Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinin Seminer Sunu Performanslarının Çok-Yüzeyli Rasch Modeli İle Analizi

Çetin SEMERCİ[1] Nuriye SEMERCİ[2] Burcu DUMAN[3]

[1]Bartın Üniversitesi, EğitimFakültesi, Bartın/Turkiye

E-mail: csemerci@bartin.edu.tr

[2]Bartın Üniversitesi, EğitimFakültesi, Bartın/ Türkiye

E-mail: nsemerci@bartin.edu.tr

[3]Baskil İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü, Elazığ/ Turkey

E-mail: dmn.brc@gmail.com

Öz

Araştırmanın amacı, "Yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin seminer sunu performanslarının çok-yüzeyli Rasch modeli ile analizi"ninyapılmasıdır. Araştırmada survey yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışma grubunu, 2009-2010 akademik yılında Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü'nde yüksek lisans semineri sunan yedi öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada, beş jüri yedi öğrencinin seminer sunularını izlemiştir. Değerlendirme kriterleri 11 adettir. Araştırmalarda kullanılan yüzeyler (seminer sunuları, jürilerin katılık/cömertlikleri ve kullanılan kriterler) kendi içlerinde sıralanmıştır. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, yedi seminerden S1 kodlu seminer en başarılı, S2 kodlu seminer en başarısızdır. S1, 213 puan alırken S2, 166 puan almıştır. En cömert jüri J4 ve en katı jüri J2'dir. Araştırma sonuçlarına göre bir öneri: Jürilerin yanlılık nedenlerini daha belirgin olarak ortaya konulabilmesi için çok-yüzeyli Rasch ölçme modeline ilave olarak ölçme araçları kullanılmalıdır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Seminer sunusu, Rasch ölçme modeli, Yüksek lisans öğrencileri

Genişletilmiş Özet

Amaç

Akademisyen olmak isteyen kişilerin sahip olması gereken niteliklerden biri, seminer hazırlama ve sunmadır. Seminer hazırlama ve sunma, kişinin, hakim olduğu bir konuyu anlatabilme ve topluluk önünde konuşabilme yeteneğinin gelişmesine yardımcı olur. Seminer çalışması yapacak kişiler, literatüre ulaşma, analiz, sentez, eleştirel düşünme, problem çözme, karar verme ve sunu becerilerine sahip olmalıdır. Seminer, kredili veya kredisiz olsun tez öncesinde seminer sunusu, bir akademisyen için önemli bir deneyimdir. Seminer sunusunda başarılı olan öğrencilerin kendilerine olan güveni artmakta ve bilimsel araştırma yapabileceğine dair cesaretlenmektedir. Bu çalışmada seminer sunu performansları üzerinde durulmuştur.

Araştırmanın amacı, "Yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin seminer sunu performanslarının çok-yüzeyli Rasch modeli ile analizi"nin yapılmasıdır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda;

1. Seminer sunu performanslarının analizi,

2.Jürilerin katılıkları/cömertliklerine ilişkin analizi,

3.Seminer sunu performanslarına ilişkin kriter güçlük analizi ve,

4.Değerlendirici yanlılık analizi yapılmıştır.

Yöntem

Araştırmada survey yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışma grubunu, 2009-2010 akademik yılında Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü'nde yüksek lisans semineri sunan yedi öğrenci oluşturmuştur. Bu öğrencilerin dördü Eğitim Yönetimi ve Teftişi anabilim dalı ve üçü Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim alanında yüksek lisans yapmaktadır. Araştırmada beş jüri, yedi öğrencinin seminer sunularını izlemiştir. Jüriler, Eğitim Yönetimi ve Teftişi anabilim dalında görevli iki öğretim üyesi, Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim anabilim dalında görevli iki öğretim üyesi ve bu alanda doktora yapan bir öğrenci olmak üzere beş kişidir. Değerlendirme kriterleri 11 adettir. Bunlar, fiziksel ve psikolojik durum, içerik, diksiyon, konuya hakimliği, öğrenme ilkelerine göre anlatım, araç-gereç kullanımı, beden dilinin kullanımı, sorulara verdiği cevaplar, konunun sentezlenmesi, zamanın iyi kullanılması ve kaynakçadır. Bu ölçütler üç uzman görüşüyle belirlenmiştir. Jüriler, bu kriterleri, "Hiç yeterli değil: 1", "Çok az yeterli: 2", Kısmen yeterli: 3", Büyük oranda yeterli: 4" ve "Tamamen yeterli: 5" derecelemelerle puanlamışlardır.

