



Effective EFL Teachers: Non-English Department Students' Perspectives

Lena Febriana¹, Daflizar², Musdizal³

^{1,2,3}Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kerinci

E-mail: lenafebriana14@gmail.com

Received: 2025-05-05 Accepted: 2025-06-09

DOI: 10.24256/ideas.v13i1.6543

Abstract

This study investigated the perspectives of non-English major students at an Islamic institution of higher education in Indonesia regarding the attributes of effective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lecturers. The study aimed to identify key factors students consider important in learning English and to explore teaching strategies that enhance learning effectiveness. A quantitative survey method was employed, involving 300 students from various non-English majors. Data were analyzed using ANOVA to examine differences among groups, followed by post-hoc Tukey tests to identify specific group differences. The results indicated that students rated communication skills ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 0.61$) and teaching methods ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 0.65$) as the most important attributes of effective EFL lecturers. These were followed by lecturer credibility ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.68$) and knowledge of English ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.70$). Additional influential factors included the quality of interpersonal relationships between lecturers and students, fairness in assessment, and organization and preparation in teaching. Furthermore, the study found that the strategic use of the mother tongue (L1) in instruction increased students' confidence in using English. The implications of this study underscore the importance of flexible teaching approaches that accommodate diverse learning styles. The use of interactive methods, educational technology, and clear material delivery can significantly enhance the effectiveness of English language teaching in higher education settings.

Keywords: *teaching effectiveness; English as a foreign language; students' perspectives; teaching strategies; higher education.*

Introduction

The effectiveness of EFL teachers is highly influential on the success of English language learning. Studies show that teacher quality determines student achievement more than other factors such as curriculum (Hattie, 2009). Effective teachers are able to combine mastery of the material, appropriate pedagogical approaches and positive relationships with students (Richards, 2011). In the realm of language education, the role of the teacher is paramount. The effectiveness of a foreign language teacher can significantly impact students' language acquisition (Ellis, 2008), motivation and overall learning experience (Z, Dörnyei, 2001).

English has become a global language that plays an important role in various aspects of life, including education, business and international communication. In Indonesia, although English is widely taught from primary school to tertiary level, students' proficiency levels are still low compared to other Asian countries such as Singapore, Malaysia and the Philippines (EF English Proficiency Index, 2023). According to the EF EPI 2023 report, Indonesia ranks 80th out of 113 countries in English proficiency, indicating a major challenge in the effectiveness of English language teaching in schools and universities.

Interestingly, recent research has shown that the effectiveness of English language teaching is strongly influenced by the attributes of the teacher, such as rapport with students, method of delivery, fairness in assessment, credibility, and preparation for teaching (Barnes & Lock, 2013). In addition, factors such as previous English learning experiences, individual learning styles, and students' initial abilities also play an important role in determining their learning outcomes (Kember, et al, 2004).

Many studies have been conducted globally to understand students' and university students' perceptions of the characteristics of effective EFL teachers. In the context of foreign language (FL) teaching, quantitative research in US universities (Brown, 2009; Levine, 2003; Loewen et al., 2009; Schulz, 2001) confirms that effective pedagogical strategies contribute to student learning success. examined Korean students' perceptions of various characteristics of EFL teachers, while Schulz (2001) examined Colombian students' perceptions of foreign language lecturers.

In Australia, Lai (2009) found that the use of mother tongue in ESL learning for migrants can improve students' understanding and confidence in using English. In Saudi Arabia, a study conducted by (Liton, 2013) showed that curriculum and teaching methods that do not match the needs of students are the main challenges in the effectiveness of EFLS teaching. Meanwhile, in Lebanon, (Nicolas & Annous, 2021) found that although English was used as the medium of instruction (EMI), many students felt that their communication skills did not improve significantly. This suggests that the effectiveness of teaching is highly dependent on the methods applied.

In Iran, some studies have also highlighted different aspects of EFL teaching. (Shishavan, 2009) found that students valued aspects of teacher personality and social interaction more than pedagogical skills or language acquisition. Zamani, Ahangari (2016) also emphasized that building rapport with students as well as creating a supportive classroom environment are key factors in teaching effectiveness. In addition, (Moradi & Sabeti, 2014) compared teachers' and students' perceptions of EFL teaching effectiveness, finding that teachers put more emphasis on pedagogical knowledge and teaching experience, while students prioritized communication skills and interactive approaches.

In India, a study by Shishavan & sadeghi (2009) revealed that both teachers and students considered mastery of the target language as a major factor in EFL teacher effectiveness. However, students emphasized the importance of social interaction and flexibility in teaching methods. Whereas in Turkey, a study by (Inceçay & Inceçay, 2009) highlighted the importance of a combination of communicative and non-communicative methods in English language learning to improve students' skills.

In Indonesia, there have been several studies on effective EFL teachers, including research on non-English major students in Indonesia which has been conducted by Putra & Suparni, (2023) with a quantitative study. The results showed that students from non-English faculties had a positive view of English courses and hoped that the courses would continue to be taught (Putra & Suparni, 2023). In addition, (Saifullah & Yawan, 2023) examined English teachers' perspectives on factors influencing the teaching and learning of English as a compulsory course for non-English students at Dayanu Ikhsanuddin University, Baubau.

