

Students' Views About Pedagogical Competence of Lecturers*

Öğrenci Görüşlerine Göre Öğretim Elemanlarının Pedagojik Yeterlikleri*

Hacı Bayram YILMAZ, Ayşe KAZANCI TINMAZ

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine the students' views about faculty members' pedagogical proficiencies and to determine if these views differ in terms of selected variables. The sample of the study is composed of 792 third and fourth year university students and the population of the study involves students at Faculties of Education, Engineering, Theology, and Economics and Administrative Sciences of a university located in Turkey's Black Sea Region. The research data were collected by Pedagogical Competences Scale. Results revealed that students think most of the lecturers are sufficient in Democratic Attitude; however, few of them found to be sufficient in Course Process, and Measurement and Evaluation. While there were differences in Democratic Attitude and Measurement Assessment and Evaluation between male and female students, in other proficiencies no significant differences were observed in terms of students' gender. The views of the students differed in all four factors in terms of faculties and grades. However, their views in none of the four dimensions differed significantly according to the attendance variable.

Keywords: Pedagogical competence, students' evaluations, evaluation of instructors

ÖZ

Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretim elemanlarının pedagojik yeterliklerine ilişkin öğrenci görüşlerini incelemek ve bu görüşlerin bazı değişkenler açısından farklılaşma gösterme durumlarını belirlemektir. Araştırmanın evrenini, Karadeniz Bölgesi'nde yer alan bir üniversitenin eğitim fakültesi, mühendislik fakültesi, ilahiyat fakültesi, iktisadi ve idari bilimler fakültesi öğrencileri, örneklemini ise bu fakültelerin birinci öğretim programlarının üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıflarında öğrenim gören 792 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veriler 'Pedagojik Yeterlik Ölçeği' ile toplanmıştır. Elde edilen bulgulara göre; "Demokratik Tutum Yeterlikleri" ile "Ders Girişine İlişkin Yeterlikler" boyutlarında öğretim elemanlarının çoğu yeterli bulunmasına rağmen "Ders Sürecine İlişkin Yeterlikler" ile "Ölçme Değerlendirme Yeterlikleri" boyutlarında öğretim elemanlarının azı yeterli bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerine göre; "Demokratik Tutum Yeterlikleri" ve "Ölçme-Değerlendirme Yeterlikleri" boyutlarında anlamlı fark olduğu bulunurken; "Ders Girişine İlişkin Yeterlikler" ve "Ders Sürecine İlişkin Yeterlikler" için anlamlı fark olmadığı bulunmuştur. Fakülte türü ve sınıf seviyesi değişkenine göre öğrenci görüşleri dört faktörde de farklılık göstermekte iken, derse devam durum değişkenine göre öğrenci görüşleri dört boyutta da farklılık göstermemektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Pedagojik yeterlik, öğrenci değerlendirmeleri, öğretim elemanı değerlendirme

*This study has been prepared based on master's thesis entitled "Lecturers' Pedagogical Competencies According to Student Views"

*Bu çalışma, "Öğrenci Görüşlerine Göre Öğretim Elemanlarının Pedagojik Yeterlikleri" başlıklı yüksek lisans tezine dayalı olarak hazırlanmıştır.

Hacı Bayram YILMAZ

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Samsun, Turkey
Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Samsun, Türkiye

Ayşe KAZANCI TINMAZ (✉)

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Samsun, Turkey
Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü, Samsun, Türkiye
kazanci87@gmail.com

Received/Geliş Tarihi : 24.12.2015

Accepted/Kabul Tarihi : 24.02.2016

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions play primary role in producing information in scientific research to shape the future of society, and in the training of highly qualified manpower required by the age (Adem, 1977; Kaya, 2009). According to Humbolt, the founder of the University of Berlin which is considered the first example of modern research university, the university is the institution at which all the education in the field of science is implemented in a coherent way together with research activities (Terzioğlu, 2003). To Reboul (1990), the teaching and research are functions that can not be considered separately by the university. Müftüoğlu parallel to this view (2004, p. 307) expresses his thoughts as follows:

“University is the institution where ‘the information related to all areas of life is earned, and at all levels of the truth being sought, so that the information is disseminated and taught to the requester’. Although it said that production is the university’s essential function; scientific knowledge generation and teaching are two inseparable and chief functions ... But in particular it should be noted that, neither research disrupts the education nor the education disrupts research activities ...”

In above-mentioned opinion on the responsibility of teaching and research undertaken by faculty members, it is emphasized that the two tasks should be carried out effectively. Other duties that faculty members are responsible should not lead to supplant the task of teaching. To ensure effective teaching and learning environment and the faculty should be conscious of using appropriate pedagogical approaches (Higher Education Council [HEC], 2007). The quality of university raises parallel to the lecturers’ success in research and consulting (Korkut, 2001) which raises the need to evaluate the lecturers in these areas. While academic progress of lecturers is assessed by the help of research performance, there is a lack of systematic assessment systems to assess their teaching duties in Turkey. Only a small number of faculties at universities have optional performance evaluation systems.

Due to the fact that teaching has a multi-dimensional nature and the effectiveness doesn’t have a single criterion, it is difficult to be measured (Abrami, 1989; Abrami, d’Apollonia, & Cohen, 1990; Abrami, Perry, & Leventhal, 1982; Algozzine et al, 2004; Cashin, 1995; Gravestock & Gregor-Greenleaf, 2008; Marsh, 1987; Wagenaar, 1995). Therefore, using a variety of data sources is very important for a sound assessment practice (Cashin, 1995). The effectiveness of teaching can be tested utilizing data from different sources including but not limited to students, colleagues, administrators and self-assessment (Trans. Kalaycı, 2009). Student evaluations among those are more widely used than others and considered as the reliable, current and useful in evaluating the performance of teaching faculty members (Abrami, 2001; Arubayi, 1987; Aleamoni, 1999, Baş Collins, 2002; Cashin, 1995; Cohen, 1981; Hoyt & Pallett, 1999; Marsh, 1987; Wright, 2006). Esen and Esen (2015) exploring attitudes of the faculty members towards the performance evaluation systems, has come to the conclusion that faculty members would like to see their students,

sub-department heads, department heads and colleagues as performance evaluators.

