

Beata Webb, Alicia Vallero
bwebb@bond.edu.au
Bond University, Gold Coast, Australia

WHAT MAKES GOOD TEACHING? STUDENTS' VIEW OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING IN LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT A UNIVERSITY (PRIMARY RESEARCH)

1. Introduction

How do we define 'good pedagogy'? Recent research (Hattie, 2008; 2012; Coe, Aloisi, Higgins & Major, 2014; Vallero, 2014; Webb & Vallero, 2017; Kornell & Hausman, 2016; Duke, 2012; Harmer, 2014; Grant, 2014; Strong, Gargani & Hacifazlioglu, 2011; Hamre, Goffin & Kraft-Sayre, 2009; Stillings Candal, 2015; Malczewska-Webb, Vallero, King & Hunter, 2016) suggests that, while the question itself is neither original nor new, the answer to it, however, is both dynamic and complex. This paper forms part of a project examining great teaching, its recent research-based models and their elements (Webb & Vallero, 2017). The project aims to define a workable model of good pedagogy for the purpose of evaluation of university teaching based on student ratings. First, the paper reviews definitions of effective teaching and ways of measuring it. Next, the methodology of the project, its aims, sample and research methods are addressed. Then, the model of good pedagogy selected for its suitability for evaluation by university student ratings is introduced (Webb & Vallero, 2017). The next part of the study examines data from student evaluation of university subjects to determine the elements of good pedagogy most relevant to the learners in that particular educational context. Finally, the paper proposes

a new model for the purpose of evaluation of good university teaching based on student ratings.

2. Great teaching: definitions, its elements and how to measure it

This section examines some recent definitions of good teaching and tools for its measurement. Three recent definitions have been reviewed to determine the overarching focus of great teaching. According to Coe et al. (2014), the most important element of effective pedagogy is that it leads to improved student progress. Chubb's (2012) definition points to a very similar aspect of good teaching, referring to it as the practice which helps every student succeed. Similarly, Flinders University website's description of good teaching (Good Teaching Practice, 2017) defines it as a result of teachers' strive to provide the best learning experience for their learners. All of the above statements of good teaching share the principle that good teaching is about good learning. Each of these recent definitions of good pedagogy stresses the fact that what makes pedagogy 'good' is the positive effect on learning, on student outcomes and the ultimate student success.

As evaluating teaching is a very complex and difficult task, the best way to evaluate it is through a wide range of methods. These methods vary in their validity (Chubb, 2012; Coe et al., 2014). The methods considered as having moderate (the highest rating) validity in evaluating teaching include (1) classroom observations by peers, bosses and external evaluators, (2) 'value-added' models (assessing gains in student achievement) and (3) student ratings. These rate higher than the methods considered to have limited validity such as (4) boss's judgment, (5) teacher self-reports and (6) analysis of teacher portfolios. Accordingly, student ratings are considered to be one of the most effective, moderately valid methods in evaluating teaching, with a stronger validity in university settings.

Coe et al. (2014) present several arguments supporting student ratings as a valid source of data for evaluating good pedagogy. First, this method requires minimal training and is cost-effective, valid and reliable. Second, it involves a wide range of participants who draw their observations from the experience of many lessons. Additionally, the validity of student ratings increases in a university context, where the evaluators are adults with prior rich educational experience.

While research demonstrates that good teaching is about successful learning, different models of good teaching are designed for different educational contexts (Hattie, 2008; Hattie, 2012; Coe et al., 2014; Harmer, 2014; Chubb, 2012; Creemers & Kyriakides, 2006; Grant, Stronge & Xu, 2014; NCTQ Teacher Prep Review Standards and Indicators, Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Standards, 2017). After examining six recent frameworks for good pedagogy, Webb and Vallero (2017) selected Coe et al.'s (2014) model as best adhering to the criteria for evaluating effective pedagogy based on student ratings, in a university setting. This model was chosen as its development was the result of prior comparative research of other pedagogical frameworks. The Coe et al. (2014) model encompasses the following six elements, which have an impact on student outcomes: (1) Pedagogical and content knowledge, (2) Quality of instruction, (3) Classroom climate, (4) Classroom management, (5) Teacher beliefs about teaching and (6) Professional behaviours in and outside the classroom. Further, Webb and Vallero (2017) added sub-elements to the first three elements of Coe et al.'s (2014) model. These sub-elements were drawn from the criteria of good teaching defined by Bond University (Online student evaluations, 2017) and Flinders University (Good Teaching Practice, 2017). The model from Flinders University (Good Teaching Practice, 2017) provided an example of an Australian higher education institution. The components of the Bond University Teaching Evaluation model of best educator practices were also incorporated into Coe et al.'s (2014) framework as the main aim of the project is to develop the workable framework for this institution. Next, the project methodology is presented in more detail.