The study found that factors such as syllabus, resources, student motivation, class size, institutional support, and teacher enthusiasm have a significant influence on the quality of learning (Saifullah & Yawan, 2023). Another study conducted by (Liando, 2015) addressed the perspectives of students and lecturers regarding the characteristics of an ideal English teacher in an EFL classroom. This study revealed that characteristics such as friendliness, intelligence, humor, and the ability to explain the material well are aspects that are highly valued by students.

The study also highlighted that teachers' verbal and nonverbal behaviors, such as closeness and warm communication, can increase students' learning motivation, while less supportive behaviors can be a demotivating factor (Liando, 2015). Thus, the effectiveness of English language teaching in Indonesia for non-English speaking students is greatly influenced by students' attitudes, institutional support, as well as teachers' approaches to language use during instruction. In addition, there is a significant relationship between students' academic performance in English courses and their perspectives on language learning.

In other words, the more positive the students' attitudes towards English, the better their academic results (Putra & Suparni, 2023). Although previous research has addressed various aspects related to EFL teaching in Indonesia, some gaps can be identified. Putra & Suparni (2023) research focused more on non-English students' perceptions of English courses and their relationship with academic achievement, while Saifullah & Yawan (2023) highlighted factors affecting English language teaching from the teachers' perspective.

In addition, Liando's (2015) study examined ideal teacher characteristics and their impact on student motivation. However, not many studies have comprehensively integrated students' perceptions and teaching effectiveness of EFL teachers and their influence on non-English students' academic outcomes. In addition, previous studies tend to focus on aspects of perception and motivation, but not many have explored innovative teaching strategies that can improve the effectiveness of EFL learning for non-English speaking students. Thus, this study aims to fill the gap by analyzing how teachers' roles in shaping students' positive attitudes towards English as well as identifying teaching strategies that are more contextualized and based on the needs of non-English students' fields of study. Therefore, this article attempts to answer the following the research questions:

1. What factors do non-English major students consider most important in determining the teaching effectiveness of EFL lecturers in higher education?
2. How do non-English departments at an Islamic institution of higher education perceive the characteristics and effective teaching approaches of EFL lecturers?
3. Are there significant different in student in students' Perceptions of effective EFL Lectures regarding students' learning style, proficiency level, and past learning experiences?

Method

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative survey method to examine non-English major students' perceptions of effective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lecturers at an Islamic institution of higher education in Indonesia. The survey method was chosen for its ability to efficiently collect quantifiable data from a large and diverse student population, allowing for meaningful statistical analysis. Participants and Sampling Method A total of 300 first-year students from 21 non-English majors participated in this study, representing 44.63% of the target student population (672 students).

Participants were selected using a convenience sampling technique, as students were recruited directly during scheduled classroom visits. This approach allowed the researchers to maximize accessibility and participation within a limited timeframe. The participating students came from 21 different study programs:

Table 1: Participants based on Study Program

No	Study Program	Tot	Percenta
1	Islamic Family Law	10	3,33%
2	Islamic Economic Law	14	4,67%
3	Islamic Criminal Law	15	5%
4	Constitutional Law	10	3,33%
5	Mathematics Education	29	9,67%
6	Biology Education	17	5,67%
7	Islamic Religious Education	31	10,33%
8	Arabic Language Education	14	4,67%
9	Islamic Education Management	18	6%
10	Islamic Education Guidance and Counselling	20	6,67%
11	Chemistry Education	6	2%
12	Early Childhood Education	21	7%
13	Physics Education	5	1,67%
14	Da'wah Management	5	1,67%
15	Qur'anic Science and Tafsir	10	3,33%
16	History of Islamic Civilization	16	5,33%
17	Islamic Library and Information Science	10	3,33%
18	Islamic Banking	9	3%
19	Islamic Economics	20	6,67%
20	Islamic Financial Management	10	3,33%
21	Islamic Business Management	10	3,33%

Instrument and Reliability

The data collection instrument was a three-part structured questionnaire written in Indonesian to ensure accessibility across proficiency levels: The questionnaire consisted of three parts: Part 1 included 42 Likert-scale items (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) adapted from (Barnes & Lock, 2010), measuring the perceived importance of teacher attributes across five dimensions Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organization and Preparation; Part 2 asked students to rank these five main categories based on their perceived importance, following the framework of

(Faranda & Charke, 2004); and Part 3 gathered demographic and academic background data, including students' major, gender, English proficiency level, prior EFL learning experience, and learning style. To ensure internal consistency, a reliability analysis was conducted. The overall Cronbach's alpha for the 42-item scale was 0.848, indicating high internal reliability (see Figure 1).

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.848	42

Figure 1 Reliability Statistics

Questionnaire Adaptation

The original instrument from Barnes & Lock (2010) was adapted through the following steps: Translated into Bahasa Indonesia by two bilingual experts. Modified culturally (e.g., substituting references to Korean classroom practices with Indonesian equivalents). Reviewed for linguistic and conceptual equivalence to maintain content validity while ensuring local relevance.

