of lecturer enthusiasm and preparation are very obvious to students (even as the lecturer walked into the room) and major factors influencing classroom atmosphere and motivation. Motivation is also promoted when lecturers vary the instructional modes and methods and when they ensure that students can understand the classes.

Third, diverse views about the type and level of error correction will be a source of conflict unless lecturers make the effort to align student expectations with their own, and be sensitive to student self esteem. Aligning student expectations would seem especially important in contexts like Korea, where high degrees of error correction are expected and especially if the lecturer is a strict adherent to the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method, which does not favour explicit error correction (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Clearly, the inevitable conflict between students and lecturers in this situation could only be resolved when the lecturer negotiates the level and type of correction with the students. Sensitivity to student self esteem will always be required when correcting errors. In many cases, corrections should be made sparingly and, wherever possible, countered by positive feedback.

Fourth, existing and prospective EFL practitioners should be aware that students appreciate their efforts to employ a participatory approach. When employing this approach; however, care should be taken to include all students, as several respondents pointed out that lecturers tend to favour participation from the more advanced students and do not give lower level students equal chances. At the same time, other comments suggest that lecturers should be aware that some students with low confidence need special care and consideration and expressed the view that students should be encouraged to participate – but not forced. The line to be drawn between encouraging participation while avoiding intimidation needs to be addressed by practising and potential lecturers. Discussion in the data about the use of questioning in class further illustrates this apparent dilemma; students seem to have conflicting views about whether lecturers should practice equity by directing questions to individual students, or prevent feelings of intimidation by relying on volunteers to answer questions. Whichever method a lecturer adopts, care should be taken to be sensitive to the student dynamics. If the lecturer feels that asking questions to the whole class then waiting for volunteers is the best method, they should spend time explaining the merits of this method

to the students. This form of questioning would be much more successful if the students are privy to the rationale. If the lecturer feels that students should be selected to respond to questions, so that all students are afforded equal chance to participate, care should be taken to avoid intimidation of the shyer students, perhaps by directing simpler, less threatening questions to these students and giving them plenty of time to respond. Furthermore, lecturers should understand that processing communication in a foreign language is quite difficult, so students need plenty of time to understand questions and then prepare responses.

An analysis of the data revealed 40 attributes of effective EFL lecturers and useful elaborations of several of these attributes, particularly those in the rapport and delivery categories. A comparison of the number of times that attributes from each category were identified reveals that rapport and delivery themes dominated the responses. The other categories of Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organisation and Preparation attracted relatively little discussion. While the focus of discussion on Rapport and Delivery may be indicative of their importance, the value of less frequently discussed attribute categories should not be discounted. For example, the low level of discussion about the attributes in the organisation and preparation category does not necessarily indicate that the respondents did not think these attributes were important. Respondents may have felt that justification of the importance was self evident, or that well prepared lecturers could be taken for granted. This highlights the limitations of the data presented in this investigation for reaching conclusions about the value of individual attributes. In view of these limitations, we have carried out a follow-up investigation involving the administration of a rating questionnaire on a proportionally stratified sample of the student population. The data derived from this quantitative instrument will provide information about the importance that students attribute to individual attributes and categories, and complement understandings of student views gleaned from the present study.

When the beliefs of students and their instructors align, and students agree with the teaching approach, effective learning is enhanced. To achieve this alignment, lecturers, teachers, and student teachers must first understand student beliefs so that they can identify possible areas of discord, and then take action either to amend their own instruction or change erroneous student perceptions. Unfortunately, there is very little literature about student perceptions of effective teaching and lecturing in EFL contexts. Indeed, the present study appears to be the first about EFL student perceptions in the Korean university context. We hope that other researchers from diverse EFL contexts will carry out similar studies and add to the small pool of knowledge that currently exists about this topic. This knowledge will help lecturers, teachers, and student teachers to understand their students better and become more effective lecturers and teachers.

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.

- Chen, R. (2005). Chinese tertiary students' perceptions of a good EFL teacher. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 2(4) (Serial No. 16). Retrieved March 14, 2007 from: <http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/su200504/su20050406.doc>
- Clayson, D.E. (2005). Within-class variability in student-teacher evaluations: Examples and problems. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 3(1), 109-124.
- 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.
- 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.
- Gorham, J.K. (1987). Sixth grade students' perceptions of good teachers. Retrieved from the *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)* March 14, 2007 from: http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/26/d3/f8.pdf
- Griemel-Fuhrmann, B., & Geyer, A. (2003). Students' evaluation of teachers and instructional quality – analysis of relevant factors based on empirical evaluation research. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(3), 229-238.
- 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.Y.: Prentice-Hall.
- 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.D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon Press.
- Kutnick, P., & Jules, V. (1993). Pupils' perceptions of a good teacher: a developmental perspective from Trinidad and Tobago. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 63, 400-413.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J.M. (2005). What do students think about the pros and cons of having a native speaker teacher? In E. Llorca (Ed.), *Non native language teachers: Challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 217-241). Netherlands: Springer.
- 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.
- Nunan, D. (1989). Hidden agendas: the role of the learner in programme implementation. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 176-187). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, D. (2000). Students' perceptions of good and bad university teaching. *Teaching Review* (on-line journal). Retrieved March 14, 2007, from: <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/service/teachinglearning/teachingreview/palmer.html>
- 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.
- Payne, M. (1978). Determinants of teacher popularity and unpopularity: a West Indian perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 13(3), 193-205.
- Rammal, S.M. (2006). The other side of the mirror: ESL students offer their opinions of good language teaching. Article retrieved from the *UsingEnglish.com* website on March 14, 2007 from: <http://www.usingenglish.com/articles/other-side-mirror.html>
- Reid, J.M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 87-111.
- 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.html>
- Yorio, C. (1989). The other side of the looking glass. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 8(1), 32-45.