3. Research methodology and results

This section introduces research methodology employed for this project. First, it describes research aims and research questions. Second, the section outlines the research methods employed for the purpose of the project and research sample. Third, the results of the research project are presented.

Three broad aims have been formulated for this project. The first aim is to assess the suitability of the Coe et al.'s (2014) model for measuring great teaching using qualitative data collected from student ratings. The second aim is to define the student view of important elements of good university teaching through classifying student data according to the Coe et al.'s (2014)

model. The third aim is to design a universal model for evaluating teaching in a university context, based on student ratings.

The following three research questions were formulated in order to achieve research goals:

1. What categories of good teaching are referred to in data collected from student comments?
2. What are the similarities and differences between the research view and student view of important elements of good teaching?
3. Which elements should be included in the model of good teaching for university contexts when applying data from student ratings?

The research sample used for the analysis includes the qualitative data collected from non-compulsory end-of-the-semester teaching evaluation (TEVAL) forms completed by Bond University students. The research participants were enrolled in three programs, Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the Graduate Certificate in TESOL and Spanish language program, levels 1–4. Overall, students evaluated the teaching of lecturers in ten subjects, six in TESOL and four in Spanish language. The answers which formed the research sample were given in response to the following two open-ended questions:

1. What aspects of this educator's approach helped you learn?
2. What aspects of this subject did you find most helpful?

In total, 149 student answers were collected over 6 semesters between the years of 2015–2016.

As far as the research methods are concerned, two main procedures were adopted, which represented a combination of mixed research methods, where qualitative data was statistically analysed in order to delineate trends in student ratings. The first method was to collate and classify the qualitative student data (student comments) into the thematic categories defined by Coe et al.'s model (2014). The second research method was to compare and evaluate the elements defined by student ratings with the Coe et al.'s (2014) model in order to determine the similarities between the research-based good teaching model with aspects of good pedagogy relevant and important to the students. Data collected for the purpose of this project is presented in the table below:

Table 3.1
Student comments: results

	Element of teaching	Student Comments
1.	Classroom climate	33% (49)
2.	Pedagogical and content knowledge	33% (49)
3.	Quality of instruction	30% (45)
4.	Classroom management	3% (4)
5.	Teacher beliefs	1% (2)
6.	Professional behaviours	0
	Total	149

Source: own data source.

As is demonstrated in the table above, students' comments focused on the following three out of six elements of teaching: (1) Classroom climate, (2) Pedagogical and content knowledge and (3) Quality of instruction. These three elements were referred to in 96% of the comments. Classroom climate and pedagogical and content knowledge were mentioned by 33% of the comments each, and very closely to these, 30% of the comments described quality of instruction as important. Classroom management and teacher beliefs were marginally cited by students, with only 4 (3%) and 2 (1%) comments referring to these elements respectively. There were no references to professional behaviours in the 149 student comments. Consequently, it is proposed that the most important aspects of good pedagogy were the first three elements of the model, and the remaining three were not perceived as important or relevant by university students.

4. Student view of good pedagogy: student model of good pedagogy

This section describes the elements of good pedagogy as expressed through student ratings. Each element important to the students is illustrated with examples from student comments. First, the section introduces classroom climate, then pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction.

The section briefly refers to the remaining three elements which were not perceived as important by the students.

4.1. Classroom climate: research view, student data and examples.

According to the research view, classroom climate refers to the quality of communication in the classroom. It concerns the aspects of communication in the classroom which foster quality interactions between teachers and students, mutual respect, expectations, enthusiasm and encouragement. Classroom climate refers to the importance of communicating teacher expectations, where the teacher demands and recognises students' self-worth, their effort into their work and resilience to failure (Coe et al., 2014; Good Teaching Practice, 2017; Online student evaluations, 2017). The table below demonstrates the details of student comments addressing a classroom climate.