Öğrencilerin yüksek lisans seminer sunu performanslarına ait gözlem verilerinin analizi, çok-yüzeyli Rasch modelinde yaygın olarak kullanılan ve Linacre (1993) tarafından geliştirilmiş FACETS analiz programı ile yapılmıştır. Rasch modeli ile bireyin yetenek ölçüleri, puanlayıcıların performansları (katılık/cömertlikleri) ve kullanılan gözlem formu maddelerinin uygunluğu görülebilmektedir. Rasch analizi, test, ölçek ve gözlem formlarında yer alan seçenekler arası gerçek uzaklıkları hesaplamakta, daha hassas ve gerçekçi bir aralık birimi oluşturmaktadır. Rasch modeli objektiflik üzerine kurulmuştur.

Bulgular

Bulgulara göre, 1 numaralı seminer sunusunun (S1) yüksek düzeyde başarılı olduğu, 2 numaralı seminer sunusunun (S2) ise en düşük başarı düzeyinde olduğu söylenebilir. Puanlayıcılar, en cömert olandan en katı olana doğru sıralandığında 4 numaralı puanlayıcının "en cömert", 2 numaralı puanlayıcının ise "en katı" olduğu söylenebilir. Puanlayıcılar en katıdan cömert olana doğru 4-5-1-3-2 olarak sıralanmıştır.

Seminerlerin değerlendirilmesinde kullanılan maddelerin güçlükleri arasında anlamlı bir farklılık vardır" hipotezi ki-kare ile test edildiğinde (x2= 82.6, df: 10, p=0.00) yokluk hipotezi reddedilmiştir. Bu sonuçlara göre, seminerlerin değerlendirilmesinde kullanılan maddelerin güçlükleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmaktadır. Seminerleri sunan kişilerin gerçekleştirmede en çok zorlandıkları maddeler, öncelikle "sorulara verilen cevaplar", "konunun sentezlenmesi" ve "öğretim ilkelerine göre anlatım"dır. En kolay gerçekleştirdikleri maddeler ise, "kaynakça", "fiziksel ve psikolojik durumu" ve "içerik"tir.

Ayırma indeksi 2.76 ve güvenirlik katsayısı 0.88 ile sabit etkiye ait "Yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin seminer sunuları arasında anlamlı bir farklılık vardır" hipotezi ki-kare testi ile test edildiğinde (x2=59.3, df: 6, p=0.00) yokluk hipotezi reddedilmiştir. Bu sonuç, yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin seminer sunuları arasında istatistiksel açıdan anlamlı farklılıklar bulunduğunu göstermektedir.

Sonuçlar

Yanlılık analizine göre, bazı jürilerin bazı yüksek lisans öğrencilerine aşırı derecede katı ya da cömert değerlendirmede bulundukları söylenebilir. 3 numaralı puanlayıcı (J4), yüksek lisans seminer sunularına ilişkin değerlendirmesinde S5 nolu seminer sunusuna yaklaşık 36 puan vermesi beklenirken 29 puan vererek aşırı derecede katı bir puanlamada bulunduğu gözlenmiştir (Z= 3.00). Bu katı değerlendirme durumu, 1 numaralı puanlayıcının (J1), S2 nolu seminer sunusuna yaklaşık 31 puan vermesi beklenirken 36 puan