Validity and Pilot Testing

Content validity was established by consulting three EFL educators with more than five years of teaching experience. A pilot study with 25 non-participating students was conducted to assess clarity, language appropriateness, and question interpretability. Feedback from the pilot was used to revise several items for clarity and reduce ambiguity.

Ethical Considerations

This study received ethical approval from the institutional review board of the university. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to survey administration. Respondents were informed that participation was voluntary, anonymous, and that their responses would be used solely for research purposes.

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected during a four-week period by administering paper-based questionnaires in classrooms before or after lectures. This in-class distribution method helped ensure a high response rate and immediate clarification of any doubts. Out of 310 questionnaires distributed, 300 were returned and fully completed, yielding a 96.8% response rate.

Data Analysis and Assumption Testing

The data were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were used to summarize trends, and inferential statistics (ANOVA and post-hoc Tukey tests) were employed to explore differences based on learning style, proficiency level, and previous English learning experience. Before conducting ANOVA, assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances were tested: Shapiro–Wilk test and Q-Q plots were used to assess the normality of residuals. Levene's Test was performed to verify the homogeneity of variances. Results confirmed that the data met the necessary assumptions for conducting ANOVA. All statistical tests were conducted at a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Results

Rankings of the Attribute Categories

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

Table 2: Overall Rankings of the Attribute Categories

Mean ranking	Attribute category	Overall ranking
1.93	Delivery (Communication skill and teaching method)	1
2.04	Knowledge and Credibility (Knowledge of English)	2
2.13	Rapport (Relationship with students)	3
2.76	Fairness	4
3.41	Organization and Preparation	5

Delivery was clearly considered the most important category, and its importance is consistent with all studies measuring a comprehensive set of attributes. Knowledge of English (L2) was nominated as the second most important category before Rapport this finding is similar in results to previous research on students in Korea (Barnes & Lock, 2013) While fairness in this study was ranked 4th and the last ranking was organization and preparation in contrast to previous research by students in Korea whose results were the opposite of this study. These results, together with the findings in this study, may indicate a certain preference given to target language knowledge among Indonesian FL students.

The results of Part 1 of the questionnaire revealed that more than half of the 42 attributes evaluated were considered important by respondents, with 27 attributes obtaining an average score above 4 on a 5-point Likert scale. Interestingly, only one attribute achieved the highest score in the 4.6-5 range, while the remaining 26 attributes fell within the 4.1-4.5 range. This finding suggests that most of the factors measured have a strong degree of relevance in the context of the study, with one attribute being considered highly significant, while the remaining attributes remain of fairly high importance albeit with variations in the degree of urgency perceived by respondents. Details of the results are presented under each of the categories: Rapport, Delivery, Fairness, Knowledge and Credibility, and Organization and Preparation.

Rapport

Attributes in this category were all considered important by the respondents. Mean responses to 11 rapport attributes scored 4.07 (see Table 3). The overall high level of importance placed on rapport attributes is generally supported by the literature.

Table 3: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Rapport Items

Item Number and Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. friendly	4.44	.665
2. develop good relationships with students	4.35	.666
3. share personal experiences	3.66	.899
4. care about students	4.11	.766
5. patient	4.09	.811
6. listen to students	4.00	.789
7. have a positive attitude in general	4.12	.749
8. have charisma	3.93	.755
9. understand the student's English education backgro	3.98	.834
10. understand the different student levels	4.20	.726
11. have a sense of humor	3.95	.820

Delivery

In the analysis of the quantitative data, responses to delivery attributes were varied. Mean responses to 17 Delivery attributes scored 4.22 (see Table 4). The mean responses helped to clarify the overall strengths of student feelings about certain teaching approaches and styles.

Table 4: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Delivery Items

Item Number and Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. enthusiastic about teaching	4.36	.734
2. give clear explanations	4.43	.663
3. use good examples	4.13	.747
4. use a variety of teaching methods	4.43	.753
5. use Indonesian (L1) selectively	4.31	.776
6. correct writing errors	4.16	.693
7. correct speaking errors	4.28	.687
8. teach grammar	4.27	.652
9. use group work	4.01	.892
10. encourage student participation in class	4.06	.713
11. encourage participation of students with low con	4.40	.723
12. talk slowly in the target language	3.92	.834
13. use easy words	3.99	.774
14. ask questions frequently	3.42	1.043
15. ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	3.79	.911
16. ask individual students to answer questions	3.91	.910
17. give students plenty of time to answer questions	3.77	.926

Fairness

The notion of the importance of preparing students for exams was highly valued by respondents, the response was the highest of all 42 attributes tested in this questionnaire with an average score of 4.56, and almost half of the respondents gave this attribute a score of 5. Mean responses to 5 Fairness attributes scored 4.08 (see Table 5). Teacher impartiality (Item 1) was also highly valued by respondents, with a mean score of 4.47 Impartiality was particularly important in the context of this study as ability levels varied in the class and some students felt that preferential treatment was often given to more advanced students.

Table 5: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Fairness Items

Item Number and Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. treat all students fairly	4.47	.686
2. prepare students well for examinations	4.56	.639
3. give students clear grading guidelines	4.42	.647
4. require students to work hard during class	3.89	.949
5. require students to do homework	3.07	1.067

Knowledge and Credibility

The three knowledge and credibility attributes all scored highly. Mean responses to 3 Knowledge and Credibility attributes scored 4.39 (see Table 6). Item 1 (are well qualified for FL teaching) returned a mean score of 4.43. There were no negative responses to this attribute and 176 respondents (58,67%) gave it a value of 5. 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.