Table 4.1

Classroom climate: student data

Student comments	%
Teacher is learner-centred	22,4% (11)
Teacher creates a positive learning environment	18,4% (9)
Teacher supports and helps	18,4% (9)
Teacher is approachable	14,3% (7)
Teacher's personality and attitude	14,3% (7)
Teacher encourages and inspires	12,2% (6)
Total	49

Source: own data source.

The student comments concerning classroom climate were the most elaborate and diverse. Students articulated the importance of teachers being supportive and approachable and being able to develop a positive learning environment and promote learner-centredness. The students rated highly their teachers' positive attitude and encouragement. In their comments, they described their teachers' best attributes as being *enthusiastic, accessible, approachable, inspiring, caring, supportive, humorous*. Other comments that reflect teacher attributes valued by students are: the teacher *cares about student*

learning; is clearly interested in student welfare; always gives me support; really cares about how students are going. Not only the number of comments but also their volume and diversity indicate that students recognise these 'soft' teaching skills as the most important aspect of good university teaching.

4.2. Pedagogical and content knowledge: research view, student data and examples. Pedagogical and content knowledge forms the second element of the good pedagogy model. Coe et al. (2014) include in this category a teacher's deep knowledge of the subject and the understanding of the ways learners think about the content. The Bond University (Online student evaluations, 2017) criteria support this further by pointing to the importance of the ability to explain difficult concepts, while the Flinders website (Good Teaching Practice, 2017) promotes teachers' respect to diverse learner talents and ways of learning. The table below demonstrates the details of student comments in relation to pedagogical and content knowledge.

Table 4.2
Pedagogical and content knowledge: student data

Student comments	%
Teacher's explanations and resources	30,6% (15)
Liked the whole subject	26,5% (13)
Teacher's knowledge	18,4% (9)
Liked the topics	14,3% (7)
Teacher's experience	10,2% (5)
Total	49

Source: own data source.

Just over 30% of the comments concerning pedagogical and content knowledge showed that the students rated highest the teacher's explanations and the resources chosen or made for the subject. Nearly a third of the comments (26,5%) also included positive references concerning the whole subject content presented by the teacher. Teacher's knowledge was the third component commented on by 18,4% of the students. Students also made positive comments about specific topics chosen for the subject (14,3%) and teacher's experience (10,3%). Some of the examples of student comments

in this category described their educator as *knowledgeable; experienced; with impressive depth of knowledge; who chose remarkable and relevant topics*; the students stated that their teacher *explained concepts and theories: interestingly; easily; thoroughly*. Pedagogical and content knowledge is the second of the two elements of good pedagogy rated highest in student ratings.

4.3. Quality of instruction: research view, student data and examples.

The third element of the good pedagogy framework refers to the quality of instruction. Coe et al. (2014) include in this category a range of broader areas such as assessment and specific pedagogical practices. These strategies include effective questioning, reviewing previous learning, providing model responses for students or developing appropriate scaffolding practices for learners. Flinders University's (Good Teaching Practice, 2017) website also suggests a range of good teaching practices including providing opportunities for active participation, motivating learning by communicating expectations and timely and appropriate response and feedback. Bond University's criteria for good teaching also promote constructive and timely feedback, and overall effectiveness of the teacher. According to the research-based models, quality of instruction concerns assessment, questions, specific practices, scaffolding, opportunities for active participation and feedback. Table 4.3 below demonstrates the details of student comments concerning the Quality of instruction: student data.

Table 4.3
Quality of instruction: student data

Student comments	%
Highly valued activities	51,1% (23)
Teacher's teaching	31,1% (14)
Engaging in activities	13,3% (6)
Authentic content	4,4% (2)
Total	45

Source: own data source.

As far as the quality of instruction is concerned, more than a half of the students (51,1%) made positive comments about the activities used for class. Another large cluster of responses (31,1%) showed that the overall teacher's

teaching is rated highly by the students. Fewer students (13,1%) valued engaging in activities as important and two students (4,4%) saw the authenticity of activities as valuable. Students' comments concerning the quality of instruction described an effective teacher as the one who *makes it relevant; directs me when I am confused; prepares highly valued activities and makes content authentic*. The comments concerning involving learners in the learning and teaching process illustrated well the importance of this strategy to students. Accordingly, a good teacher *enables the environment that engages us with the lesson; engages us with the tasks at hand; involves us in activities; always keeps the class engaged throughout the lesson*.

As the sub-category in the quality of instructions contains 50,1% of the references to highly valued activities, the table below provides more details on the student comments on activities.