Student assessments provide information for lecturers to improve their teaching practice, helps students in course selection, and leads the managers’ accountability and the promotion matters (Abrami et al., 1990; Marsh, 1987). While the first two goals come in the scope of formal assessment, the final objective used is within the scope of judicial evaluation for decision-making on issues related to the lecturers promotion, compensation and contract extension (Gravestock & Gregor-Greenleaf, 2008). While the evaluation of teaching performance is rather important in two respects, it is seen that it is not used for judicial purposes in Turkey. In the assessments made by formal purpose, it can be said that there are problems in the application process of giving feedback to faculty members and students.

There are discussions in the literature regarding the validity and benefits as well as the reliability of students’ assessment of the lecturers. The prevalence of judicial assessment has led to contradicting results regarding the validity. The cause of this may be more concerned about the the number of factors that affect students’ assessment. Indeed, evaluation is affected by factors like course features (class time, course load, class size, undergraduate-graduate level), student characteristics (gender, age, previous experiences, success), instructor characteristics (gender, personality, charisma, experience), the transaction process (application time, anonymous feedback , the presence of the instructor during practice) (Algozzine et al., 2004; Cashin, 1995; Gravestock & Gregor-Greenleaf, 2008; Marsh & Roche, 1997; Wright, 2006). While some of these factors affect evaluation at very low level, some affects at a medium or high level. However, if criteria are estavlished, the feedback received about the effectiveness of teaching from the students provides a very important source of information about the quality of teaching in higher education institutions (Baş Collins, 2002; Wagenaar, 1995; Wright, 2006).

To Shulman (1987), the knowledge base of the profession can be divided in seven categories of information that forms the basis of the teaching: content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, curriculum knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge (educational field information), knowledge about learner characteristics, educational content knowledge (education environment and conditions information), educational goals, values, and historical and philosophical basis knowledge. Pedagogical knowledge is related to how the teacher teach and covers the knowledge and skills such as getting to know students, learning theories, principles and strategies in classroom management, material development and use, measurement and evaluation. Shulman (1986) suggests that, it is not enough for a teacher to have only knowledge of a subject, but he/she also have to know and explain the source of knowledge, its causes, its interaction with other areas, and why the students should learn that information.

According to Mishra and Koehler (2006) pedagogical knowledge is a general information form including in-depth knowl-

edge about learning methods or methods and practices covering student learning, classroom management, lesson plan development and execution, and assessment. A teacher having a deep pedagogical knowledge understands how the student develop the knowledge, how he/she gains the skills, how he/she develops a positive tendency towards learning. Pedagogical knowledge requires developmental, social and cognitive learning theories and to know how to apply those in classroom settings.

Pedagogical content knowledge need of academic staff is described in two aspects. The first covers pedagogical applications of the lecturer. The second is related to the quality of the lecturer as a role model in terms of students' professional development. Quality of their education can enrich and strengthen the life of the students who will become a teacher or an instructor in the future. The lecturers are said not only the ones making academic studies but also excellent teachers (Fernandez-Balboa & Stiehl, 1995).

It is expressed that lecturer should understand what the students know about a topic; they should think about how students can learn and what kind of difficulties they will come across in learning process. They also have to give answers to the differences arising from individual characteristics and students' needs in addition to learning continuously about the factors that affect student learning and to improve their knowledge (Major & Palmer, 2002). Entering and leaving the class on time, not disrupting the courses, compensating if disrupting occurs, giving the opportunity to review the exam papers and listening to the objections, not discriminating students, considering students as adults, being sensitive to students' problems, creating an atmosphere where any thought can be articulated in class, are also responsibilities of the lecturers given in this context (HEC, 2007). Helterbran (2008) insists that effective lecturer who trains instructors should have competent in three areas: information and presentation, personality traits, and professional characteristics. In a different study Okoye (2008), found that students pay attention to teaching methods, course plan and management of the lecturer, in addition to the easiness of understanding the staffs' (lecturers') expressions. They give less value to the features such as research capability and friendly approach.

In another study investigating the characteristics of effective teaching of instructors; general culture, knowledge of the subject matter, course planing and preparation, the teaching-learning strategies, teaching materials, classroom management, measurement and assessment, and communication skills are considered important for students (Şen and Erişen, 2002). Açıkan and Saydan (2009) indicated that teaching skills, measurement and assessment skills, empathy skills, professional responsibility, personal dignity, raising interest to the subject and kindness are considered important characteristics of teaching faculty members.

Özbek and Yeşil (2010) examined lecturers' classroom teaching activities in four dimensions as input, activity, the result stages, and classroom climate. Students rated their lecturers at «good

level» in creating a positive classroom climate. They perceived the lecturers at «medium level» in other dimensions. Köseoğlu (1994) reported that faculty members perceived themselves more positive compared with the students' views. In Kumral's study (2009) study, students provided negative analogies more than positive ones. In a similar study, very few of faculty members working at a Faculty of Education were found to be proficient in in-class educational activities (Murat, Aslantaş, & Özgan, 2006).

Literature shows that faculty members give deep information, but they do not provide enough general and main information about the subject they teach; they do not establish healthy relationships with students; they can not make an effective assessment (Ergün, 2001); Yeşil and Özbek (2008) adds that lecturers have trouble in preparing questions, asking questions and giving feedback. In a different study by Beşoluk and Horzum (2011), students expressed that lecturers do not give importance to the courses, courses are carried out by students, rote learning is applied and courses are delivered through oral presentations which lead to ineffective instruction.