Table 6: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Knowledge and Credibility Items

Item Number and Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. well qualified for FL teaching	4.43	.812
2. have a good knowledge of grammar	4.35	.718
3. have a good knowledge of vocabulary	4.40	.628

Organization and Preparation

Result of the quantitative data shows that the attributes of organization and preparation are viewed positively. Mean responses to 6 Organization and Preparation attributes scored 4.09 (see Table 7). Students were very supportive of the general attribute of teacher preparation and the mean response was 4.30 for (item 1) being well prepared for each lesson.

Table 7: Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Organization and Preparation Items

Item Number and Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. well prepared every lesson	4.30	.707
2. provide a syllabus detailing course content week by week	4.33	.764
3. explain the instructional methods to the class	4.26	.627
4. tell students the lesson objectives each lesson	4.00	.756
5. stick to the syllabus	3.71	.792
6. make their own supplemental material.	3.91	.831

Different in students' perception regarding ANOVA DAN POST-HOC TUKEY test Based on students' learning style, proficiency level, and past learning experiences

Pictures 1: ANOVA AND POST-HOC TUKEY Test Results Based on Learning Style

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Are patient	Between Groups	4,438	2	2,219	3,430	,034
Are enthusiastic about EFL teaching	Between Groups	6,420	2	3,210	6,163	,002
Give clear explanations	Between Groups	6,066	2	3,033	7,180	,001
Use good examples	Between Groups	9,447	2	4,723	8,923	,000
Use group work	Between Groups	5,105	2	2,552	3,256	,040
Ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	Between Groups	6,500	2	3,250	3,991	,019
Ask individual students to answer questions	Between Groups	5,172	2	2,586	3,171	,043
Require students to do homework	Between Groups	8,343	2	4,171	3,731	,025
Explain the instructional methods to the class	Between Groups	3,024	2	1,512	3,915	,021
Tell students the lesson objectives each lesson	Between Groups	7,193	2	3,596	6,521	,002

Post Hoc Tests			
Variable	Groups	Mean Difference	Sig. (p-value)
Are patient	Passive vs. Half Passive & Half Active	-,360*	0.026
Are enthusiastic about EFL teaching	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	-,318*	0.016
Give clear explanations	Passive vs. Half Passive & Half Active	-,423*	0.001
Use good examples	Passive vs. Half Passive & Half Active	-,368*	0.010
Use group work	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	-,291*	0.030
Ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	-,317*	0.019
Ask individual students to answer questions	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	-,293*	0.043
Require students to do homework	Passive vs. Active	,508*	0.021
Explain the instructional methods to the class	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	,223*	0.001
Tell students the lesson objectives each lesson	Half Passive & Half Active vs. Active	,345*	0.025

Pictures 2: ANOVA DAN POST-HOC TUKEY Test Results Based on Proficiency Level

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Listen to students	Between Groups	5,567	2	2,784	4,582	,011
Have a positive attitude in general	Between Groups	3,793	2	1,896	3,437	,033
Understand the student's English education background	Between Groups	4,410	2	2,205	3,218	,041
Have a sense of humour	Between Groups	4,473	2	2,236	3,377	,035
Use good examples	Between Groups	3,938	2	1,969	3,594	,029
Use group work	Between Groups	4,962	2	2,481	3,163	,044
Encourage student participation in class	Between Groups	3,370	2	1,685	3,372	,036
Encourage participation of students with low confidence	Between Groups	4,380	2	2,190	4,284	,015
Give students clear grading guidelines	Between Groups	4,045	2	2,022	4,956	,008
Require students to work hard during class	Between Groups	8,877	2	4,439	5,061	,007

Post Hoc Tests			
Variable	Groups	Mean Difference	Sig. (p-value)
Listen to students	Below Average vs Average	-,322*	0.012
	Below Average vs Above Average	-,340*	0.041
Are enthusiastic about EFL teaching	Below Average vs Average	-,272*	0.030
Understand the student's English education background	Below Average vs Average	-,302*	0.031
Have a sense of humour	Below Average vs Above Average	-,379*	0.027
Use good examples	Below Average vs Average	-,258*	0.041
Use group work	Below Average vs Above Average	-,381*	0.045
Encourage student participation in class	Below Average vs Average	-,254*	0.034
Encourage participation of students with low confidence	Below Average vs Above Average	-,358*	0.015
Give students clear grading guidelines	Below Average vs Average	-,265*	0.011
	Below Average vs Above Average	-,308*	0.021
Require students to work hard during class	Average vs Above Average	-,436*	0.007
	Below Average vs Above Average	-,435*	0.027

Pictures 3: ANOVA DAN POST-HOC TUKEY Test Results Based on Learning Experience

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Are patient	Between Groups	7,242	4	1,810	2,821	,025
Are enthusiastic about EFL teaching	Between Groups	7,491	4	1,873	3,596	,007
Give clear explanations	Between Groups	10,025	4	2,506	6,085	,000
Use a variety of teaching methods	Between Groups	7,701	4	1,925	3,510	,008
Use Indonesian selectively	Between Groups	5,873	4	1,468	2,485	,044
Ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	Between Groups	7,975	4	1,994	2,447	,047
Require students to do homework	Between Groups	14,125	4	3,531	3,193	,014