(Z=2.34), 2 numaralı puanlayıcının (J2), S7 nolu seminer sunusuna yaklaşık 34 puan vermesi beklenirken 29 puan (2.34) vermesi şeklinde devam etmiştir. Aynı zamanda, 2 numaralı puanlayıcının (J2), S2 nolu seminer sunusuna yaklaşık 27 puan vermesi beklenirken 33 puan vermesi (Z=-2.75) ve 4 numaralı puanlayıcının S5 nolu seminer sunusuna 49 puan vermesi beklenirken 52 puan vermesi (Z=-1.69) cömert puanlamalar yapıldığını göstermektedir. Ortaya çıkan yanlılıkların çeşitli sebepleri olabilir. Rasch ölçme modeli yanlılıkların sebeplerini ortaya çıkarmamakla beraber; sadece yanlılıkların kaynaklarına ve yanlılıkların hangi değerlendirmeci ya da değerlendirmecilere ait olduğunu göstermektedir.

Öneriler

Seminer dersleriyle ilgili Rasch modeli uygulaması sonucunda şunlar önerilebilir: (1) Jürilerin yanlılık nedenlerinidaha belirgin olarak ortaya konulabilmesi için çok-yüzeyli Rasch ölçme modeline ilave olarak ölçme araçları kullanılmalıdır. (2) Üç kişilik jüri oluşturulmalı, seminer kitapçığında üç jürinin imzası olmalı ve sonuca göre başarılı/başarısız kararı dersin öğretim üyesi tarafından verilmelidir. (3) Seminerler kredili olursa ve standartlar oluşturulursa, Rasch analizi sonunda görülen başarısızlıklar en aza inecektir. Bu şekilde uygulamadaki farklılıklar da ortadan kalkacaktır (Bazı yerlerde sadece kitapçığın teslim edilmesi, seminer sunusunun olmaması, sunuya izleyici alınmaması vb.)

Analysis of Seminar Presentation Performances of Postgraduate Students with Many-Facet Rasch Model

Çetin SEMERCİ[1] Nuriye SEMERCİ[2] Burcu DUMAN[3]

[1]Bartın University, Education Faculty, Bartın/ Turkey

E-mail: csemerci@bartin.edu.tr

[2]Bartın University, Education Faculty, Bartın/ Turkey

E-mail: nsemerci@bartin.edu.tr

[3] District National Education Directorate of Baskil,Elazığ/ Turkey

E-mail: dmn.brc@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the study is to make "Analysis of seminar presentation performances of postgraduate students with many-facet Rasch model". Survey method was used in research. The study group consisted of seven students who present graduate seminar in Firat University, Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences in 2009-2010 academic year. Five juries observed the seminar presentations of seven students in the study. The surfaces used in researches simultaneously (seminar presentations, severity/leniency of the juries and criteria used) are arranged in respective contexts. The seminar S1 coded was found to be the most successful and seminar coded S2 was found most unsuccessful according to the study conclusions. Most lenient jury is J4 and most severe jury is J2. According to research, a suggestion: Measurement instruments should be used in addition many-facet Rasch measurement model in order to set forth the biases reasons of juries more specifically.

Key Words: Seminar presentation,Rasch measurement model, Postgraduate students.

1. INTRODUCTION

Early times, the academic career has often been experienced as rather rocky road, both in Australia and elsewhere. The academic role is complex, combining the functions of teaching, research and service and/or administration. While most staff appointed to academic positions havealready completed a research degree, and thus have already received training and experience in the methodology of their research, there is no parallel provision for preparation for their teaching role. This is especially ironic when teaching occupies such a large part of e new academic's time and energy. Most new academics feel isolated with little support from their colleagues. According to the studies in the 80s and 90s in the USA, UK and Australia have indicated It is little wonder then than many new academic staff find their first years stressful and the experience of teaching difficult (Adams &Rytmeister 2000). One of the qualifications for those wishing to become academician that he/she should have is preparation and presentation seminar.