It is stated that lecturer greatly makes information transmitting, gives very little space to learn through research and discovery, uses the simplest narrative technique, and makes only summative evaluations most of the time (Senemoğlu, 1994). In a similar study, the students generally have a negative perception regarding academic staffs' behaviours, course applications and measurement and assessment applications. It is concluded that lecturers are not empathetic enough to communicate with students, and they exhibit insufficient democratic attitudes. In addition, students do not have a strong conviction in that the instructors are fair and objective enough when measuring and evaluating student success (Aksu, Çivitçi, & Duy, 2008).

In another study conducted by Ergün, Duman, Kınca, & Arıbaş (1999) students stated that they are disturbed by the political behavior of the lecturer and their discrimination when giving grades. Students want their instructors show respect for their ideas, listen to them, act kindly and friendly, and be reliable. Students also demand instructors to whom they can communicate and ask questions. As for education, students paint a portrait of an instructor who lectures well, relaxes the course with humor, makes it attractive, exemplifying, and teach the subject matter considering what learners already know, as well as using language effectively when giving lectures.

Students criticize the instructors for humiliating some students when making jokes, dealing with the students taking their gender into account, giving lectures reading from textbooks during the course, exaggerating trivial errors of the students, giving examples from ignorance of students while highlighting the importance of what they have said (Anık, 2007). In a similar study, being hard and nervous, not communicating with students, not contributing students in regard to course topic, creating a tense learning environment, giving low grades were stated among unpopular behaviors (Özdemir & Üzel, 2010).

According to results of a related study, it is seen that some faculty members are trying to activate their students; very few

of them exhibit course entry activities such as drawing attention, increasing motivation, relating the previous course. Yet again a few use teaching strategies that help students learn, relate the topic with real life, and give feedback (Evrancı Acar, Kılıç, Ay, Kuyumcu Vardar, & Kara, 2010). Due to the problems stated above, it is expressed in many studies that the instructors need training in relevant areas (Arslantaş, 2011; Ergin & Dursun, 2005; Evrancı Acar et al., 2010; Tonbul, 2008). Within the framework of the research results mentioned above it is clear that some of the faculty members lack important characteristics when fulfilling their responsibilities and there is a need to integrate student evaluations of lecturers in evaluation system of faculty staff in Turkey.

The overall objective of this study is to assess the pedagogical competence of instructors according to the opinion of the students. For this purpose, answers to the following questions are sought:

- What are the university students' views on the pedagogical competence of the lecturers?
- Is there a significant difference between male and female university students' views about pedagogical competence of faculty members?
- Are there significant differences in students' perception of their faculty members' pedagogical competence in terms of the faculty they attend?
- Is there a significant difference in students' perception of their faculty members' pedagogical competence in terms of their attendance level?
- Is there a significant difference in students' perception of their faculty members' pedagogical competence in terms of their grade level?

METHODOLOGY

Research Model

A descriptive / exploratory design is utilized to answer the research questions introduced above. Therefore, the study is focused to describe and measure independent and dependent variables and relationship among them. As a non experimental research, findings of the current study does not suggest causality.

Population and Sample

The research was carried out at one of the major universities in the Black Sea region of Turkey. Being one of the largest universities in Turkey, this institution attracts students from different socio-economic status and different geographical regions. The population of the study consists of students studying in 2011-2012 academic year at university's Faculty of Education (FE1), Faculty of Engineering (FE2), Faculty of Theology (FT), Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences (FEAS) and study's sample includes a total of 792 junior and senior students. The reason why the students of the third and fourth year is the thought that these students have to interact with the instructors more as compared to the freshmen and sophomores.

57.2% of students who participated in the study (n = 453) were female and 42.8% (n = 339) were male. 38% of respondents (n = 298) attended FE1, 34.7% (n = 275) attended FE2, 14.6% (n = 116) attended FT and, 12.8% (n = 101) attended FEAS.

Data Collection Tool

The data used in this research were collected using "Pedagogical Competences Scale (PCS)" developed by Kazancı Tınmaz (2013). The scale consists of 20 items representing four dimensions. All the items were four-option Likert type items having the options of 'all', 'most', 'few', 'none' of the lecturers. For the validity of the PCS, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted, and Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated. The four factors were named as "Democratic Attitude", "Course Introduction", "Course Process" and "Measurement and Evaluation" Competencies. These factors explained 58.70% of the total variance. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient for the whole scale was 0.906. The internal consistency of each factor is calculated respectively as; 0.73, 0.77, 0.86, and 0.73. Fit indices obtained as a result of confirmatory factor analysis were as follows: $\chi^2 / df = 5.09$; RMSEA = 0.072; RMR = 0.032; SRMR = 0.065; GFI = 0.90; AGFI = 0.88; NNF = 0.87, and CFI = 0.89. These results shows that four-factor scale structure is acceptable. Each item was scored between 1 and 4. Higher scores have been interpreted as students give more favorable opinion of the report. Scale's highest overall score is 80, and the lowest score is 20. While 4 is the lowest and 20 is the highest scores that could be obtained on the first, second and fourth dimensions, they were 8 and 32 respectively for the third dimension.

Collection of Data and Analysis

The data were collected during class time after obtaining the necessary permissions. Students were instructed to think about the faculty members that they had taken course with and consider the faculty members working at their own faculty. For data analysis SPSS 17 software package was used. Due to the data collected using PCS was quantitative data, parametric tests has been envisaged for analysis; in line with the implementation to determine if the views of the students differ according to selected variables. Firstly if the assumptions of the analysis methods proposed were met or not. Based on the assumption check, t-test, variance analysis and Mann-Whitney U tests were performed.

RESULTS

For the purpose of evaluating pedagogical competency of lecturers, descriptive statistics cited in the methods section of the scale were used. In this context, the mean score obtained from the whole ($\bar{x} = 48.96$) shows that the students perceive that "few" of the faculty members can be considered as competent. While the highest score that can be obtained from the "Democratic Attitude", "Course Introduction" and "Measurement and Evaluation" Competencies of PCS is 16; the highest possible score on dimension of "Course Process Competency" is 32. In this context, the mean score ($\bar{x} = 11.98$) obtained on "Democratic Attitudes Competence" and the mean score ($\bar{x} = 10.22$)

obtained on "Course Introduction Competence" indicate that most of the faculty members are considered as competent. Average scores ($\bar{x} = 9.45$) obtained on "Measurement and Evaluation Competence" and "Course Process Competence" ($\bar{x} = 17.31$) show that only few of the lecturers are perceived as competent by their students.