Post Hoc Tests			
Variable	Groups	Mean Difference	Sig. (p-value)
Are patient	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Mostly	0.528	0.042
	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Always	0.517	0.048
Are enthusiastic about EFL teaching	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Mostly	0.562	0.013
Give clear explanations	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Always	0.660	0.000
	Communicative Activities Mostly vs Memorization and Grammar Always	0.394	0.045
Use a variety of teaching methods	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Mostly	0.585	0.011
	Memorization and Grammar Mostly vs Some Memorization and Grammar & Some Communicative Activities	0.332	0.043
Use Indonesian selectively	Memorization and Grammar Always vs Communicative Activities Always	0.445	0.040
Ask questions then wait for volunteers to answer	Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Always	0.239	0.047
Require students to do homework	Memorization and Grammar Always vs Communicative Activities Always	0.559	0.014

The participants consist of male 119 (39,67%) and “female” 181 (60,33%). English ability as “below average” 67 (22,33%), “average” 175 (58,33%), and “above average” 58 (19,33%) relative to the other students in her class. Past English language learning experience and 33,33% claimed to have been exposed to instructional methods dominated by Some memorization and grammar and some communicative activities. Learning styles as “passive” 43 (14,33%), “half passive

and half active" 161 (53,67%), and "active" 58 (19,33%).

Discussion

The results show that the delivery aspect, which includes communication skills and teaching methods, is the most important factor according to students. This study are in line with the findings of Putra & Suparni (2023) in Indonesia which showed that non-English major students have a positive view of English learning, especially in terms of teaching methods and lecturers' communication skills. This study also corroborates Liando's (2015) findings on the importance of lecturers' emotional closeness with students, as well as the ability to explain material well. However, unlike Saifullah & Yawan (2023) who highlighted external constraints such as curriculum and institutional support, this study emphasizes the role of personal characteristics and teaching strategies of lecturers from the students' perspective.

When compared to overseas research such as Barnes & Lock (2013) in Korea, there is a similarity in the assessment of the attributes "Delivery" and "Rapport" as the most important aspects. However, there is a difference in the priority order of the "Organization and Preparation" category, which occupies a low position in this study, while in Korea the category is highly appreciated. This result indicates that there are different cultural contexts and learning needs between countries. The Indonesian cultural context, which values teacher authority and polite communication, also influences students' perceptions of EFL lecturers. Students tend to appreciate lecturers who are patient, friendly and understanding of their difficulties. An overly strict or direct approach tends to be less acceptable in the Indonesian learning culture that emphasizes harmony and respect. In addition, the results showing a preference for the strategic use of mother tongue (L1) are also consistent with Lai's (2009) study in Australia which found that the use of L1 can increase confidence in using English.

Critically, students' preference for these attributes can be explained by their need for comprehensible input, as described by Krashen (1985) in the Input Hypothesis, which emphasizes that language learning occurs when students receive input that is slightly higher than their ability level. Good lecturer communication skills facilitate this input and reduce the potential for misunderstandings in material comprehension.

This data supports Barnes & Lock (2010) assertion that attributing that relieving anxiety levels and building student confidence is very important for language students. Lecturer characteristics that were considered important included credibility, emotional closeness, clarity in teaching, patience, and the ability to build interpersonal relationships. This finding also supports Liando's (2015) research which emphasizes the importance of emotional closeness between lecturers and students. This finding is consistent with the Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen 1982) of which states that affective factors such as anxiety

and motivation affect the success of language learning.

Lecturers who are supportive, patient, and understand students' backgrounds can reduce affective filters and create a conducive learning environment. In addition, active interaction in class is highly appreciated by students with active learning styles, which supports the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996). These attributes - including friendliness, rapport, caring, patience and acceptance - all scored above 4. The highest level of importance among the rapport items was given to are friendly, with an average score of 4.44.

The strong support given to this attribute is consistent with the findings of Faranda & Clarke (2004) and (Thompson, 2006). Are patient ($p = 0.034$) Passive Learning Style is lower than Half Passive & Half Active Learning Style. Students with passive learning styles tend to feel that their teachers are less patient compared to students who have mixed or more active learning styles. This suggests that passive students may need a more patient approach to learning. Students who had a communicative activity-based learning experience wanted their teachers to be more patient than students with a memorization and grammar-based experience Communicative Activity Always vs Memorization and Grammar Mostly ($p = 0.042$) and Communicative Activity Always vs Memorization and Grammar Always ($p = 0.048$). There was a difference between the Below Average vs. Average groups ($p = 0.030$) Students with Below Average ability gave lower scores compared to students who were at the Average level, indicating a positive attitude in general was not very important to them.

Teachers' understanding of two context-specific factors - students' educational history and level - was considered very important by respondents. The importance of teachers' understanding of students' educational history (item 9) with ($M=3.98$) supports the discussion reported in Barnes & Lock (2013) They suggested that teachers need to realize that students have not received much teaching in writing especially in the areas of scientific papers and public speaking because previously they were only involved with group games.

