Received 16 May 2016
Revised 21 September 2016
Accepted 16 October 2016

Teaching effectiveness attributes in business schools

Earl Simendinger
Sykes College of Business, University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida, USA
Abdul-Nasser El-Kassar
Department of Information Technology and Operations Management, Adnan Kassar School of Business, Lebanese American University, Beirut, Lebanon
Maria Alejandra Gonzalez-Perez
Department of Management, Universidad EAFIT, Medellin, Colombia
John Crawford
Department of Management, Entrepreneurship and Marketing, College of Business, Lipscomb University, Nashville, Tennessee, USA
Stephanie Thomason
Department of Management, University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida, USA
Philippe Reynet
KEDGE Business School, Bordeaux, France
Björn Kjellander
Jönköping International Business School, Jonkoping, Sweden, and
Judson Edwards
Sorrell College of Business, Troy University, Troy, Alabama, USA

Abstract

Purpose – Determining the attributes of effective business teachers is critical to schools as they strive to attract and retain students, assure learning, obtain and maintain reputation and accreditations, and place their alumni in the competitive job market. The purpose of this paper is to examine students and faculty perceptions of teaching effectiveness in five culturally disparate countries: Colombia, France, Lebanon, Sweden, and the USA.

Design/methodology/approach – A survey was designed based on previous research complemented by an extensive literature review as well as personal communications with faculty in different international business schools. The survey considered 39 teaching attributes related to three specific dimensions: class delivery, class preparation and design, and instructional traits and personal characteristics. The survey targeted students and faculty from seven business schools located in five countries.

Findings – This study offers new conceptual and analytical analyses from a cross-country comparative perspective. Rankings of the importance of perceived teaching attributes for both major groups involved in the teaching of business, faculty and students, are reported. The attributes are also ranked by teaching taxonomy and examined across countries.

Practical implications – This study provides practical results that can be useful to instructors wishing to increase their teaching effectiveness and to universities considering revising their student evaluation forms.

International Journal of Educational Management
Vol. 31 No. 6, 2017
pp. 780-800

0951-354X
DOI 10.1108/IJEM-05-2016-0108

The authors would like to recognize the contribution and commitment of Universidad EAFIT, Lebanese American University, Lipscomb University, Jonkoping University, Kedge Business School, Troy University, and The University of Tampa. The authors are certain that without their cooperation the data collection of this paper could not have been possible. Furthermore, they want to acknowledge the time and interest by students and faculty members who responded to the designed survey.

Originality/value – This study includes data collected from faculty and students from several schools located in culturally disparate countries and, thus, increases the applicability of the results in a cross-cultural manner and provides implications for practice internationally.

Keywords Cross-cultural, Teaching effectiveness, Personality characteristics, Class delivery, Class preparation, Instructor traits

Paper type Research paper

1. Introduction

There is a consensus that strong instructor performance in the classroom contributes to the attainment of educational standards (Carpenter *et al.*, 2013; Marsh and Hattie, 2002; Slater *et al.*, 2012). The extant literature on teaching effectiveness suggests that several teachers' attributes are important (Shaftel and Shaftel, 2005; Simendinger *et al.*, 2009; Smith, 2003). Therefore, identifying and promoting faculty with strong teaching skills is important to many business schools as they compete globally for students and strive to achieve and maintain their reputation and accreditations. Accordingly, higher education institutions (HEIs) around the world are increasingly relying on students' perceptions of teaching and learning when making evaluations of teachers' performance (Shao *et al.*, 2007; Smith, 2009; Stark-Wroblewski *et al.*, 2007). Results from these evaluations are used for quality improvement and accreditation purposes and also affect promotions, salaries, merit bonuses, and the tenure of academics in HEIs.

Because teaching effectiveness is so important, the authors of the present study were motivated to gather empirical international evidence on the perceived attributes of business teachers and of the classroom environment which contribute to teaching effectiveness. This research was also motivated by the need for administrators, department chairs, and faculty to understand and keep pace with the level of change underway in HEIs around the world. The speed of change is driven by a variety of growing market forces that must be scrutinized and addressed if colleges and universities are to remain competitive and relevant to business and society around the world. But perhaps more importantly, the authors wanted to select sample sites that are known for, and required to produce teaching effectiveness. So it was logical therefore to target universities that hold accreditation from agencies that emphasize teaching effectiveness, AACSB, ACBSP, SACS, ABET, WASC among others, which specifically emphasizes as part of their accreditation requirements teaching effectiveness. The motivation and rationale for this effort came from all the authors who are accomplished university professors wanted to improve their teaching effectiveness as well as their colleagues, to advance student learning and their skills to give students a better chance of success as a practitioner.

HEIs currently face forces such as globalization, competition, time constraints, the explosion of teaching technologies, new design and delivery methods, and distance learning. Perhaps most importantly, student expectations regarding their educational experiences are challenging HEIs in regard to their mission, vision and modus operandi in their teaching, research, and engagement with society (Beuckelaer *et al.*, 2012; King and Watson, 2010; Smimou and Dahl, 2012).

Accordingly, the following literature review examines the perceived attributes of an effective business teacher with respect to class delivery, class preparation and design, and instructional traits and characteristics. We further examine whether perceptions of the importance of these attributes vary as a function of role (i.e. student or faculty) and international context. To examine the latter, we have collected and analyzed data from universities located in Lebanon, Sweden, the USA, Colombia, and France. We have chosen these locations based on their disparate nature as identified in a variety of cross-cultural management and sociological empirical studies (e.g. Hofstede, 2001; Schwartz, 1992; Smith *et al.*, 1995; House *et al.*, 2005; Inglehart, 2004). Table I provides a demographic overview of the students and university faculty participating in the research.

2. Literature review

Although, the effects of teaching on student learning can be diverse, and there are several models of teaching and learning that affect student (Seidel and Shavelson, 2007); teaching effectiveness can be defined as a multi-dimensional construct that implies understanding the effects of teaching on students' learning.

The primary purpose of this literature review is to identify the attributes of business teachers for which there is evidence that affect student and faculty perceptions of teaching effectiveness.

Dimensions such as content delivery mode; cultural and socio-economic context of the classroom; structural and personal traits of the instructors; behaviors, competences and skills; and institutional evaluation processes are explored, and summarized in this section.

2.1 Content delivery

Some conceptual, empirical and theoretical studies focus on teaching delivery. For instance, some authors use qualitative and quantitative techniques to measure technology-mediated distance learning (Hrastinski and Monstad, 2013; Ivancevich *et al.*, 2008). Other authors analyze the importance of including face-to-face learning with online activities (blended format) (Ross and Rosenbloom, 2012).

2.2 Cultural and socio-economic context of the classroom

Increasing cross-national migration since the 1980s led to greater international student mobility, and increased the presence of foreign students in classrooms that have been traditionally domestically populated. Also, HEIs have faced global market and quality demands for internationalization over the last several decades.

These changes have created challenges for the delivery of education services, teaching, research, and supporting services delivered by HEIs. De Beuckelaer *et al.* (2012) found that when dealing with culturally-diverse classrooms, faculty members with cross-cultural experience and competences score higher on teaching performance than their domestically-centered counterparts. Some authors suggest that faculty with cross-cultural competences tend to be perceived as more open-minded and culturally and socio-economically empathetic (De Beuckelaer *et al.*, 2012; King and Watson, 2010; Smith, 2007; Smith, 2009).