Findings on the Difference Between Male and Female University Students' Views About Pedagogical Competence of Faculty Members

To investigate the difference between male and female university students' views about pedagogical competence of faculty members an independent samples t test was used. For the purpose of checking if each factor variance is equal or not in independent variable categories that are the assumptions of t-test, Levene test results were checked and it was seen that the assumption of the equality of variance was

ensured for each factor (for first factor $p = .464 > .05$; for second factor $p = .162 > .05$; for third factor $p = .232 > .05$; for fourth factor $p = .651 > .05$). This result suggests that t-test can be used for the second research question.

The t-test results revealed that mean of the "Course Introduction" [$t(787) = -.960$; $p > .05$] and "Course Process" Competencies [$t(789) = .286$; $p > .05$] does not differ in terms of student gender. However, "Democratic Attitude" [$t(788) = -3.558$; $p < .05$] and "Measurement and Evaluation" Competencies [$t(790) = -2.561$; $p < .05$] differ based on students' gender. Female students' views ($\bar{x} = 12.23$) on the democratic attitude of the lecturer are more positive than that of males ($\bar{x} = 11.65$). Similarly, as regarding measurement and evaluation competencies female students' views ($\bar{x} = 9.61$) are more positive compared with male students ($\bar{x} = 9.22$). The results of the analysis are given in Table 1.

Findings on the Differences in Students' Perception of Their Faculty Members' Pedagogical Competence in Terms of the Faculty They Attend

To compare the students' perception of faculty members' competence based on the faculty they attend, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was chosen as the analysis method. An investigation of homogeneity of variances among groups indicated that although the first and fourth dimensions met the assumption, other two dimensions had unequal variances. Since each group can be considered large it was decided to run ANOVA on the data as this method provides robust statistics (Field, 2005). As seen in Table 2, in each four factors students' views also differ significantly: for the first factor $F(3, 786) = 7.16$; $p < .05$; for the second factor $F(3, 785) = 24.85$; $p < .05$; for the third factor $F(3, 787) = 25.28$; $p < .05$; for the fourth factor $F(3, 787) = 17.93$; $p < .05$.

For detecting variations among faculties, post-hoc test statistics were calculated. In the second and fourth factors, due to the fact that the variances of the dependent variable are not equal across groups, and the number of samples in groups are not equal, Dunnett-C test has been preferred. In cases where variances are equal but sample sizes are not, Bonferroni test was used. Students views about lecturers "Democratic Attitude Competence" of FT ($\bar{x} = 12.59$) is found to be more positive compared to the students studying in FEAS ($\bar{x} = 12.58$), FE1 ($\bar{x} = 11.78$) and FE2 ($\bar{x} = 11.73$). Students' views about lecturers' "Course Introduction Competence" of FEAS ($\bar{x} = 11.43$) is found to be more positive compared to FT ($\bar{x} = 11.07$), FE1 ($\bar{x} = 10.03$) and FE2 ($\bar{x} = 9.63$). When the views of the students about "Course Process Competence" are examined, FT ($\bar{x} = 19.43$) students' views are found to be more positive compared to the students of FEAS ($\bar{x} = 18.68$), FE1 ($\bar{x} = 16.92$) and FE2 ($\bar{x} = 16.33$). Like in the dimension of "Democratic Attitudes Competence", in this dimension while the students of FT have

Table 1: t-test Results Comparing Females and Males on Their Views about Faculty Members

	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Democratic Attitude Competence	Female	451	12.23	2.22	788	3.558	.000
	Male	339	11.65	2.32			
	Total	790					
Course Introduction Competence	Female	451	10.28	2.27	787	.960	.337
	Male	338	10.13	2.15			
	Total	789					
Course Process Competence	Female	452	17.27	3.95	789	-.286	.775
	Male	339	17.35	3.69			
	Total	791					
Measurement and Evaluation Competence	Female	453	9.61	2.21	790	2.500	.013
	Male	339	9.22	2.13			
	Total	792					

the most positive views on lecturers, the students of FE2 have the most negative views. In dimension of "Measurement and Evaluation Competency" the views of the students of TF ($\bar{x} = 10.48$) were concluded to be more positive compared to the students of FE1 ($\bar{x} = 9.28$), FEAS ($\bar{x} = 10.11$) and FE2 ($\bar{x} = 8.97$).

Findings on the Differences in Students' Perception of Their Faculty Members' Pedagogical Competence in Terms of Their Attendance Level

For data analysis of the differentiation of the views of the students according to the students' status of attendance variables regarding on pedagogical proficiency of the lecturers, independent samples t test and Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted. Results of Levene Test conducted in order to check if each factor has equal variances across the categories of independent variable showed that for the factor of "Democratic Attitude Competence" equality of variance ($p = .423 > .05$) the assumption was met, but for other three factors ($P = .040 < .05$, $p = .002 < .05$, $p = .030 < .05$, respectively) the assumption of variances equality was not ($p < .05$) observed.

According to t-test results in Table 3; the views of students about "Democratic Attitude Competence" of lecturers do not differ according to the attendance status $t(788) = 0.16$; $p > .05$. The results of The Mann-Whitney U Test conducted for other dimensions can be seen in table 4. Accordingly, in all three dimensions students' views do not differ in terms of their attendance status.

Findings on The Differences in Students' Perception of Their Faculty Members' Pedagogical Competence in Terms of Their Grades

In analysis of findings on differentiation of students' views according to the grade level variable, as in previous variables, Levene Test results was analyzed and it was seen that "Democratic Attitude Competence" factor met the equality of variances ($p = .483 > .05$) assumption; other factors ($p = .014 < .05$; $p = .038 < .05$, $p = .001 < .05$, respectively) the assumption of the equality of variance ($p < .05$) was not observed. Therefore, for the first factor t-test, for other factors Mann-Whitney U test was used.