Understand the student's English education background A significant difference was found between the Below Average vs. Average group ($p = 0.031$) teachers considered it very important to understand the English education background by Average students compared to Below Average students. Another context-specific factor that was considered very important was the teacher's understanding at various levels as each student has different English abilities depending on their choice of English course and their learning perseverance.

The qualitative data from Barnes and Lock explain that this seems to be particularly relevant in university contexts, where classes are multi-level, and where some teachers may tend to favor more advanced students. Have a sense of humor Significant difference between: Below Average vs. Above Average ($p = 0.027$) Above Average students prefer teachers who have a sense of humor compared to Below Average students.

The importance of teacher enthusiasm was confirmed by responses to Item 1 Delivery (are enthusiastic about teaching), which recorded a mean score of 4.36. The importance of enthusiasm is also consistent with research conducted on American business students (Faranda & Clarke, 2004; Desai et al., 2001; Kelley et al., 1991). are enthusiastic about teaching ($p = 0.002$) Half Passive & Half Active Learning Styles gave lower scores than Active Learning Styles. Students who are more active in learning tend to want teachers to be more enthusiastic about teaching compared to students who have mixed learning styles.

This may be because active students are more involved in learning so they are better able to capture the energy and enthusiasm of the teacher. Students who had communicative activity-based learning experiences were more likely to want their teachers to be more enthusiastic in teaching EFL than students who were used to memorization and grammar methods Communicative Activities Always vs Memorization and Grammar Mostly ($p = 0.013$). Give clear explanations (item 2) and use a variety of teaching methods (item 4) had the same mean score of 4.43.

This is the first highest mean score in the delivery category and no students gave negative responses to both items. Students who had the communicative activity experience always valued teachers who used a variety of teaching methods more than students with the memorization and grammar experience ($p = 0.011$). This suggests that students with more dynamic learning experiences expect more variety in teachers' teaching methods. With the advancement of technology in this current era, English teachers must also have the ability to use technology as a learning medium that is more interesting and easy to understand. Cahyani (2024) emphasized that the application of technology in English learning, such as the use of digital media, can increase students' motivation and understanding of the material taught. Darmayanti (2023) showed that the selection of media that suits students' needs can significantly improve their learning achievement.

This finding supports the results of previous research by Barnes & Lock (2013) which states that the success of English language teaching depends not only on the methods used, but also on the readiness of the teacher in utilizing various learning media. Students who are familiar with memorization and grammar always agree more with the use of Indonesian in the classroom than students who have experience of communicative activities always ($p = 0.040$). This suggests that students with traditional learning methods are more comfortable if the teacher uses their first language in learning.

Other attributes of intelligibility including Item 12 (speaking slowly in the target language) and Item 13 (using easy words) were also seen as important, with mean scores of 3.92 and 3.99 respectively. Average students gave higher scores for item 3 use good examples than Below Average students ($p = 0.041$). Students who are more active in learning enjoy or value group work more as an effective learning method compared to students who have mixed learning styles ($p = 0.040$). This suggests that group work method is more suitable for active students as this

difference was also found in Above Average Students who felt it was important for teachers to implement group work compared to Below Average students ($p = 0.045$).

The information about methodological preferences provided by the data is helpful. Questionnaire items 10 (encouraging participation in class) and 11 (encouraging participation of low confidence students) directly tested respondents' general support for participation. Average students wanted to be encouraged to participate more than Below Average students, and Above Average students gave teachers high scores for encouraging participation of less confident students than Below Average students. Both cases had positive responses, with mean scores of 4.06 and 4.40, respectively.

The data provides useful insights into the use of questions. Responses to Item 14 (ask questions often) showed that students from all profiles, generally did not want teachers to use questions too often ($M = 3.42$) this was the lowest mean score in the delivery section. Item 15 (ask a question then wait for a volunteer) received a response ($M = 3.83$). This response was representative of all student profile groupings with significant differences ($p = 0.019$) Active students were more comfortable or valued more the teacher's method of waiting for volunteers to answer questions and from the learning experience profile Students with communicative activity-based learning experiences were always more comfortable with the teacher's method of waiting for volunteers to answer than students who were used to rote memorization and grammar always ($p = 0.047$).

This suggests that interactive methods encourage students to be more confident in participating in class. In contrast, responses to Item 16 (asking students to individually answer questions) were more positive ($M = 3.91$). Factor analysis of the responses to this item revealed that active students are more accustomed to or prefer if the teacher directly points to them to answer questions, while students with mixed learning styles may feel less comfortable with this method. Despite the differences all respondent profiles clearly preferred questions directed at individual students rather than the whole class. Another attribute related to questioning was tested through Item 17 (giving students plenty of time to answer questions). The average response to this was quite high waiting long enough to get answers to questions.

The final area of focus in the delivery category is the content of lessons. Informants in this study were generally ambivalent about the inclusion of explicit grammar teaching ($M = 4.27$), with responses to Item 8 (teaching grammar) showing a fairly strong response. Respondents also expressed a general desire for error correction with mean scores of 4.16 and 4.28 for Item 6 (correcting writing errors) and Item 7 (correcting speaking errors) respectively. While respondents generally agreed with the use of correction, the level and type of correction desired was not clear in the data.