2.3 Structural and personal traits of the instructors

Perceived knowledge base, delivery style, course organization, and course load are aspects that students have associated with teaching effectiveness (Carpenter *et al.*, 2013; Pietrzak *et al.*, 2008; Smith, 2009). According to Keeley *et al.* (2006), the psychometric instruments for measuring teaching have quantified instructor attributes such as caring,

Table I. Universities' faculty and students demographics data

	Troy University	Lebanese American University	Lipscomb University	Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), Jönköping University	The University of Tampa	Kedge School of Business	Universidad de EAFIT
Total students	18,376	8,348	4,680	1,594	7,079	12,452	14,087
Female	11,332	4,241	2,899	858	327	6,470	6,401
Male	7,044	4,107	1,781	736	328	5,982	7,686
Local students	76%	81.40%	67.4%	62%	35%	70%	98.79%
Undergraduate	14,535	8,348	3,030	12,000	7,079	12,452	10,840
Faculty total	1,345	795	553	99	655	246	1,262
Full time	481	308	252	68	295	178	344
Part Time	864	487	301	31	360	68	918

Note: Data taken from 2015 and/or 2016

supportive and professional competences, and communication skills. In their study of psychology teachers these researchers identified attributes such as being humble, sensitive and persistent, striving to be a better teacher, providing constructive feedback, rapport, encouragement and caring for students, being enthusiastic, flexible/open-minded, understanding, and having a positive attitude as behaviors that students associate with the qualities and behaviors of good teachers.

Cardoso de Sousa (2011) found that the relationship between students and their teacher affects perceptions of teaching effectiveness and creativity. The reason suggests that perceptions are impacted by the nature of the relationship between students and teachers and the definition of their respective roles. Empirical and conceptual research suggest that trustworthiness and student perception of teacher expertise are related to some objective and subjective attributes of the teacher (Davison and Price, 2009; Heckert *et al.*, 2006; Hoffmann and Oreopoulos, 2009). Included among the attributes are attractiveness, charisma, goodwill, rapport, and even sexual appeal, all of which can positively impact student opinions regarding teaching effectiveness. In some cases, due to gender stereotypes, female instructors are evaluated higher than their male counterparts (Arbuckle and Williams, 2003; Pietrzak *et al.*, 2008).

2.4 Behavior, competences, and skills

Simendinger *et al.* (2009) identified 29 teachers' critical attributes positively affecting the perception of teaching effectiveness in business schools in the USA. In their study, it was found that the most significant attributes were: illustrating the knowledge, fairness when dealing with students, creating a comfortable atmosphere for asking questions; provide information that is worthwhile and applicable; and provide practical examples.

Lizzio and Wilson (2008) found that students tend to value in-depth feedback, acknowledgment of achievements, identification of goals, recognition of effort, and justification of the assigned grades. Dimensions such as development, encouragement, and fairness are strongly associated with effective assessment feedback (Lizzio and Wilson, 2008).

Arnold (2008) found that course level plays a crucial role when correlating the results of research productivity and teaching effectiveness. Arnold's (2008) findings suggest that research productivity is higher when the students involved are at advanced levels (rather than in lower-level courses) and that productive researchers are often allocated to upper-level course delivery. It has been found that there is a perception that academics with stronger publication records were more effective teachers and better qualified to evaluate students (Balam and Shannon, 2010; Marsh and Hattie, 2002). At the masters' level, attribute such as being passionate, respectful, approachable, fair, creative, and well prepared are associated with outstanding teachers (Keeley *et al.*, 2006).

2.5 Institutional evaluation processes

A variety of institutional mechanisms for measuring teaching effectiveness have been used. Among these are teaching portfolios, classroom visits, student rating forms, peer evaluations, and self-evaluations (Shao *et al.*, 2007; Smimou and Dahl, 2012; Smith, 2009). Alternative measurements such as pre-post measures of learning tailored to individual courses have been used to supplement the teaching evaluations just listed (Stark-Wroblewski *et al.*, 2007). Other measures such as scholarly activity, department, university and community engagement contribute even more comprehensive qualitative and quantitative evaluations of academic performance. Regarding the format of evaluation, Burdsal and Harrison's (2008) study reveals that including open-ended question items in the evaluation provides the ability to create multi-dimensional profiles of teaching effectiveness. However, Davison and Price (2009) found that open-ended statements (in online surveys) do not offer many rigorous indicators for teaching effectiveness.

Previous research has also found that, when evaluating teaching effectiveness, students with higher grades tend to give their teachers higher effectiveness evaluations (Balam and Shannon, 2010; Pietrzak *et al.*, 2008; Smimou and Dahl, 2012). An explanation for this behavior is that student satisfaction with grades is associated with "rewarding the teacher" through higher evaluation scores (Balam and Shannon, 2010, p. 218).

There is a lack of consensus regarding variables that should be employed for evaluating teaching performance by administrators, faculty peers, and students. In addition, there is little agreement regarding the methods used for measuring performance.

Although, the main objective of evaluating teaching effectiveness in higher education is having a reliable, valid and useful measures to support the improvement of the quality of pedagogical aspects for imparting learning (Dresel and Rindermann, 2011; Hoffmann and Oreopoulos, 2009; Shao *et al.*, 2007; Smimou and Dahl, 2012; Smith, 2007), there is a perception that teaching effectiveness is associated with "customer satisfaction" (Davison and Price, 2009; Heckert *et al.*, 2006; Stark-Wroblewski *et al.*, 2007). Regarding the scope of the evaluations often employed, some studies indicate that the evaluation of teaching effectiveness is primarily an evaluation of the instructor as a person rather than an evaluation of the quality of the course being taught or the achievement of student learning objectives (Arbaugh and Hwang, 2013; Burdsal and Harrison, 2008; Dresel and Rindermann, 2011; Heckert *et al.*, 2006; Hoffmann and Oreopoulos, 2009; Lizzio and Wilson, 2008; Stark-Wroblewski *et al.*, 2007).

2.6 What is new?

At present, while there is a wide base of existing literature on different extents of business teaching effectiveness, there are not many empirical studies outside of the USA or having international perspective integrating a wide variety of teaching effectiveness variables. This study was designed and conducted to address this international gap in the existing literature.

3. Hypotheses development

Achievement Goal Theory (Wolters, 2004) suggests that individuals' behaviors are directed to achieve specific goals and outcomes. Role theory (Merton, 1968) suggests that behaviors may vary as a function of the role of the individual as either a student or a teacher. In a classroom setting students may be more focused on mastery goals, which reflects a desire to gain particular skill sets and knowledge. In contrast, faculty members may be more focused on performance goals, since assessments of their performance in the classroom may impact various outcomes, such as pay raises and promotions.

Role theory further supports the notion that students in similar classroom environments around the world attend to their culturally-influenced roles as students when determining the importance placed on various attributes of teaching effectiveness. Cross-cultural differences may be mitigated through attention to role, status, and goals, particularly when immersed in coursework.

Learning styles between students and faculty also vary. According to Kolb (1976), undergraduate business students have accommodative learning styles, which translates to a focus on concrete experience and active problem solving and experimentation, while business school faculty have the opposite learning styles, applying reflective observations and abstract conceptualization.

Accordingly, we propose that the two groups will vary to some extent with respect to their perceptions of "Class Delivery," "Class Preparation and Design," and preferable "Instructor Traits and Personal Characteristics."

As noted in the literature review, there is evidence of a connection between assurance of learning and evaluations of teaching quality and effectiveness (Barrie, 2007; Boerboom *et al.*, 2015; Lawson *et al.*, 2015). However, the studies on how the feedback

provided in those teachers' evaluations by students is used as a source of improving teaching effectiveness or as a faculty development initiative are limited (Boerboom *et al.*, 2015; Emery *et al.*, 2003). Nonetheless, there are indications that evaluations of teaching effectiveness provide a basis for curriculum development, continuous improvement, and evaluation (Lawson *et al.*, 2015).

According to Killion and Hirsh (2011) there are seven core attributes for effective teaching: learning communities (collaboration amongst educators that leads to teachers learning from peers), leadership to build capacity and structures to support learning, resources to support effective teaching, data (measures of increased effectiveness in teaching and student achievement), and effective learning design, implementation and outcomes.