Table 4.4

Quality of instruction: highly valued activities

Student comments	%
Online sessions	39,1% (9)
Student Seminars and peer teaching	13% (3)
Weekly revision tasks	13% (3)
All!	13% (3)
Quizlets & quizzes	8,7% (2)
Pre-recorded lecture videos	8,7% (2)
Teaching Practicum	4,3% (1)
Total	23

Source: own data source.

Among the activities which students pointed to as contributing to good teaching, the largest cluster of comments (39,1%) referred to online sessions. This number is particularly significant as only some of the students were enrolled in the online TESOL program which offers online tutorials delivered on the Blackboard Ultra Collaborate platform. This suggests that the majority of those students nominated them as an important aspect of good pedagogy.

The following examples from students' comments focused on online sessions: *I enjoyed the interactive Blackboard activities; I liked the online sessions and it actually worked out better than I had expected; I really enjoyed the interaction in the Collaborate tutorials; Online sessions were very personable.* The effective and surprising features of the online sessions were their interactivity and personalisation.

Other activities which students viewed as contributing to good pedagogical practices were diverse and included references to student seminars, peer teaching, weekly revision tasks, quizzes, pre-recorded lecture videos and teaching practicum. Some students simply stated that they liked all the activities introduced in the class by the teacher. Student statements about other highly valued activities referred to the following: *Activities in the class enhance understanding; Student seminar presentations were very useful; Recorded lectures; Quizzes and quizzes; The weekly tasks made sure we were practicing outside of class to improve our learning.* Consequently, students made observations about a wide range of activities which they perceived as promoting or constituting effective teaching, were useful and helpful in understanding the subject content.

4.4. Classroom management, teacher beliefs and professional behaviours: student view. After examining the student data concerning elements of great teaching included in Coe et al.'s (2014) model of effective pedagogy, the results pertaining to the remaining three elements are outlined briefly. The reason for the decision to group them and summarise the results is motivated by the minimal or no comments found in student responses on these aspects of pedagogy. Altogether, only 4% of the comments related to these three elements of teaching, with only four students (3%) commenting on classroom management, two comments on teacher beliefs (1%), with no comments found on professional behaviour of teachers. This strongly suggests that these three elements of Coe et al.'s (2014) framework are of little relevance to university students.

5. Good pedagogy from research and student perspective: a comparison and interpretation

This section compares the two views of good pedagogy, the research-based Coe et al.'s (2014) model chosen for the purpose of this project with the data from student ratings. The comparison is undertaken in order to determine the suitability of Coe's model for evaluating good teaching based on student

ratings within a university context. The table below presents the primary model and the student data driven analysis.

Table 5.1
Good pedagogy: research and student perspectives

Coe et al. Model	Impact on quality of teaching	Student ratings	Impact on quality of teaching
Pedagogical and content knowledge	strong	Classroom climate	strong
Quality of instruction	strong	Pedagogical and content knowledge	strong
Classroom climate	moderate	Quality of instruction	strong
Classroom management	moderate	Classroom management	very weak
Teacher beliefs about teaching	weak	Teacher beliefs about teaching	very weak
Professional behaviours	weak	Professional behaviours	none

Source: own data source.

According to Coe et al. (2014), pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction are the two elements with a strong impact on the quality of teaching. This is followed by classroom climate and classroom management, which are of a moderate impact on good teaching. Teacher beliefs about teaching and professional behaviours are referred to as having a weak impact on good pedagogy. The data from university student ratings, which had been classified according to these six elements, defines a different mapping of the elements, with some similarities and differences with respect to the original model.

As far as the similarities between the two models are concerned, the first two elements of the research-based model, pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction, are also perceived as important by the students. Also, the last two elements, teacher beliefs about teaching and professional behaviours defined by research as having a lower impact, are also perceived by students as less important than other elements. The similarities between the two systems indicate that all except for one (professional behaviour) of the elements of the primary model are also reflected in student ratings.

There are also some differences between the research view and the student view of the elements influencing good teaching. The most significant difference concerns the perception of classroom climate. While the research view

defines it as having a moderate impact on the quality of teaching, students rated it the highest, although only marginally higher than pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction. The six elements of the primary, research-based framework of great teaching are classified into three clusters as having strong, moderate and weak impact on teaching. Conversely, the student view demonstrates two clear clusters consisting of three elements each. The first cluster includes classroom climate, pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction. The second cluster comprises classroom management, teacher beliefs about teaching and professional behaviours. The elements of the first cluster demonstrate a very strong impact on student perception of teaching, with the three elements constituting 96% of all references made by students. On the other hand, the second cluster is of very little or no significance or relevance to student perception of good pedagogy. Out of these three, classroom management and teacher beliefs about teaching were marginally referred to in student comments, while professional behaviours were not mentioned.