Students generally agreed that teachers should provide clear grading guidelines as seen by the score ($M=4.42$) ($p = 0.008$) Students with Below Average profiles gave less importance to clear grading guidelines than students at Average and Above Average levels who gave importance. The data provides some information about the level of classwork and homework. In general, students moderately approved of hard work during class with the discovery of a significant difference in the Above Average profile students felt it was more important to work hard in class than Below Average and Average students ($p = 0.007$).

Require students to do homework almost all respondents disagreed with item 5 Fairness ($M=3.07$) this value is the lowest value out of 42 questionnaires in this study. From this data, significant differences were found from the learning style and learning experience profiles. Students with passive learning styles agreed more with high scores with giving homework than active students. This suggests that passive students may rely more on homework as part of their learning process, while active students may prefer learning through hands-on activities in class ($p = 0.025$). Students with memorization and grammar learning experiences also gave higher scores to mandatory homework than students with always communicative activity-based experiences ($p = 0.014$).

Barnes & Lock (2010) revealed that students believe that information about the syllabus allows them to prepare for the lesson, and information about teaching methods and objectives helps students understand the purpose and context of the lesson. Of the three attributes, opinions regarding the explanation of teaching methods (Item 2) were the strongest, with the majority of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing. (provide a syllabus detailing course content week by week) item 2 with an average score of 4.33 is the highest value in the Organization and Preparation category.

Explain the instructional methods to the class item 3 ($M=4.26$) in this data found a significant difference from the learning style profile Active students gave a higher score to the explanation of teaching methods than students with mixed learning styles ($p = 0.021$) this means that active students need more clarity on the methods used in a lesson. Item 4 ($M=3.71$) Active students want the teacher to convey the lesson objectives clearly more than students with mixed learning styles. Adherence to the syllabus was not considered important by respondents this finding with previous research (Barnes & Lock, 2013).

Research among mainstream university students in Hong (Kember & Wong, 2000) showed that passive learners strongly supported this. However, statistical analysis of the quantitative data showed a non-significant difference in the level of support between passive and active learners in this study. The last attribute tested in the quantitative part of the study was item 6 (creating own supplementary materials). Respondents were generally positive ($M = 3.91$), indicating that students want teachers to go beyond textbooks or want teaching materials that are more interesting, innovative and easily understood by students.

Communication skills, diversity of teaching methods, and the use of relevant learning media proved to be important factors in creating effective EFL learning. Students appreciate lecturers who are able to deliver material clearly, use technology, and build positive relationships in class. This finding supports Faranda & Clarke (2004) and Barnes & Lock (2013) who emphasize the importance of interpersonal interaction, lecturer credibility, and communicative delivery. Meanwhile, students with active learning styles prefer participatory approaches, while students with passive learning styles need clearer structures and explicit approaches (Xiao, 2006; Kember & Wong, 2000).

The presence of teachers who have a deep understanding of the subject matter, strong pedagogical skills, and sensitivity to students' different ability levels is key in EFL learning. Limited use of L1 can be a strategic tool, especially for explaining difficult concepts and building students' confidence (Cook, 2001; Levine, 2003). Therefore, a flexible bilingual approach as well as the integration of digital media such as Google Classroom (Cahyani, 2024) are recommended to improve the quality of learning. This finding indicates the need for pedagogical training that is oriented towards students' needs as well as institutional policy support that encourages innovation in English language teaching. As such, the findings not only enrich the EFL literature in Indonesia, but also provide a practical basis for future policy development and teacher training.

Implication

EFL lecturers should develop a variety of teaching methods, including communicative and collaborative methods. Selective use of mother tongue (L1) can help explain difficult concepts and increase students' confidence. Higher education institutions need to organize pedagogical training that focuses on developing lecturers' interpersonal competence and the use of learning technology.

Limitations of the study

This study has a number of limitations that need to be considered in the interpretation of the results. Firstly, this study was only conducted in one higher education institution. Therefore, generalization of the findings to other higher education contexts in Indonesia or even to other countries should be done with caution, given the differences in geographical, social, and institutional contexts that may affect students' perceptions of EFL teaching effectiveness. Secondly, the research approach used was quantitative in nature with the instrument being a closed-ended questionnaire.

While this approach provided a strong statistical picture of students' perceptions, it did not include qualitative approaches such as in-depth interviews or focus group discussions (FGDs) that could have explored in more detail the background and rationale behind the ratings given by students. Future mixed approaches may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that

influence the effectiveness of EFL teaching from the perspective of non-English language students.

Conclusion

This study examines non-English major students' perceptions of the characteristics of effective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lecturers in higher education. The findings show that the delivery aspect - which includes communication skills and teaching methods - is perceived as the most important factor in determining the effectiveness of EFL teaching. This was followed by lecturer knowledge and credibility, interpersonal relationships (rapport), fairness in assessment, and teaching organization and preparation.