Meyers (2012), using focus groups in the USA, found that business faculty evaluations of teaching effectiveness take into consideration attributes such as: level of preparedness, speaking clearly, knowledge of subject, relating subjects to real world, enthusiasm for subject, availability outside of class, fairness in grading, approachability, self-confidence, professionalism, a sense of humor, the discussion of research findings in class, and making students feel comfortable asking questions in class and encouraging them to think. In Australia, Barrie (2007), using a phenomenographic approach with his "Conceptions of Generic Attributes model," found that academics hold disparate views of teaching attributes and their place among the outcomes of a university education. Barrie (2007) identified six generic attributes: remedial, associated, teaching content, teaching process, engagement, and participatory.

Accordingly, we posit the following hypothesis:

H1. Comparative rankings of the attributes of teaching effectiveness will vary as a function of the respondents' roles as either students or faculty members.

A multitude of large, cross-cultural studies have indicated that individual-level and societal-level value preferences vary as a function of the society in which one is immersed (e.g. Hofstede, 2001; House *et al.*, 2005; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz, 1994). According to Schwartz (2012), values are the guiding principles that one uses to make decisions in life. Values shape individuals' evaluations of people (Schwartz, 2012). Since extensive empirical research has indicated that values vary cross-culturally, making the assertion that the perceptions of the attributes of teaching effectiveness vary cross-culturally seems reasonable. Accordingly, we offer the following hypotheses:

H2. Comparative rankings of the attributes of teaching effectiveness by students will vary across cultures.

H3. Comparative rankings of the attributes of teaching effectiveness by faculty will vary across cultures.

H4. Absolute mean scores of the attributes of teaching effectiveness by students will vary across cultures.

H5. Absolute mean scores of the attributes of teaching effectiveness by faculty will vary across cultures.

4. Research methodology

The present study builds upon prior research by Simendinger, Galperin, LeClair, and Malliaris (2009), by incorporating findings from a literature review, along with personal communications with administrators and faculty in different international business schools. Based on these elements, we identified three specific dimensions of teaching effectiveness: class delivery, class preparation and design, and instructional traits and personal characteristics.

4.1 Data collection

An online-based survey was created to measure perceptions regarding 39 previously identified attributes of teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, demographic information was requested in the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to identify their educational institution, the country with which they were currently affiliated, nationality, gender, and occupational/educational level. Data were collected simultaneously in seven business schools in five different countries.

4.2 Sample

A total of 2,224 responses from seven business schools located in five different countries (Colombia, France, Lebanon, Sweden, USA) were collected, 1,975 of which were deemed usable and included in the analysis. The following seven educational institutions participated in the survey:

(1) Universidad EAFIT (Colombia) ($n = 252$);

(2) Kedge Business School (France) ($n = 309$);

(3) Lebanese American University (LAU) (Lebanon) ($n = 549$);

(4) Jonkoping University (Sweden) ($n = 78$);

(5) Troy University (USA) ($n = 104$);

(6) University of Tampa (USA) ($n = 445$);

(7) Lipscomb University (USA) ($n = 228$); and

(8) Other (data acquired from other countries but response numbers small) ($n = 10$).

Regarding the 1975 respondents, males provided 52.9 percent of the usable surveys and females provided 47.1 percent. Students represented the larger portion of the study sample (88.5 percent) compared to faculty participation (11.5 percent), a natural and expected result. Within the student group, 71.4 percent indicated that they were in the process of completing a business degree. All students, however, were taking at least one business course. The majority of the students (69.9 percent) were at the undergraduate level. Within the faculty group, 31.1 percent indicated that they were from Columbia, 17.5 percent from France and 47.8 percent from the USA. The responses of the remaining 3.5 percent, faculty from Lebanon and Sweden, were removed from the analysis of the cross-cultural faculty perspectives.

4.3 Data analysis

A mean score and an ipsatized mean score were calculated for each perceived teaching effectiveness attribute. A two-step process was followed to derive these scores. The first step followed the ipsatization strategy identified by Smith (2004). Responses to each item for each respondent were divided by the mean responses to four separate items representing four categories of teaching effectiveness. This process removed biases from individual tendencies to respond similarly across all items. In the second step, mean scores were computed from responses on the five-point Likert-type scale for each item and scores were then ranked from lowest mean score to highest mean score. Using the mean score of each teaching attribute, the corresponding ipsatized score is calculated and used to obtain the overall rankings.

5. Results

First, the questionnaire was evaluated for reliability. The reliability results depicted in Table II list the Cronbach's α value for each of the teaching effectiveness dimension using both the as well as the combined list of all the ipsatized and non-ipsatized scores. The Cronbach's α for all of the teaching effectiveness dimensions were robust and well above the lower limit of 0.7, indicating high-scale reliability.

5.1 Most important perceived attributes by students and faculty

Table III displays the mean scores along with the rankings according to students as well as faculty. The results in Table III are used to address the first hypothesis, which proposed that students and faculty members would diverge on their comparative perceptions of the importance of various attributes of teaching effectiveness. It is worth noting that the overall sample rankings reveal that students and faculty combined consider "Provides practical examples and applications" and "Is well prepared" to be the most important attributes of an effective teacher (mean score: 4.436, 1.882 after ipsatization), followed by "Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions" (mean score: 4.427, 1.878). The first two criteria belong to the "Class Preparation and Design" category of attributes of an effective teacher whereas the third is an element of "Class Delivery." Given the utmost importance rankings for these criteria and categories, our findings are consistent with Smith (2009) concerning the role of course organization and delivery style.

The next group of criteria, in order of importance, is composed of five items: "Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students," "Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter," "Is passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter," "Is fair when dealing with students," and "Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn." This is consistent with the findings of Pietrzak *et al.* (2008) who note the importance of the perceived knowledge base as a characteristic of an effective teacher. The finding is also consistent with that of Keeley *et al.* (2006) regarding the impact of personal characteristics of teachers.

Further examination of the results with respect to the first hypothesis suggests that there is no agreement on the ranking of the attributes as perceived by students and faculty, especially for those attributes that are in the first half of the ranking. Two Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were calculated. The first coefficient (Rs1) was obtained from the ranking of the 39 attributes of the study by each group, while the second (Rs2) was obtained from the first 15 attributes of the students' rankings.

Concerning the rankings of the full list of attributes, the Rs1correlation coefficient is 0.9514 and the calculated t statistic from $t = Rs\sqrt{n-2/1-Rs^2}$ is 18.795. This results in a p-value of less than 0.001. Hence, there is a strong monotonic relationship between the rankings of students and faculty at a level of significance of $\alpha = 0.05$. In other words, faculty and students rankings are in general, but not absolute agreement.

On the other hand, the test performed on the first 15 attributes of the students' rankings does not reveal such a relationship: $Rs2 = 0.3929$ $t\text{-cal} = 1.450$, $p > 0.1$, $\alpha = 0.05$. This test highlights the differences in the perceptions of the two groups and shows that "Challenges students to learn" or "Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter" are more important attributes for faculty than for students. In contrast, students give more importance to the quality of the course design "Provides practical examples and applications" and "Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn."

5.2 Most important attributes by teaching taxonomy

Within the category of "Class Delivery," students and faculty agree that "Creating an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions" is the most important attribute.