The following two key reasons have been attributed to the differences between the research-based model and the student data, the educational setting and the form of teacher evaluation. The educational setting of the project, a university, determines certain aspects of teaching and learning process such as the age of the learners, the motivation behind their education and the professional relationships between staff and students. The most interesting outcome of the project is, perhaps, the finding that university students value the soft teaching skills highest, viewing them as even marginally more significant than the teacher knowledge or ability to deliver the content. Adult university students, who continue their education not because they have to, as is the case with primary and secondary settings, but because they choose to, view teacher support and teacher ability to enthuse and motivate them as more central to their learner success than teacher knowledge or experience. The educational setting of a university would also explain the reason the students do not consider classroom management as a principal contributor to good pedagogy. Classroom organisation and discipline are not usually a concern at tertiary institutions.

The form of teacher evaluation, student ratings, is proposed as another reason separating the research and student views of the good pedagogy framework. Although students are well-equipped to evaluate classroom teaching and learning, they may not be aware of teacher beliefs about teaching, which

are often implicit. Also, students may not have access to the information concerning teacher behaviours towards other teachers or parents. As a result, information regarding some of the elements of the framework will either be irrelevant or inaccessible to university students.

6. Good pedagogy framework based on university student ratings: the new model

Following the discussion of the application of the data from university student ratings to Coe et al.'s (2014) framework of good pedagogy, this paper proposes a new model for evaluating university teaching based on student ratings. Considering the two clusters of the elements of good teaching formed by student responses, it is suggested that the first cluster of the elements including classroom climate, pedagogical and content knowledge and quality of instruction forms an effective tool for measuring good pedagogy in a university setting. The second cluster comprising classroom management, teacher beliefs about teaching and teacher professional behaviours is not considered significant to university students and, therefore, is not included as part of the new suggested model. While the original six-element framework represents a comprehensive system of evaluating teaching, it is more suitable at primary and secondary levels. For university settings, where the evaluative data is provided by student ratings, this paper recommends the use of the three-element model as an effective tool for the evaluation of good pedagogy.

7. Conclusion

To conclude, this paper aimed to design a workable model of good pedagogy suitable for the evaluation of university teaching, based on student ratings. It examined some definitions of good teaching and how to measure it. The data from student ratings was analysed according to the previously selected model of good pedagogy. The results of this analysis were compared with the Coe et al.'s (2014) model. The comparison demonstrated some discrepancy between what Coe et al. (2014) and university students view as having an impact on good pedagogy. The study suggests that these differences were determined by the specific educational setting, a university, and the form of teaching evaluation, student ratings. The differences showed that students focused on three of the six elements of the original framework of good teaching. These three elements, classroom climate, quality of instruction and

pedagogical and content knowledge were selected as the most relevant and significant in the university students' ratings. Therefore, this paper proposed the use of the three-element model as an effective tool for measuring good pedagogy in a university setting, based on student ratings. Considering the limited sample selection employed for the purposes of this project, the next step in the project development is to test the validity of the proposed model. This will be achieved by applying the three-element model to a larger student ratings sample.

References

- Bond University Student evaluation of teaching policy*, <https://bond.edu.au/files/944/TLR207.pdf> [accessed: 25.02.2017].
- Chubb, J.E. (2012). *The best teachers in the world: Why we don't have them and how we could*. Chicago: Hoover Institution Press.
- Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S. & Major, L.E. (2014). *What makes great teaching? Review of the underpinning research. Project Report*. London: Sutton Trust.
- Creemers, B.P.M. & Kyriakides, L. (2006). Critical analysis of the current approaches to modelling educational effectiveness: The importance of establishing a dynamic model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(3), 347–366.
- Duke, R.A. (2012). Their own best teachers: How we help and hinder the development of learners' independence. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(2), 36–41.
- Good Teaching Practice*, <http://www.flinders.edu.au/teaching/quality/evaluation/good-teaching-practice.cfm> [accessed: 25.03.2017].
- Grant, L., Stronge, J. & Xu, X. (2014). *West meets east: best practices from expert teachers in the U.S. and China*, <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com> [accessed: 20.03.2017].
- Hamre, B.K., Goffin, S.G. & Kraft-Sayre, M. (2009). *Classroom assessment scoring system implementation guide: measuring and improving classroom interactions in early Classroom settings*, <https://www.vbgrowsmart.com/providers/Documents/CLAS-ImplementationGuide.pdf> [accessed: 15.02.2017].
- Harmer, J. (2014). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow, United Kingdom: Pearson Longman.
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London–New York: Routledge.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. London–New York–Routledge.
- Kirschner, P., Sweller, J. & Clark, R. (2006). Why unguided learning does not work: An analysis of the failure of discovery learning, problem-based learning, experiential learning and inquiry-based learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86.