"Democratic Attitude Competence" varies according to grade level, $[t(788) = 5.936$; $p < .05$]. The Mann-Whitney U-test results for the other three factors are presented in Table 6. According to the analysis results:

- The views of students on "Course Introduction Competence" vary according to grade level ($U = 66486.50$; $p < .05$); third year (Mean Rank = 412.44) students express more positive views than fourth year ones (Mean Rank = 368.90).
- The views of students in "Course Process Competence" vary significantly according to grade level, ($U = 67510.50$; $p < .05$). These differences are in favor of third year students. Third year (Mean Rank = 411.87) students display more positive views compared to fourth year students (Mean Rank = 372.14).

Table 2: Anova Results Comparing Students Attending Different Faculties on Their Views about Faculty Members

Factors	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Democratic Attitude Competence	Between Groups	109.06	3	36.35	7.16	.000
	Within Groups	3990.70	786	5.08		
	Total	4099.75	789			
Course Introduction Competence	Between Groups	338.34	3	112.78	24.85	.000
	Within Groups	3562.17	785	4.54		
	Total	3900.50	788			
Course Process Competence	Between Groups	1024.20	3	341.40	25.28	.000
	Within Groups	10627.77	787	13.50		
	Total	11651.96	790			
Measurement and Evaluation Competence	Intergroups	241.76	3	80.59	17.93	.000
	Intragroups	3537.71	787	4.50		
	Total	3779.47	790			

Table 3: t-test Results Comparing Students on Their Views about Faculty Members Based on Course Attendance Status

	Attendance	N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Democratic Attitude Competence	Not Skipping Class	147	11.98	2.41	788	.016	.987
	Skipping Class	643	11.98	2.25			

- In dimension regarding “Measurement and Evaluation Competence”, the results were similar. The views of students differ according to the grade levels, ($U= 67677.50$; $p< .05$). In this dimension also, third year students (Mean Rank = 411.52) made more positive views than that of fourth year (Mean Rank = 372.67) students.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

In this study aiming to explore the views of university students on pedagogical competencies of lecturers, the conclusion has been reached that students believe that few of the lecturers have pedagogical competence in general. While lecturers have seen to have democratic attitude and competence regarding course introduction according to the subscales of pedagogical

competences, few of the lecturers are perceived as competent in proficiencies related to course process and measurement and evaluation.

In current research, while interacting with students caring about them as they are human beings and not discriminating based on students’ characteristics (gender, appearance, religion) and not transmitting their own ideology to students and respecting the views of the students, can be considered as an indication that most of the lecturers have democratic attitude in classrooms. While these results are supported by Teyin (2009), Erdem and Sarıtaş’s (2006) studies, they contrasts with the results obtained by Duman and Koç (2004). Contrary to the findings of this study, Duman and Koç (2004) have expressed that university students believed that faculty members’ demo-

Table 4: Mann-Whitney U Test Results Comparing Students on Their Views about Faculty Members Based on Course Attendance Status

	Attendance	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	p
Course Introduction Competence	Not Skipping Class	146	402.77	59206.50	44074.50	.244
	Skipping Class	643	393.84	253238.50		
	Total	789				
Course Process Competence	Not Skipping Class	147	397.37	58413.00	47133.00	.936
	Skipping Class	644	395.69	254823.00		
	Total	791				
Measurement and Evaluation Competence	Not Skipping Class	147	400.79	58916.00	46630.00	.776
	Skipping Class	644	394.91	254320.00		
	Total	791				

Table 5: t-test Results Comparing Junior and Senior Students on Their Views about Faculty Members

	Grade	N	\bar{X}	S	df	t	p
Democratic Attitude Competence	Junior	474	12.37	2.26	788	5.936	.000
	Senior	316	11.41	2.19			

Table 6: Mann Whitney U Test Results Comparing Junior and Senior Students on Their Views about Faculty Members

	Grade Level	N	Rank Average	Rank Sum	U	p
Course Introduction Competence	Junior	473	412.44	195082.50	66486.50	.008
	Senior	316	368.90	116572.50		
	Total	789				
Course Process Competence	Junior	475	411.87	195639.50	67510.50	.016
	Senior	316	372.14	117596.50		
	Total	791				
Measurement and Evaluation Competence	Junior	475	411.52	195472.50	67677.50	.018
	Senior	316	372.67	117763.50		
	Total	791				

cratic attitudes and behaviors were in the middle and lower levels.

Contrary to the the results related to “Course Introduction Competence” obtained by this study Şen and Erişen (2002) claimed that very few of the lecturers has been found satisfactory. Köseoğlu’s (1994) study also indicated parallel results with Şen and Erişen. On the other hand, Özbek and Yeşil (2010) found that the faculty members competency level was “moderate”. The reason of conflicting results in studies is thought to come from the differences in study samples. It can be told that the university students included in this study probably thought that the lecturers plan the entrance of the course well or their motivation is high. Other possible reasons could be that the lecturers’ quality is getting better, or students’ expectations from faculty members are declining. The reason for conflicting results needs to be addressed by new studies.

Unlike the previous two dimensions, in “Course Process Competence”, only few of the lecturers were found competent by the participants. The studies of Şen and Erişen (2002) and Arslantaş’s (2011) support this conclusion. Özbek and Yeşil (2010) have found the lecturers were moderately competent at this dimension. The reason why few of the lecturer in this dimension is sufficient could be that that student expectations regarding planning the course process are not met and that lecturers may have difficulty in teaching the subject matter. Another reason could be that the motivation level of the lecturers declines during the class time. Decline in motivation of the lecturer might result from their own troubles and may also be caused by the behavior of the students. If the lecturer could not plan how to transfer the subject and how to handle it, his/her motivation may decline. Furthermore, though in “Course Introduction Competency” most of the lecturers are found to be competent, if during the course process contrary exists, it suggests that there may be troubles arising from students (i.e., class apathy, impairment of cognitive proficiencies, disruptive behavior) or the physical conditions (technical problems and so on.).