Teaching effectiveness dimension	Cronbach's α	Cronbach's α based on ipsatized scores	No. of items
Behaviors, competences and skills	0.832	0.887	10
Content delivery	0.842	0.887	9
Structural and personal traits	0.825	0.855	15
Cultural and socio-economic context	0.859	0.851	5
Overall teaching effectiveness	0.908	0.936	39

Table II.
Reliability statistics

	Mean scores				Ranks	
	Students*		Faculty*			
	1**	2**	1**	2**	Students	Faculty
Provides practical examples and applications	1.883	(4.425)	1.875	(4.526)	1	9
Is well prepared	1.877	(4.412)	1.915	(4.622)	2	4
Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions	1.872	(4.400)	1.923	(4.634)	3	1
Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students	1.858	(4.368)	1.908	(4.599)	4	5
Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn	1.844	(4.339)	1.817	(4.368)	5	12
Is fair when dealing with students	1.841	(4.328)	1.862	(4.477)	6	10
Is passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter	1.839	(4.325)	1.896	(4.572)	7	6
Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter	1.837	(4.321)	1.921	(4.623)	8	3
Is organized	1.831	(4.303)	1.789	(4.322)	9	15
Is passionate and enthusiastic about teaching	1.822	(4.286)	1.875	(4.532)	10	8
Keeps students engaged	1.797	(4.226)	1.852	(4.467)	11	11
Is sincerely interested in student learning	1.789	(4.209)	1.877	(4.532)	12	7
Challenges students to think	1.763	(4.156)	1.922	(4.636)	13	2
Is professional	1.754	(4.130)	1.795	(4.333)	14	14
Regularly gives clear and constructive feedback	1.741	(4.093)	1.786	(4.313)	15	17
Encourages students to excel and set high standards	1.733	(4.082)	1.815	(4.382)	16	13
Is approachable – both in and outside of the classroom	1.732	(4.082)	1.736	(4.203)	17	19
Is accessible – both in and outside of the classroom	1.731	(4.076)	1.698	(4.113)	18	21
Is self-confident	1.676	(3.957)	1.716	(4.140)	19	20
Meets course objectives	1.675	(3.947)	1.787	(4.325)	20	16
Is flexible	1.667	(3.934)	1.577	(3.824)	21	27
Sets expectations about course content	1.665	(3.911)	1.776	(4.300)	22	18
Achieves a positive rapport with students	1.665	(3.936)	1.680	(4.072)	23	24
Is able to teach to different levels and experiences	1.648	(3.888)	1.685	(4.083)	24	23
Sets expectations about the grading contract up-front	1.616	(3.800)	1.691	(4.088)	25	22
Uses diverse teaching and delivery mechanisms	1.570	(3.716)	1.641	(3.956)	26	25
Is effective at selling the value of the class	1.515	(3.597)	1.601	(3.890)	27	26
Incorporates research into classroom learning	1.427	(3.376)	1.384	(3.373)	28	28
Is an effective researcher	1.394	(3.304)	1.282	(3.145)	29	32
The international cultural examples are related to work that I do	1.373	(3.262)	1.314	(3.203)	30	30
Incorporate cultural samples into classroom learning	1.352	(3.221)	1.337	(3.257)	31	29
Opportunities to share information about own countries and education system	1.322	(3.144)	1.283	(3.126)	32	31
Quality of having a group of instructors from different sectors and countries	1.306	(3.104)	1.260	(3.077)	33	33
The class includes visits and/or excursions	1.170	(2.791)	0.912	(2.259)	34	34
Is physically attractive	0.538	(1.284)	0.567	(1.383)	35	36
Is physically fit	0.529	(1.261)	0.608	(1.477)	36	35
Is male	0.429	(1.022)	0.369	(0.905)	37	38
Is female	0.426	(1.015)	0.358	(0.874)	38	39
Is tall	0.418	(0.995)	0.396	(0.968)	39	37

Notes: *Number of students in the sample is 1,747; *number of faculty in the sample is 228; 1**mean scores after ipsatization (used for ranking the attributes); 2**raw mean scores

Table III.
A comparison between students and faculty of perceived attributes on teaching effectiveness in business schools

These findings are consistent with those of Keeley *et al.* (2006) regarding the importance of instructor approachability and caring. Students and faculty ranked the next three items similarly. Students attached importance to the item "Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn," while faculty considered the item slightly less important than

the item "Challenges students to think." Both groups considered "Student engagement" to be an important aspect of "Class Delivery." Giving "Clear and constructive feedback regularly" ranked mid-way down the list for both students and faculty, a contrasting finding vs that of Lizzio and Wilson (2008) who found in-depth feedback to be important.

Within the category of "Class Preparation and Design," students and faculty ranked the same four items in the top four of the ten items listed. Students considered "Provides practical examples and applications" to be important, which underscores the value of experiential and authentic learning strategies to students (Ma and Lee, 2012), while faculty considered "Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter" important, which underscores the value of experiential and authentic learning strategies to students (Ma and Lee, 2012). Both considered "Well-prepared" and "Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students" to be important, yet not as important as the previous items.

Within the category of "Instructor Traits and Personal Characteristics," students and faculty again scored the same four items in their top four. They similarly scored the same items representing physical and gender traits in the bottom five. The latter contrasts with findings from other authors (Pietrzak *et al.*, 2008; Arbuckle and Williams, 2003) that indicate a preference for females instructors over males. Within this category, students tend to focus on justice, whether or not the instructor is "Fair when dealing with students." Faculty considered "Passion and enthusiasm about the subject matter" to be highly important, while students considered it slightly less important than the fairness item. These findings are similar to those of Keeley *et al.* (2006) who also found passion and enthusiasm to be important dimensions.

5.3 Comparative student perspectives

Table IV displays a comparison by country of the ranking of the 39 attributes that students identified as most important in producing effective business teachers. The first and second columns of the table display the attributes and the overall ranking according to all 1,975 students, respectively. The by-country rankings and mean scores are presented in the subsequent ten columns. The last column shows the p-values for the ANOVA tests to determine whether there is a significant difference in the mean ipsatized scores of individual attributes. In each case, the ranking was obtained based on the mean ipsatized scores.

Students indicated that "Provides practical examples and applications" is the most important attribute. This attribute is top ranked by French and Swedish students, and ranked among the top five for the remaining countries. Moreover, the attribute's corresponding p-value of 0.633 indicates that there is no significant difference in the mean scores across countries, which does not support *H4* that proposed differences Regardless of cross-cultural context, all students feel that being provided with practical examples about complex concepts will engage them, increase their understanding, and aid their professional development (Ma and Lee, 2012).

The ANOVA test for the second ranked attribute, "Is well-prepared," reveals a significant difference in the average scores. Nonetheless, this attribute is ranked in the top six for each country. The greatest significant difference in the mean scores for this item is between the Lebanese and Swedish rankings. Also, both Lebanese and Colombian students emphasized the importance of preparation by ranking it highly. The finding of high importance for instructor preparation is consistent with the findings of Cardoso de Sousa (2011) who researched the significance of course design and delivery.

The third ranked attribute, "Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions," is ranked in the top five in four countries, with the fifth country (Sweden) ranking it at number 10. However, the ANOVA test shows no significant difference in the mean scores (p-value of 0.091). The high importance students from the various countries placed on this attribute supports the findings by Keeley *et al.* (2006) where approachability

Table IV.
By country for all students, a side-by-side comparison, of the most important attributes that influence the perception of teaching effectiveness