- Klionsky, D.J. (2005). Points of view. Lectures: Can't learn with them, can't learn without them. Talking biology: Learning outside the book – and the lecture. *Cell biology education*, 3, 204–211.
- Kornell, N. & Hausman, H. (2016). Do the best teachers get the best ratings?. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 570.
- Malczewska-Webb, B., Vallero, A., King C.P. & Hunter, S. (2016). Breaking down the barriers of online teaching: training TESOL teachers in a virtual environment. In: D. Gałajda, P. Zakrejewski & M. Pawlak (eds.), *Researching second language learning and teaching from a psycholinguistic perspective* (p. 237–259). Berlin: Springer International Publishing.
- NCTQ Teacher Prep Review Standards and Indicators Traditional Teacher Preparation Program Standards, http://www.nctq.org/dmsView/NCTQ_-_Standards_and_Indicators_-_Traditional_Programs [accessed: 23.02.2017].
- Online student evaluations, <https://bond.edu.au/about-bond/academia/learning-teaching/online-student-evaluations> [accessed: 19.02.2017].
- Stillings Candal, C. (2015). *Great teachers are not born, they are made: Case study evidence from Massachusetts charters. White Paper No. 130*. Pioneer Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Strong, M., Gargani J. & Hacifazlioglu, O. (2011). Do we know a successful teacher when we see one? Experiments in the identification of effective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62(4), 367–382.
- Vallero, A.J. (2014). *Contrast and compare: direct and minimal guidance instruction*. Sydney, Australia: The University of Sydney.
- Webb, B. & Vallero, A. (2017). Great teaching: models and evaluation. *Konteksty Pedagogiczne*, 9, 33–48.

WHAT MAKES GOOD TEACHING? STUDENTS' VIEW OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING IN LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT A UNIVERSITY (PRIMARY RESEARCH)

Summary: The paper aims to define a workable model of good pedagogy for the purpose of evaluation of university teaching based on student ratings. Firstly, it reviews definitions of effective teaching and ways of measuring it. Then, the model of good pedagogy selected for its suitability for evaluation by university student ratings is introduced (Webb & Vallero, 2017). The next part of the study examines data from student evaluation of university subjects to determine the elements of good pedagogy most relevant to the learners in that particular

educational context. Finally, the paper proposes a new model for the purpose of evaluation of good university teaching based on student ratings.

Keywords: great teaching, good pedagogy, university teaching, effective teaching, evaluation

CO SPRAWIA, ŻE DOBRZE UCZYMY? OPINIE STUDENTÓW DOTYCZĄCE ROLI EFEKTYWNEGO NAUCZANIA W KSZTAŁCENIU PRZYSZŁYCH NAUCZYCIELI JĘZYKÓW OBCYCH (BADANIA WSTĘPNE)

Streszczenie: Celem artykułu jest zdefiniowanie modelu dobrego nauczania uniwersyteckiego bazującego na opiniach studentów. Tekst rozpoczyna analiza definicji skutecznego nauczania i sposobów jego pomiaru. Następnie przedstawiony jest model ewaluacji nauczania pod kątem jego przydatności, zgodnie z ocenami studentów uniwersyteckich (Webb & Vallero, 2017). Część empiryczna odnosi się do analizy opinii studentów dotyczących zajęć uniwersyteckich celem określenia elementów dobrego nauczania najbardziej odpowiednich dla uczących się w danym kontekście edukacyjnym. W części końcowej artykułu zaproponowano nowy model oceny nauczania akademickiego, oparty na opiniach studentów.

Słowa kluczowe: dobre nauczanie, nauczanie uniwersyteckie, efektywne nauczanie, ocena, model oceny nauczania akademickiego