Similar to the above explanations, few of the lecturers are considered competent at measurement and evaluation endeavors. That means while the students expect the lecturers to select suitable measurement tool and to give information on their exam results if they ask for it, few of lecturers are found to be meeting the expectation. These results are parallel to Şen and Erişen’s (2002) and Arslantaş’s (2011) findings. The results of Aksu et al. (2008) are quite remarkable in this regard. In their research, 20.3% of students state that lecturer did not make a fair evaluation, 53% of students reported that lecturer have left some students in their courses unduly. In addition, one out of every four students noted that they had been threatened by the lecturers for exam results and they lack objectivity when measuring and evaluating student success.

Conclusions on the difference between male and female university students’ views about pedagogical competence of faculty members

Views of female students on the Democratic Attitude Com-

petence of lecturer is more positive than that of males. In contrast to these results, Erdem and Sarıtaş (2006) have found that perception of students regarding lecturers’ behaviours shows differentiation in terms of democratization. This can be said that female students’ views are more positive than male students may arise from that “democratization” criterion is perceived by the two groups in a different way. Besides the differences in the perception, this result can be interpreted as an indication of the lecturer gained consciousness for positive discrimination in favor of females.

In dimensions of course introduction and course process competences it was found that no significant difference exists in the views of students based on their gender. When the relevant research are analyzed, results supporting the findings of this study can be reached. Studies indicating male students reported more positive views than the female students has also been found. For example, Arslantaş (2011) states that students’ views on competences of using teaching strategies, methods and techniques of lecturer is not significantly different according to gender, Marsh and Roche (1997) state that there is no relationship between students’ gender and student evaluations. In Özbek and Yeşil (2010) and Murat et al.’s (2006) studies the views of students were found to differ according to the gender of the students. In Özbek and Yeşil’s (2010) research, male students evaluated the proficiencies of lecturer during the entry and process of the course at a better level compared to the female students, Mura et al.’s (2006) research reached the conclusion that in educational activities within the class again female students compared to male students see their lecturer more competent.

In dimension of “Measurement and Evaluation Competence”, the conclusion reached is that there is a significant difference in views by gender. That is, female students’ views regarding proficiencies of lecturers’ measurement and evaluation proficiency is more positive compared to male students. In contrast to these result, Kalaycı and Çimen’s (2010) findings implied that there is not a significant difference between the views of female and male students’view; however, the rate of male students’ evaluation of lecturers is higher ‘descriptively’ than the rate of female students. Arslantaş (2011) identified that there is not significant difference in students’ views regarding measurement and evaluation competences of lecturers in terms of gender variable. As a result of current research, the reason why female students have more positive views on measurement and evaluation competence than male students, is possible to be due to the fact that female students are more successful or hardworking than male students. Male students may also think that lecturers give higher notes for females’ exam papers, which also requires further research.

Conclusions on the differences in students’ perception of their faculty members’ pedagogical competence in terms of the faculty they attend

When examining the results of student opinion regarding the differentiation status by the faculty the study shows that in all four dimensions student views differ. Concerning democratic

attitude, course process and measurement and evaluation proficiencies FT students have the most positive views. When the views of the students in dimension of "Course Introduction Competence" are examined, it is observed that the students of FEAS have the most positive view compared to the other faculties. The reason for the differing views in this way can be due to their area of expertise. It can be said that students attending different faculties and their faculty members develop specific attitudes and behavior according to their cultural setting. The results coming in this way may arise from the differentiation in perceptions and expectations of students. For example, FE1 students can expect more perfection from the lecturer compared to the students in other faculties.

The fact that FT students have most positive views in three of the factors may be coming from the reason that the approaches of lecturers satisfy the students. It is also possible that those students have more optimistic. Another reason may be due to the fact that the number of students in the FT in academic year when the research was carried out and therefore the number of students per lecturer can be fewer than other faculties.

The reason why the students at FAES also have positive views on the factors emerged may be that their faculty members perceive their teaching job as business as their professional track suggests. As a result, they may try to satisfy their students' expectations in providing quality education with the motion of business-like culture. In a research done in FAES, the satisfaction levels of students conducted and it was seen that most of the students surveyed (53.9%) were somewhat satisfied with lecturers' performance; 28.7% of them were satisfied, and remaining 17.4% stated that they were not satisfied (Açan & Saydan, 2009).

While the majority of lecturers in FE1 are expected to be sufficient it is remarkable that in each four dimensions the students' views at the third rank. The reason for this could be that the lecturer are not at expected level of proficiency or students' pedagogical awareness and expectations at this point may be higher than students in other faculties.

Conclusions on the differences in students' perception of their faculty members' pedagogical competence in terms of their attendance level

In each of four dimensions of pedagogical proficiency, it is seen that the variable of attendance status does not affect the views of students regarding the pedagogical competence of lecturers. According to Davidovitch and Soen's (2006) research results, it is observed that the students' attendance status influences the lecturers' evaluation. The lack of difference in students' views brings mind the possibility that students with less attendance status are influenced by the views of the students who attend courses properly.

Conclusion on the differences in students' perception of their faculty members' pedagogical competence in terms of their grades

Considering the views of students according to grade level, "Democratic Attitude Competence" of lecturers are seen to be

differing. In this dimension, juniors report more positive opinion compared to the seniors. In parallel, Erdem and Sarıtaş (2006) state that students' perception regarding democratization of the lecturers' behaviors differ according to the grade levels, and first grade students perceive lecturers' behaviours as more democratic compared to other grades. Duman and Koç (2004) also found that the perceptions of freshmen's are higher than seniors' perceptions.