		USA ($n=668$)		LEB ($n=543$)		FR ($n=269$)		SW ($n=77$)		COL ($n=181$)		Country effect
	All	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	*P*-value
Provides practical examples and applications	1	5	1.889	3	1.903	1	1.870	1	1.818	2	1.866	0.633
Is well prepared	2	6	1.888	2	1.908	6	1.818	5	1.780	1	1.875	0.047*
Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions	3	3	1.896	5	1.876	3	1.859	10	1.739	4	1.845	0.091
Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students	4	2	1.912	6	1.868	8	1.729	4	1.785	3	1.850	0.000**
Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn	5	4	1.895	4	1.881	10	1.702	9	1.752	8	1.802	0.000**
Is fair when dealing with students	6	8	1.878	1	1.921	11	1.701	8	1.758	15	1.716	0.000**
Is passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter	7	10	1.855	8	1.826	5	1.838	3	1.808	6	1.835	0.822
Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter	8	1	1.941	11	1.781	9	1.714	2	1.818	10	1.785	0.000**
Is organized	9	9	1.856	7	1.855	4	1.847	11	1.736	20	1.667	0.000**
Is passionate and enthusiastic about teaching	10	12	1.836	10	1.793	2	1.868	6	1.768	7	1.810	0.176
Keeps students engaged	11	7	1.878	12	1.768	12	1.690	12	1.720	12	1.767	0.000**
Is sincerely interested in student learning	12	13	1.835	16	1.746	7	1.801	17	1.619	9	1.789	0.001**
Challenges students to think	13	17	1.796	14	1.748	13	1.676	13	1.720	5	1.839	0.002**
Is professional	14	21	1.748	9	1.819	15	1.643	7	1.765	11	1.767	0.000**
Regularly gives clear and constructive feedback	15	11	1.842	20	1.678	16	1.638	18	1.613	13	1.748	0.000**
Encourages students to excel and set high standards	16	19	1.776	15	1.747	18	1.610	14	1.681	14	1.740	0.000**
Is approachable – both in and outside of the classroom	17	14	1.827	19	1.721	20	1.573	20	1.603	18	1.685	0.000**
Is accessible – both in and outside of the classroom	18	18	1.787	17	1.746	17	1.615	16	1.627	19	1.684	0.000**
Is self-confident	19	24	1.711	13	1.766	27	1.456	19	1.608	22	1.649	0.000**
Meets course objectives	20	25	1.709	21	1.678	19	1.610	15	1.653	23	1.638	0.069
Is flexible	21	22	1.728	18	1.737	25	1.471	21	1.568	32	1.563	0.000**
Sets expectations about course content	22	16	1.799	25	1.573	22	1.559	22	1.545	27	1.615	0.000**
Achieves a positive rapport with students	23	23	1.711	22	1.636	14	1.661	25	1.519	24	1.636	0.006**
Is able to teach to different levels and experiences	24	20	1.750	23	1.624	28	1.428	23	1.539	16	1.704	0.000**
Sets expectations about the grading contract up-front	25	15	1.815	26	1.528	30	1.389	24	1.528	33	1.452	0.000**
Uses diverse teaching and delivery mechanisms	26	27	1.600	24	1.592	26	1.456	27	1.431	26	1.619	0.000**
Is effective at selling the value of the class	27	26	1.613	27	1.422	29	1.395	26	1.505	28	1.592	0.000**
Incorporates research into classroom learning	28	29	1.479	28	1.409	32	1.270	29	1.178	25	1.621	0.000**
Is an effective researcher	29	28	1.488	29	1.397	34	1.083	30	1.173	30	1.590	0.000**
The international cultural examples are related to work that I do	30	30	1.303	31	1.300	23	1.530	28	1.286	21	1.667	0.000**
Incorporate cultural samples into classroom learning	31	32	1.270	30	1.312	24	1.481	31	1.172	17	1.687	0.000**

(*continued*)

Opportunities to share information about own countries and education system	32	31	1.300	33	1.258	31	1.387	34	1.098	29	1.519	0.000**
Quality of having a group of instructors from different sectors and countries	33	33	1.183	32	1.264	21	1.572	32	1.166	31	1.567	0.000**
The class includes visits and/or excursions	34	34	1.100	34	1.134	33	1.267	33	1.163	34	1.413	0.000**
Is physically attractive	35	36	0.612	35	0.533	35	0.511	36	0.290	36	0.384	0.000**
Is physically fit	36	35	0.621	36	0.502	36	0.455	35	0.378	35	0.402	0.000**
Is male	37	37	0.505	37	0.414	39	0.362	38	0.231	37	0.339	0.000**
Is female	38	38	0.499	38	0.411	37	0.373	39	0.231	38	1.590	0.000**
Is tall	39	39	0.499	39	0.388	38	0.367	37	0.243	39	0.317	0.000**

Panel: test of cross-country agreement on ranking of attributes of an effective teacher as perceived by students

		R	*t*	*p*-value
USA	Lebanon	0.539	2.31	0.019*
	France	0.307	1.16	0.133
	Sweden	0.493	2.04	0.031*
	Colombia	0.300	1.13	0.139
Lebanon	France	0.421	1.68	0.059
	Sweden	0.539	2.31	0.019*
	Colombia	0.336	1.29	0.111
France	Sweden	0.479	1.97	0.036*
	Colombia	0.475	1.95	0.037*
Sweden	Colombia	0.482	1.98	0.034*

Note: *,**Significant at 0.05; 0.01

Table IV.

and caring were valued. Moreover, the importance attached to the first three attributes is evident from their high ranking in each case (top 6 in almost all cases).

The attributes of "Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students" and "Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn" complete the top five students' ranking overall. The former reiterates the importance of "Providing applicable information and examples" in "Class Delivery" and the latter complements the attribute of "Being well-prepared." It is worth noting that the teaching effectiveness categories of "Class Preparation and Design" as well as "Class Delivery" dominate the top 5 student rankings overall and for individual countries. This supports the finding of the importance of the role of course organization and delivery style (Smith, 2009) and further extends it across countries.

The variation in the rankings may be attributed to educational systems as well as cultural and social differences (Beuckelaer *et al.*, 2012; Cardoso de Sousa, 2011; Smith, 2007; Smith, 2009). For example, in a culture of internal attribution, students project their course results onto their personal efforts "I got a grade of ___." On the other hand, students in Lebanon attribute their results to external causes "He/she gave me a grade of ___." In such a culture, it becomes important to emphasize "fairness" as a teaching characteristic. Such findings are consistent with prior cross-cultural studies that have identified differences in mastery vs harmony, luck vs fate, external vs internal locus of control (e.g. Smith *et al.*, 1995), and conforming behaviors vs cultivating interests (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz, 2012).

Using the rankings in Table IV, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients for all possible pairs of countries were computed to test *H2*. When all 39 attributes were considered, the results showed that there is a strong monotonic relationship between students rankings for each pair of countries, all p-values are less than 10^{-10}. From this table it can be observed that some pairs of countries exhibit agreement in the ranking of top 15 attributes (p-value < 0.05), whereas others do not. The strong monotonic relationship between the USA and Sweden rankings explains many of the above mentioned results. This could be due to the similarities in the cultures and values. On the other hand, the strong monotonic relationship between the USA and Lebanon rankings can be explained by the fact that the Lebanese data were collected from an American institution in Lebanon (LAU). The LAU is not only highly affected by American values and standards, but also operated according to US educational rules and regulations. Although the LAU is a HEI in Lebanon that operates under a charter from the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, the overwhelming majority of its student body consists of Lebanese students (see newly added demographics information on participating universities, faculty and students). These students come from a 12-year Lebanese schooling system background, which is fundamentally different from its American counterpart, and are culturally identical to students at other Lebanese Universities. That is what makes the similarities surprising. Also, it is worth noting that no formal interactions exist between the universities considered in this study. However, interactions between faculties from all over the global occur at international conferences, workshops and through collaboration in research and developmental activities. When it comes to the rankings between the USA and France, the weak relationship may be attributed to the difference between the countries' educational systems. Interestingly, the p-value between Lebanon and France is 0.059, i.e., almost significant. The close ties between the two countries and the fact that the school structure in Lebanon is dominated by the French educational system can explain this.

In summary, American and Swedish students emphasize on the attributes of knowledge relevance, practicality and applicability, thus supporting the findings of Pietrzak *et al.* (2008). On the other hand, French students, in agreement with Keeley *et al.* (2006), consider teaching traits as more important. Students in Lebanon and Colombia value both knowledge practicality and teaching traits, leaning somewhat more toward the latter.

5.4 Cross-cultural faculty perspectives

Table V displays a comparison, by-country, of the ranking of the attributes that faculty members considered important for effective business teaching and is used to test *H5*. Unlike students, faculty members from different countries agree less on what contributes to effective business teaching. For instance, the top ranked overall attribute "Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter" is ranked significantly different across countries. Faculty from the USA considered this attribute as the most important contributor to teaching effectiveness whereas faculty from France ranked it 14th. Moreover, a p-value of 0.000 for this attribute reveals a significant difference in the average scores across countries. Similarly, the second overall attribute, "Is well-prepared," exhibits an inconsistency between individual rankings, albeit less dispersed than rankings of "Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter." Faculty in Colombia ranked it as the most important attribute while faculty in France ranked it (7th). It is interesting that the top two ranked attributes, both within the category of "Class Preparation and Design," are not uniformly ranked among faculty from different countries. This contrasts with the findings of Cardoso de Sousa (2011) where the significance of course design was found to be important.