Of the 42 teaching attributes evaluated, the aspects that received the highest ratings included the ability to explain material clearly, use a variety of teaching methods, and encourage student participation, especially for those with low confidence levels. This confirms the importance of interactive, communicative and student-centered learning approaches in EFL teaching contexts.

In addition, students showed a preference for lecturers who are enthusiastic, patient, friendly, and have an understanding of students' educational backgrounds and language proficiency levels. Selective use of the first language (L1), especially to explain complex concepts, was also appreciated as it was perceived to reduce anxiety and increase students' confidence.

The study also found significant differences in students' perceptions based on their learning styles, English proficiency levels and previous learning experiences. Students with active learning styles and communicative learning backgrounds preferred dynamic and participatory approaches. In contrast, students with passive learning styles or memorization and grammar-based learning experiences valued clear structures and the use of L1 in learning.

Thus, effective EFL lecturers are those who are able to adapt to the diverse learning needs of non-English major students, have good communication skills, implement flexible and inclusive teaching strategies, and build positive emotional and pedagogical relationships in the classroom. The findings make an important contribution to the development of EFL pedagogy in higher education, and underscore the importance of student needs-based teacher training and institutional support in innovating English language teaching.

References

- 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), 139–152.
<https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2010v35n1.2>
- Barnes, B. D., & Lock, G. (2013). Student perceptions of effective foreign language teachers: A quantitative investigation from a Korean university. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2), 19–36.
<https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.2>
- Brown, A.V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>
- Cahyani, F. (2024). ANALISIS EFEKTIVITAS PENGGUNAAN MEDIA DIGITAL DALAM PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA INGGRIS. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran (JRPP)*, 7 Nomor 3, 9135–9141.
- Darmayanti, D. (2023). Efektivitas Pemanfaatan Media dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris terhadap Peningkatan Prestasi Belajar Siswa. *Sang Pencerah: Jurnal Ilmiah Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton*, 9(2), 501–513.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/027347530123200>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2021). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351006743>
- EF English Proficiency Index (2023). EF EPI 2023 Rankings. Retrieved from <https://www.ef.com/epi/>
- Ellis, R. (2008). Explicit form-focused instruction and second language acquisition. *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*.
- Faranda, W.T., & C. I. (2004). Student observations of outstanding teaching: Implications for marketing educators. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 26(3), 271–281.
- Inceçay, G., & Inceçay, V. (2009). Turkish university students' perceptions of communicative and non-communicative activities in EFL classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(1), 618–622.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2009.01.110>
- 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. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1004068500314>
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Longman.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00194>
- Liando, N. V. F. (2015). Students' vs. Teachers' Perspectives on Best Teacher Characteristics in EFL Classrooms. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 21(2), 118.
<https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i2/118-136>
- Liton, H. A. (2013). EFL teachers' perceptions, evaluations, and expectations about English language courses as EFL in Saudi universities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(2), 19-34.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x>
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.
- Ma, L. 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.
- Moradi, K., & Sabeti, G. (2014). A Comparison of EFL Teachers and EFL Students' Understandings of 'Highly Effective Teaching.' *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1204-1213.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.535>
- Masruddin, M., Furwana, D., & Jafar, A. (2021). The Efficacy of the Think-Talk-Write Strategy in Improving Writing Skills for Teenagers at Batu Walenrang Palopo. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 252-260.
- Madehang, M., Masruddin, M., & Iksan, M. (2024). Reflecting on the Implementation of Online English Learning in Islamic Higher Education: Lecturers' and Students' Perspectives. *International Journal of Asian Education*, 5(3), 183-197.
- Masruddin, Hartina, S., Arifin, M. A., & Langaji, A. (2024). Flipped learning: facilitating student engagement through repeated instruction and direct feedback. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2412500.
- Nicolas, M. O., & Annous, S. (2021). The Realities of English Medium Instruction in Lebanon: Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of the Place of English Communication Skills in a Cultural Studies Program. *Journal of English as an International Language*, 16(1), 10-24.
- Putra, R. A., & Suparni, S. (2023). Non-EFL students' perspectives on English learning in higher education institutions: The case of Indonesian non-English

- majors. *LingTera*, 10(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v10i1.57996>
- Richards, J. C. (2011). *Competence and performance in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Roya Zamani, M. and S. A. (2016). Characteristics of an Effective English Language Teacher (EELT) as Perceived by Learners of English. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research*, 4(14).
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n4p130>
- Saifullah, S., & Yawan, H. (2023). Exploring English Teachers' Views on the Compulsory English Subject for Non-English Major Students: A Case Study at an Indonesian University. *International Journal of Education, Social Studies, and Management (IJESSM)*, 3(2), 121–134.
<https://doi.org/10.52121/ijessm.v3i2.173>
- 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. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education* Vol. 38, 2, February 2013, 33.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107>
- Shishavan, K. S. & H. B. (2009). Characteristics of an Effective Teacher as Perceived by Iranian Teachers and Learners of English. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 2(4), 130–143.
- Thompson, T. (2006). Examining Korean University Students' Expectations of Native-Speaker English Teachers. *KOTESOL Proceedings*, 167–176.
http://koreatesol.org/sites/default/files/pdf_publications/KOTESOL-Proceeds2006web.pdf
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard 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.teslej.org/ej39/a2.htm>