The views of students on proficiencies of course introduction, course process and measurement and evaluation of the lecturers differ in terms of grade levels. In all four dimensions third year students have more positive views compared to fourth year students. Kalaycı and Çimen (2010)'s "descriptive findings" support this result. In Neumann and Neumann (1985)'s research results, it was seen that the marks given to lecturers' holistic evaluation questions by the students decreased as the grade level increased. Contrary to these results, Aksu et al.'s (2008) findings are that especially third grade students have more negative views on lecturers. When it comes to the findings of the current study, the reason why fourth year students had more negative views compared to the third year students may be that these students are at the end of the school year. With reasons such as worrying about finding a job and preparation for professional exams caused difficulty in participation of the courses resulting in more negative views on lecturers. Another reason imaginable is that since the graduation of fourthgrade students' is close, they are thought to develop more objective views about lecturers.

SUGGESTIONS

According to the results of this study, it can be said that lecturers' pedagogical competence is not at a satisfying level according to their students. Because of this reason, it is expected that the study results provide faculty members an opportunity for self critique and will help them to think about both their relationships with their students and their behaviour in education process. In this context, it is possible to make following suggestions.

The fact that in dimension of proficiencies regarding course process, few lecturers are perceived to be competent. This raises questions regarding their proficiencies. Therefore, faculty members' experience could be treated as dependent variable to explore if there is difference in competencies of novice and experienced lecturers.

In studies in the literature and in this study one of the factors being common is measurement and evaluation. In almost every study this factor has appeared and it has been concluded that the lecturers usually were not seen as sufficient. Therefore, further studies on measurement and evaluation competence is needed. And also there can be made a number of innovations in the institutional sense. For example, assessment consulting unit can be installed in universities. In this sense, the lecturers can be trained and helped on developing reliable and valid examinations.

According to results of the reseach, the least satisfied students about their faculty members are the ones attending Engineering and Education Faculties. At these two faculties, studies can be designed and the reasons could be explored. To illustrate, research can be done both with students and lecturers by doing interviews. Also due to the fact that the students of FT and FAES have more positive views, qualitative studies can be done to investigate the cause of these views.

The differences in the students' perceptions and expectations of the lecturers may have originated from the distinctive culture of each faculty. Therefore, the scale can be developed specific to faculties and research may be conduct. These studies can be performed by scientists; the governing bodies of the universities can follow the process of establishing units related at each faculty. These units may conduct systematic studies and they may also provide training opportunities shouls the lecturers requested.

For continuing this research or supporting it different studies can be done in different universities and the results can be compared. Comparisons between departments, private and state universities can be done. Comparisons can be done by adding the freshmen and sophomores.

In line with the perious research, current study results imply that lecturers experience problems in some dimensions of competences and therefore they are in need of education on these issues. Today, doctoral students take "Learning and Development" and "Measurement Assessment" courses. However, how much this practice is efficient is a debatable question. These courses can be useful to offer within each department. It is thought that future faculty members should get pedagogical training that is specific to the faculties they work at for providing more qualified education.

To establish a faculty member evaluation system on solid foundations, there is a need for systematic and periodic data collection. Evaluation results should be sent to the lecturers. In addition, students also should be informed about the results. During the implementation of this research some of the students opt-out since they thought their opinion will not be taken into consideration. Therefore by making necessary explanations, students should be provided to feel a part of faculty evaluation and improvement process. Student evaluations are of the most effective ones among lecturers' assessment techniques. Besides it is an important attempt in order to meet student expectations. However, in order to assess the holistic performance of lecturers other methods should also be utilized.

REFERENCES

Abrami, P. C. (1989). How should we use student ratings to evaluate teaching? *Research in Higher Education*, 30(2), 221-227.

Abrami, P. C. (2001). Improving judgments about teaching effectiveness using teacher rating forms. In M. Theall, P. C. Abrami, and L. A. Mets (Eds.). The student ratings debate: Are they valid? How can we best use them? [Special issue]. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 109, 59-87.

Abrami, P. C., d'Apollonia, S., & Cohen, P. A. (1990). The validity of student ratings of instruction: What we know and what we do not. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(2), 219-231.

Abrami, P. C., Perry, R. P., & Leventhal, L. (1982). The relationship between student personality characteristics, teacher ratings, and student achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(1), 111-125.

Açan, B., & Saydan, R. (2009). Öğretim elemanlarının akademik kalite özelliklerinin değerlendirilmesi: Kafkas Üniversitesi İİBF örneği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 13(2), 225-253.

Adem, M. (1977). Yükseköğretim planlaması. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9(1), 336-337.

Aksu, M. B., Çivitçi, A., & Duy, B. (2008). Yükseköğretim öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarının ders uygulamaları ve sınıf içi davranışlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(16), 17-42.

Algozzine, B., Beattie, J., Bray, M., Flowers, C., Gretes, J., Howley, L., Mohanty, G., & Spooner, F. (2004). Student evaluation of college teaching: A practice in search of principles. *College Teaching*, 52(4), 134-141.

Anık, C. (2007). Eğiticinin performansını niteleyen faktörler. *Bilig*, 43, 133-168.

Aleamoni, L. M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924 to 1998. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 13(2), 153-166.

Arslantaş, İ. (2011). Öğretim elemanlarının öğretim strateji-yöntem ve teknikleri, iletişim ve ölçme değerlendirme yeterliklerine yönelik öğrenci görüşleri. *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(15), 487-506.

Arubayi, A. E. (1987). Improvement of instruction and teacher effectiveness: Are student ratings reliable and valid? *Higher Education*, 16, 267-278.

Baş Collins, A. (2002). Üniversite öğrencileri öğretim elemanlarının başarısını değerlendirebilir mi? İkilemler ve problemler. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 35(1-2), 81-91.

Beşoluk, Ş., & Horzum, M. B. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının meslek bilgisi, alan bilgisi dersleri ve öğretmen olma isteğine ilişkin görüşleri. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 44(1), 17-4.

Cashin, W. E. (1995). *Student ratings of teaching: The research revisited* (IDEA Paper No. 32). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings of instruction and student achievement: A meta-analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 281-309.

Davidovitch, N., & Soen, D. (2006). Class attendance and students' evaluation of their college instructors. *College Student Journal*, 40(3), 691-703.