The remaining attributes included in the top five overall rankings are as follows: "Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions," "Challenges students to think," and "Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students," Faculty members from three countries indicated a high perceived importance for these attributes by ranking them almost uniformly. There is no significant difference among individual scores for "Challenges students to think" (p-value of 0.094). Moreover, the third ranked attribute "Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions" is also ranked without great variation. The findings for these two "Class Delivery" attributes are consistent with those of Smith (2009) who stressed the importance of delivery style.

A pairwise comparison is used to test *H3*. When all 39 attributes are considered, there is a strong monotonic relationship between the faculty rankings for all pairs of countries. No agreement exists between USA and France for the top 15 attributes and the same is true for France and Colombia. These findings, combined with results from the students' surveys, support our suggestion that the differences may be attributed to the distinctive characteristics of the French educational system. On the other hand, the results showed a strong monotonic relationship between the USA and Colombian faculty rankings (p-value of 0.021).

In conclusion, the notable variations can be explained in a similar manner to that of the students, especially between American and French rankings. USA faculty members emphasize knowledge relevance in accordance with the findings of Pietrzak *et al.* (2008). In contrast, French faculty members attach more importance to teaching and communication traits (Keeley *et al.*, 2006).

The conflicting students and faculty results, when American and Colombian rankings are compared, can be attributed to cultural differences, which may be more pronounced among the students. Due to the interaction between faculties from both countries and their exposure to each other's culture, these differences become less prevalent at the faculty level.

6. Conclusions and implications

Although the existing literature on attributes of an effective business teacher is rich and there are abundant empirical studies and theoretical developments in this area, this study offers new conceptual and analytical analyses from a cross-country comparative survey that includes many of the key variables identified in the literature review.

Expanding an earlier study (Simendinger *et al.*, 2009) with an updated literature review, this study examines attributes related to teaching effectiveness and orders them in terms of importance based on responses received from study participants, including faculty and students. This effort expands the Simendinger *et al.* (2009) study in two major ways.

Item	All Rank	USA ($n = 109$) Rank	USA ($n = 109$) Mean	France ($n = 40$) Rank	France ($n = 40$) Mean	Colombia ($n = 71$) Rank	Colombia ($n = 71$) Mean	
Illustrates current knowledge of the subject matter	1	1	2.062	14	1.718	9	1.819	0.000**
Is well prepared	2	6	1.982	7	1.759	1	1.907	0.010**
Creates an atmosphere where students are comfortable asking questions	3	2	2.020	3	1.813	6	1.866	0.009**
Challenges students to think	4	3	1.993	1	1.837	2	1.894	0.094
Provides information that is worthwhile and applicable to students	5	4	1.990	8	1.744	3	1.894	0.005**
Is passionate and enthusiastic about the subject matter	6	5	1.983	6	1.761	7	1.865	0.011*
Is sincerely interested in student learning	7	10	1.927	5	1.769	5	1.885	0.129
Is passionate and enthusiastic about teaching	8	8	1.944	10	1.738	4	1.890	0.029*
Is fair when dealing with students	9	7	1.957	13	1.723	13	1.808	0.011*
Provides practical examples and applications	10	9	1.940	2	1.832	10	1.818	0.152
Keeps students engaged	11	11	1.912	4	1.800	11	1.814	0.206
Communicates and presents material in a way that is easy to learn	12	12	1.904	15	1.669	17	1.780	0.010**
Encourages students to excel and set high standards	13	13	1.888	19	1.618	8	1.834	0.002**
Is professional	14	17	1.816	9	1.739	12	1.810	0.633
Is organized	15	15	1.860	18	1.620	15	1.801	0.012*
Sets expectations about course content	16	14	1.876	16	1.648	21	1.721	0.008**
Meets course objectives	17	19	1.809	11	1.732	14	1.807	0.629
Regularly gives clear and constructive feedback	18	18	1.815	12	1.727	16	1.797	0.564
Is approachable – both in and outside of the classroom	19	20	1.790	23	1.593	18	1.735	0.041*
Is self-confident	20	21	1.750	20	1.608	20	1.722	0.289
Is accessible – both in and outside of the classroom	21	24	1.724	22	1.595	19	1.727	0.201
Sets expectations about the grading contract up-front	22	16	1.839	26	1.517	27	1.590	0.000**
Is able to teach to different levels and experiences	23	23	1.729	21	1.596	22	1.668	0.295
Achieves a positive rapport with students	24	22	1.737	17	1.629	24	1.641	0.234
Uses diverse teaching and delivery mechanisms	25	26	1.669	24	1.592	25	1.638	0.695
Is effective at selling the value of the class	26	25	1.695	31	1.308	26	1.633	0.001**
Is flexible	27	27	1.585	25	1.554	28	1.580	0.932
Incorporates research into classroom learning	28	31	1.203	29	1.370	23	1.656	0.000**
Incorporate cultural samples into classroom learning	29	28	1.242	28	1.375	31	1.475	0.026*
The international cultural examples are related to work that I do	30	29	1.222	27	1.394	32	1.423	0.057
Is an effective researcher	31	32	1.137	32	1.232	30	1.502	0.000**
Opportunities to share information about own countries and education system	32	30	1.206	33	1.212	33	1.412	0.047*
Quality of having a group of instructors from different sectors and countries	33	33	1.061	30	1.364	29	1.506	0.000**
The class includes visits and/or excursions	34	34	0.837	34	0.904	34	1.037	0.098

Table V.
By country for all faculties a side-by-side comparison, of the most important attributes that influence the perception of teaching effectiveness

(*continued*)

Is physically fit	35	36	0.652	35	0.593	35	0.544	0.378
Is physically attractive	36	35	0.661	36	0.454	36	0.487	0.021*
Is tall	37	37	0.428	37	0.365	37	0.363	0.512
Is male	38	38	0.387	39	0.355	38	0.356	0.829
Is female	39	39	0.376	38	0.355	39	0.336	0.775

Panel: test of cross-country agreement on ranking of attributes of teaching effectiveness as perceived by faculty members

		R	*t*	*p*-value
USA	France	0.155	0.567	0.290
	Colombia	0.529	2.245	0.021*
France	Colombia	0.305	1.156	0.134

Table V.

Simendinger *et al.* (2009)' study examined 29 teaching related attributes, whereas the current study examines 39. In addition, the current study includes data collected from faculty and students from several schools outside of the USA and, thus, increases the applicability of the results in a cross-cultural manner and provides implications for practice internationally. The implications for practice involve provide practical and useful results that can be considered by instructors wishing to increase their teaching effectiveness. Universities that have teaching effectiveness departments will find this research helpful in planning programs for their business faculty.

Among the 39 predetermined attributes ranked by study respondents to determine a hierarchy of attribute importance for business instruction, "Providing practical examples and application" and "Being well prepared" were ranked as highest in importance. This reflects the perceptions of all study respondents: males, females, faculty and students, and those studying in the USA and several other countries of varying cultural characteristics. Of the top ten ranked attributes in this study, nine were also listed in the top ten in the Simendinger *et al*'s. (2009) study. For business teachers, whether they are new to the classroom or veterans wanting to improve their teaching effectiveness, the findings from this study provide important new implications for practice and a concrete starting point on the journey to teaching excellence. Furthermore, universities considering the revising their student evaluation processes and data collection instruments can use this study to analyze their current faculty teaching effectiveness criteria in light of the findings of this research. Unfortunately, the findings of this research produce a dilemma for administration given that students and faculty do not often agree on all of the attributes of effective business instruction. Universities will have to decide how to apportion their evaluation processes and answer this question: Should a HEI give more consideration to what student perceive to be most important in regard to teaching effectiveness (a consumer-driven approach) or to give greater weight to the attributes of teaching that instructors perceive as the most important (an expertise driven approach)? This is important given the large number of universities that use student evaluation scores as the major faculty tenure and employment decision tool.

6.1 Contribution to current literature and the practice of teaching

The results reported in this paper extend, in several ways, the existing body of knowledge regarding the teaching of business. Reviewed studies of such a subject produce a snapshot of what is true in the context of the time in which the studies are conducted and which are framed by the borders of the samples that used. In a dynamic field such as teaching, such snapshots need occasional updating to document changes and to expand the landscape being captured. The current study reports an updated ranking of importance of perceived teaching attributes for both major groups involved in the teaching of business, teachers, and students. A significant widening of the landscape regarding these rankings is that they are

produced from data collected from a cross-national sample. This means that instructors of business subjects, in a notably broader geographic context, can determine whether or not their most important teaching attributes match or do not match those of the students they instruct. When difference are found adjustments can be evaluated in approaches to teaching that have promise of producing a more favorable teaching outcomes while still allowing the instructor to reach desire learning outcomes. Specific areas where adjustments in teaching methods can be made include course design, content, and evaluation methods.

It is axiomatic that knowledge of the favored teaching attributes of teachers and students in a cross-national setting has great promise of producing better and more satisfying instructional efforts. For example, most new teaching faculty in business schools have had little to no formal training in teaching. They are experts in their chosen business field, but are often novices as teachers. The information presented here will assist new post-doctoral and newer, non-tenured, faculty who may be struggling with their teaching assignments. At the same time, seasoned faculty can benefit from a knowledge of how current students view good teaching approaches. Furthermore, as the world shrinks and people seek opportunities to either teach or study abroad, the information presented in this study will benefit students and faculty alike in their search to find a good fit for their work as faculty or as students.

The analysis based on role (student vs teacher) indicated that there is evidence of similar rankings among the determined 39 attributes. The qualitative analysis of the rankings indicates that the top 15 attributes includes five attributes from each of the three categories for all respondents, all students, and all faculty. However, the ordering of the top 15 differs slightly among the three groups, with faculty replacing one "Class Delivery" attribute, "Encourage students to excel and set high expectations" for another "Class Delivery" attribute, "Regularly gives clear and constructive feedback." The quantitative analysis consists of two main tests, one to address differences in mean rankings and the other to address a correlation effect. The correlation effect was tested using Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficients. The results indicated a strong positive relationship for all 39 attributes, but there was no significant relationship for the top 15 attributes. These results are consistent with Smith (2009), Pietrzak *et al.* (2008), Keeley *et al.* (2006); and Cardoso de Sousa (2011).

Students and faculty do not always agree on the attributes that produce the most effective business teacher. Only six out of the predetermined 39 attributes were ranked the same by these two groups. The magnitude of the variation in rankings represents the difference between what students want from teachers vs what professors often give, another significant implication for practice. Seven of the rankings were far enough apart to suggest teaching improvement targets for faculty. Professors seeking to improve their effectiveness should consider this list, think about how their current design and delivery might reflect this variation, and then determine what adjustments they might make in their teaching plans to minimize the differences between faculty and students. Otherwise the variation is likely to produce a tension between professors and students as each group holds on to the attributes of teaching they highly value. This difference was tested statistically by conducting tests for difference in mean and correlation.

Regarding the cross-cultural findings, the ANOVA results indicate a significant country effect for 34 of the 39 attributes. Two of the insignificant attributes are "Class Preparation and Design" attributes and one attribute is highly ranked by all students. Two of the insignificant attributes are "Instructor Traits and Personal Characteristics" and others are highly ranked by all students. The last insignificant attribute is highly ranked by all student groups and is a "Class Delivery" attribute. The correlational analysis revealed significant correlations in the rankings of the US students and the students from Lebanon and Sweden. Students from Lebanon and students from France, Sweden, and Colombia show significant correlation. The examination also discovered significant correlations in the rankings of

students from France and students from Sweden and Colombia; and students from Sweden and students from Colombia. These results are consistent with the results for Keeley *et al.* (2006), Pietrzak *et al.* (2008), Smith (2009), Beuckelaer *et al.* (2012), Smith (2007), and Lizzio and Wilson (2008).

Teachers can improve their teaching in one or more of the three categories of teaching attribute: class delivery, class preparation and design, and instructional traits and personal characteristics. The data here offers the professor a place to start (by first selecting a category in which to seek improvement) and specific behaviors (selecting specific attributes where the faculty member can change teaching methods) that might be considered for their improvement efforts. Moreover, instructors can gain further insight into why there is often a sense of tension between themselves and students. As stated earlier, faculties have a propensity to place higher values on certain teaching attributes and behaviors whereas students highly value others. Comparing the attribute rankings his/her faculty colleagues gave to each of the attributes listed in a category against student rankings in that category may offer insight for reducing this tension. In other words, a teacher may come to better understand what he/she and faculty colleagues tend to value vs what students are more prone to value practice.

It should be emphasized that the student rankings represent what students want and what they perceive to be the most important attributes that produce effective business teachers. The faculty rankings represent what faculty value and perceive to be the most important attributes to produce effective business instruction. The wider the separation between the two groups in the classroom, the less effective the professor will be perceived by his/her students since students will not have the kind of educational experience they desire. Efforts to reduce the variances will improve the students' perceptions of their teachers, resulting in greater teacher impact in the classroom.

A contribution that this current study is making to prior research and practice involves the international perspective. The comparison of student rankings from different countries produced areas of agreement between students as well as areas of disagreement, as one would suspect. Particularly noteworthy are the general areas of agreement between students from different countries for the higher ranked categories of teaching attributes

The conclusion here, and primary value to students who choose to study abroad, is that students may perform better in their international studies by gaining an enhanced understanding of the differences in the highly valued attributes of students and faculty in their home country vs the country in which they intend to study. This understanding should help international students determine the necessary adjustments to make regarding what they should expect to experience in the new educational environment, to achieve a better "fit" regarding their own behaviors in the new environment, and, thus, elevate their learning experience. In addition, examining these differences might be added to the process a student employs and the criteria they use to decide in what country they want to study. This is a significant implication for practice.

When comparing the faculty rankings from different countries, there is less agreement among faculty rankings compared to the student rankings from different countries. The greatest agreement found between pairs of countries were the rankings of the faculty respondents from the USA and Colombia. The faculty rankings between the USA and France were found to be the farthest apart. Moreover, these differences are important to note for several reasons. For example, faculty applying for jobs outside their home country will gain an advantage by using the rankings to help them find a good match and to adjust their standard course design and delivery of content to better match their new educational culture. Conversely, a university can better assess applications from foreign applicants by using the lessons from this study during the faculty hiring process. Moreover, although a professor with international experience may be viewed as more attractive by some

universities, hiring a faculty member that comes from a country where these attributes are different than the employing university teaching attributes could be setting the faculty member up for failure. This employment caution is another important contribution of the study. Finally, by reviewing the data, a student studying under faculty members recruited outside of their home country may achieve a better fit with foreign faculty members and better understand what those teacher's expectations might be in their classrooms. Thus, the application of this study can benefit all parties in the educational arena; institutions of higher learning, faculty members, and students.

Regarding future research of attribute of effective business instruction, more work can be done in the area of cross-cultural aspects of the sample. This type of research should be done to assess the extent of the differences in perceptions of teaching effectiveness among the faculty and students in more countries. The findings of more research of this nature could assist faculty decisions regarding course design and delivery methods in those countries in which faculty are considering teaching to gain international experience. Finally, some business schools located in different countries either encourage students to study for at least one year abroad, or to acquire a full degree internationally. The findings of further research might assist the decisions of students of where study abroad.