Duman, T., & Koç, G. (2004). Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarının demokratik tutum ve davranışlarına ilişkin görüşleri. *XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı*, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya.

Erginer, E., & Dursun F. (2005). Öğretim elemanlarının etkili öğretim becerilerinin geliştirilmesine yönelik görüşleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 30(135), 11-22.

Ergün, M., Duman, T., Kincal, R. Y., & Arıbaş, S. (1999). İdeal bir öğretim elemanının özellikleri. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3, 1-11.

- Ergün, M. (2001). Üniversitelerde öğretim etkinliğinin geliştirilmesi. 2000 Yılında Türk Milli Eğitim Örgütü ve Yönetimi Ulusal Sempozyumu. Ankara: Öğretmen Hüseyin Hüsnü Tekişik Eğitim Araştırma Geliştirme Vakfı Yayınları.
- Erdem, A. R., & Sarıtaş, E. (2006). Sınıf öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin öğretim elemanlarının davranışlarının demokratikliğine ilişkin algıları (PAÜ örneği). *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 16, 525–538.
- Esen, M., & Esen, D. (2015). Öğretim üyelerinin performans değerlendirme sistemine yönelik tutumlarının araştırılması. *Yükseköğretim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 5(1), 52-67.
- Evrancı Acar, F., Kılıç, A., Ay, Ş., Kuyumcu Vardar, A., & Kara, R. (2010). Öğretim elemanlarının pedagojik formasyon ihtiyacı. International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications, Antalya.
- Fernández Balboa, J. M., & Stiehl, J. (1995). The generic nature of pedagogical content knowledge among college professors. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(3), 293- 306.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2. Edition). London: Sage Publications.
- Gravestock, P., & Gregor-Greenleaf, E. (2008). *Student course evaluations: Research, models and trends*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Helterbran, V. R. (2008). The ideal professor: Student perceptions of effective instructor practices, attitudes, and skills. *Education*, 129(1), 125-138.
- Higher Education Council (HEC). (2007). *Türkiye'nin yükseköğretim stratejisi*. Ankara: Meteksan.
- Hoyt, D.P., & Pallett, W.H. (1999). *Appraising teaching effectiveness: Beyond student ratings* (IDEA Paper No. 36). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Kalaycı, N. (2009). Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Akademisyenlerin Öğretim Performansını Değerlendirme Sürecinde Kullanılan Yöntemler. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 15(60), 625-656.
- Kalaycı, N., & Çimen, O. (2011). Öğretim elemanı ve ders değerlendirme (ÖEDD) anketlerine verilen puanların bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar*, 2(IX), 925-934.
- Kaya, Y. K. (2009). *İnsan yetiştirme düzenimiz* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem.
- Kazancı Tınmaz, A. (2013). Öğrenci görüşlerine göre öğretim elemanlarının pedagojik yeterlikleri. Yüksek lisans tezi, Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Korkut, H. (2001). *Sorgulanan yükseköğretim*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Köseoğlu, K. (1994). *İlköğretime öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlarda yüksek lisans tezi öğretim elemanı yeterliklerinin değerlendirilmesi*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Kumral, O. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretim elemanlarının davranışlarına yönelik algıları. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1) 92-102.
- Major, C., & Palmer, B. (2002). Faculty knowledge of influences on student learning. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 77(3), 138-162.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11, 253-388.
- Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness effective. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1187-1197.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017-1054.
- Murat, M., Aslantaş, H. İ., & Özgan, H. (2006). Öğretim elemanlarının sınıf içi eğitim-öğretim etkinlikleri açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26(3), 263-278.
- Müftüoğlu, F. (2004). *Maarif meseleleri*. İstanbul: Ötügen.
- Neumann, L., & Neumann, Y. (1985). Determinants of student's instructional evaluation: A comparison of four levels of academic areas. *Journal of Educational Research*, 78, 152-158.
- Okoye, N. S. (2008). The Nigerian university teachers' effectiveness as perceived by their students. *College Student Journal*, 42(2), 565-573.
- Özbek, R., & Yeşil, R. (2010). Ortaöğretim alanı öğretim elemanlarının sınıf içi öğretim yeterliklerinin değerlendirilmesi (Fırat Üniversitesi örneği). *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(2), 111-128.
- Özdemir, E., & Üzel, D. (2010). İlköğretim matematik öğretmen adaylarının öğretim elemanı özelliklerine yönelik görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(20), 122-152.
- Reboul, O. (1990). *Eğitim felsefesi*. (I. Gürbüz, Çev.). İstanbul: İletişim.
- Senemoğlu, N. (1994). Üniversite mezunu öğrencilerin görüşlerine göre üniversite öğretim elemanlarının öğretim etkinlikleri ve öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi ihtiyaçları. Sözel Bildiri, I. Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, Adana.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4-14.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching. Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Şen, Ş., & Erişen, Y. (2002). Öğretmen yetiştiren kurumlarda öğretim elemanlarının etkili öğretmenlik özellikleri. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 99-116.
- Terzioğlu, T. (2003). *Akademik özgürlükler*. (Edit. G. Vassaf), *Özgürleşmenin Sorunları- Mehmet Ali Aybar Sempozyumları 1997–2002*. Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Teyin, Z. (2009). *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi'nde çalışan öğretim elemanlarının demokratik tutumları*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa.
- Tonbul, Y. (2008). Öğretim üyelerinin performansının değerlendirilmesine ilişkin öğretim üyesi ve öğrenci görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 56, 633-662.
- Yeşil, R., & Özbek, R. (2008). Sosyal alanlar eğitimi bölümlerindeki "brans" öğretim elemanlarının sorulardan yararlanma yeterlikleri (Fırat Üniversitesi örneği). *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD)*, 9(3), 175-186.
- Wagenaar, T. C. (1995). Student evaluation of teaching: Some cautions and suggestions. *Teaching Sociology*, 23(1), 64–68.
- Wright, R. E. (2006). Student evaluations of faculty: Concerns raised in the literature, and possible solutions. *College Student Journal*, 40(2), 417-422.