References

Arbaugh, J.B. and Hwang, A. (2013), "Uses of multivariate analytical techniques in online and blended business education: an assessment of current practice and recommendations for future research", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 37 No. 2, pp. 229-260.

Arbuckle, J. and Williams, B.D. (2003), "Students' perception of expressiveness: age and gender effects on teacher evaluations", *Sex Roles*, Vol. 49 Nos 9/10, pp. 507-516.

Arnold, I.J. (2008), "Course level and the relationship between research productivity and teaching effectiveness", *Journal of Economic Education*, Vol. 39 No. 4, pp. 307-321.

Balam, E.M. and Shannon, D.M. (2010), "Student ratings of college teaching: a comparison of faculty and their students", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 209-221.

Barrie, S.C. (2007), "A conceptual framework for the teaching and learning of generic graduate attributes", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 439-458.

Beuckelaer, A.D., Lievens, L.L. and Bücker, J. (2012), "The role of faculty members'cross-cultural competencies in their perceived teaching quality: evidence from culturally-diverse classes four european countries", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 217-245.

Boerboom, T.B.B., Stalmeijier, R.E., Dolmans, D.H.J.M. and Jaarsma, D.A.D.C. (2015), "How feedback can foster professional growth of teachers in the clinical workplace: a review of the literature", *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, Vol. 46, pp. 47-52.

Burdsal, C.A. and Harrison, P.D. (2008), "Further evidence supporting the validity of both a multidimensional profile and an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 33 No. 5, pp. 567-576.

Cardoso de Sousa, F. (2011), "Creative teaching and effective teaching in higher education", *International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 5-44.

Carpenter, S.K., Wilford, M., Kornell, N. and Mullaney, K.-M. (2013), "Appearance can be deceiving: instructor fluency increase perception of learning without increasing actual learning", *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 1350-1356.

Davison, E. and Price, J. (2009), "How do we rate? An evaluation of online student evaluations. Assessment & evaluation in higher education", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 51-65.

De Beuckelaer, A., Lievens, F. and Bücker, J. (2012), "The role of faculty members' cross-cultural competencies in their perceived teaching quality: evidence from culturally-diverse classes in four European countries", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 83 No. 2, pp. 217-248.

Dresel, M. and Rindermann, H. (2011), "Counseling university instructors based on student evaluations of their teaching effectiveness: a multilevel test of its effectiveness under consideration of bias and unfairness variables", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 52 No. 7, pp. 717-737.

Emery, C.R., Kramer, T.R. and Tien, R.G. (2003), "Return to academic standards: a critique of student evaluation of teaching effectiveness", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 37-46.

Heckert, T., Latier, A., Ringwald, A. and Silvey, B. (2006), "Relation of course, instructor, and students characteristics to dimensions of students ratings of teaching effectiveness", *College Student Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 195-203.

Hoffmann, F. and Oreopoulos, P. (2009), "Professor qualities and student achievement", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 91 No. 1, pp. 83-92.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*, 2nd ed., Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V. (2005), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Hrastinski, S. and Monstad, T. (2013), "Exploring the relationship between the use of an interactive video website and organizational learning", *New Media & Society*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 594-614.

Inglehart, R. (2004), *Human Beliefs and Values: A Cross-Cultural Sourcebook based on the 1999-2002 World Values Surveys*, SigloXXI, Mexico City.

Ivancevich, J.M., Gilbert, J.A. and Konopaske, R. (2008), "Studying and facilitating dialogue in select online management courses", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 196-218.

Keeley, J., Smith, D. and Buskist, W. (2006), "The teacher behaviors checklist: factor analysis of its utility for evaluating teaching", *Teaching of Psychology*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 84-91.

King, S.H. and Watson, A. (2010), "Teaching excellence for all our students", *Theory into Practice*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 175-184.

Kolb, D.A. (1976), "Management and the learning process", *California Management Review*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 21-33.

Lawson, R., Taylor, T., Frenc, E., Falshaw, E., Hall, C., Kinash, S. and Summers, J. (2015), "Hunting and gathering: new imperatives in mapping and collecting student learning data to assure quality outcomes", *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 581-595.

Lizzio, A. and Wilson, K. (2008), "Feedback on assessment: students' perception on quality and effectiveness", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 33 No. 3, pp. 263-275.

Ma, Y.J. and Lee, H. (2012), "Incorporating an authentic learning strategy into undergraduate apparel and merchandising curriculum", *Journal of Experiential Education*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 272-289.

Marsh, H.W. and Hattie, J. (2002), "The relationship between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs?", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 73 No. 5, pp. 603-641.

Merton, R.K. (1968), *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Free Press, New York, NY, p. 702.

Meyers, M. (2012), "How business faculty evaluate teaching effectiveness", *Proceedings of the Academy of Marketing Studies (AMS)*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 17-19.

Pietrzak, D., Duncan, K. and Korcuska, J.S. (2008), "Counseling students' decision making regarding teaching effectiveness: a conjoint analysis", *Counselor Education & Supervision*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 114-132.

Ross, D.N. and Rosenbloom, A. (2012), "Reflections on building and teaching and undergraduate strategic management course in a blended format", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 351-376.

Schwartz, S.H. (1992), "Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries", *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 1-65.

Schwartz, S.H. (1994), "Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values?", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 19-45.

Schwartz, S.H. (2012), "An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values", *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 1-20, available at: http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1116&context=orpc (accessed May 16, 2016).

Seidel, T. and Shavelson, R.J. (2007), "Teaching effectiveness research in the past decade: the role of theory and research design in disentangling meta-analysis results", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 454-499.

Shaftel, J. and Shaftel, T. (2005), "The influence of effective teaching in accounting on student attitudes, behavior, and performance", *Issues in Accounting Education*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 231-246.

Shao, L.P., Anderson, L.P. and Newsome, M. (2007), "Evaluating teaching effectiveness: where we are and we should be", *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Evaluation*, Vol. 32 No. 3, pp. 355-371.

Simendinger, E., Galperin, B., LeClair, D. and Malliaris, T. (2009), "Attributes of effective business teachers", *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 107-130.

Slater, H., Davies, N.M. and Burgess, S. (2012), "Do teachers matter? Measuring the variation in teacher effectiveness in England", *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 74 No. 5, pp. 629-645.

Smimou, K. and Dahl, D.W. (2012), "On the relationship between students' perceptions of teaching quality, methods of assessment, and satisfaction", *Journal of Education for Business*, Vol. 87 No. 1, pp. 22-35.

Smith, B.P. (2007), "Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: an analysis of end-of-course faculty evaluations", *College Student Journal*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 788-800.

Smith, B.P. (2009), "Student ratings of teaching effectiveness for faculty groups based on race and gender", *Education*, Vol. 129 No. 4, pp. 615-624.

Smith, G.F. (2003), "Beyond critical thinking and decision making: teaching business students how to think", *Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 24-51.

Smith, P. (2004), "Acquiescent response bias as an aspect of cross-cultural communication style", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 50-61.

Smith, P.B., Trompenaars, F. and Dugan, S. (1995), "The rotter locus of control scale in 43 countries", *International Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 377-400.

Stark-Wroblewski, K., Ahlering, R.F. and Brill, F.M. (2007), "Toward a more comprehensive approach to evaluating teaching effectiveness: supplementing student evaluation of teaching with pre-post learning measures", *Assessment & Evaluation*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 403-415.

Wolters, C.A. (2004), "Advancing achievement goal theory: using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement", *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 96 No. 2, pp. 236-250.

Further reading

Killion, J. and Hirsh, S. (2013), "The elements of effective teaching", *Journal of staff development*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 10-16.

Marsh, H.W. and Roche, L.A. (1997), "Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective", *American Psychologist*, Vol. 52 No. 11, pp. 1187-1197.

Corresponding author
Abdul-Nasser El-Kassar can be contacted at: abdulnasser.kassar@lau.edu.lb