A seminar is a meeting which the teacher and the students discuss a particular topic or subject (Oğuzkan 1993). The seminar was defined as "informing the group by the experts on a certain issue and answering the questions from group" by Gözütok (2007) and Tan &Erdoğan(2004). In seminars, student groups meet in order to communicate and learning and on such occasions the opportunity to speak is highly desirable and this is crucially important to both tutor and student (Smith 1987). Seminar courses play an important role in synthesizing process of the information intended for implementation that was produced by disciplines in postgraduate education (Öztürk, Sapancı&Kuyumcu, 2007).

Those who will make a seminar presentation should have the skills of access the literature, analysis, synthesis, critical thinking, problem solving, decision making and presentation (Gözütok 2007). Aims of the seminar lectures are as follows (Öztürk, Sapancı&Kuyumcu 2007):

1.Deep investigation on trends and approaches related with issue,

2.Providing the students to make synthesis of the courses they received previously,

3.Providing the skills of critical thinking and evaluation to be used effectively,

4.Providing the students to establish the research plan before thesis by studying one-to-one under an supervisor's surveillance,

5.Developing the skill of the students to explain a subject that they have full knowledge about and to talk in front of community,

6.To follow the developments, innovations and,

7.To gain research experience.

Some of the students who prepare the seminar make preliminary to the thesis studies by selecting seminar subject parallel with the thesis subject. A certain part of the thesis literature appears when selecting a subject parallel with the thesis study to be prepared for the seminar. On the other hand, students gain the skills to write a research report as a result of a seminar study. In this sense, the seminar is the reinforcement and complementary for the courses in the field.

New academicians receive a seminar besides courses during graduate education. Although seminar courses have credits in some universities abroad (Arizona State University 2010; Kent University 2010) in Turkey according to regulations of post-graduate education and teaching, students have seminar courses without credits and this must be succeeded (Official Gazette 1996). A seminar presentation is an essential experiment for an academician before thesis whether it is a credited or non-credit seminar. The students retain higher self-assurance and take courage to make scientific research when they are successful in their seminar presentation. In this study, seminar presentation performances were discussed.

1.1. The Purpose of Research

The aim of the study is to make "Analysis of seminar presentation performances of postgraduate students with multifaceted Rasch model". In parallel with this purpose;

1.Analysis of seminar presentation performances

2.Analysis concerning severity/leniency of the juries,

3.Criterion hardness analysis concerning seminar presentation performances and,

4.Evaluators' bias analysis were performed.

2. METHOD

2.1. Study Group

In this research, survey method was used.The study group consisted of sevenstudents who presented postgraduate seminar in Fırat University, Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences in 2009-2010 academic year. Fourof these students attend postgraduate in department of Educational Administration and Inspection and the others have M.A. degree in Curriculum and Teaching field.

2.2. Research Data

Fivejuries observed the seminar presentations of seven students in the study. Juries consisted offive persons. Two of them are academic member employed in department of Educational Administration and Inspection and two are academic members of the faculty employed in department of Curriculum and Teaching and 1 doctoral student studies in this field. The number of evaluation criteria is 11. These are physical and psychological situation, content, diction, mastering a subject, expression according to learning principles, instrument usage, use of body language, answers for questions, synthesizing subject, making good use of time, reference. These criteria were determined by using 3 specialists' opinions. Juries gave the points for these criteria as "insufficient: 1", "Very few sufficient: 2", "Partially sufficient: 3", "Great amount of sufficient: 4", "Completely sufficient: 5".

2.3. Analysis of Data

The analysis of observation data concerning post graduate seminar presentation performances of the students was carried out by FACETS analysis program used widely in many-facet Rasch model and developed by Linacre (1993). The Rasch model has two main advantages. The first is specific objectivity. The second advantage of the measurement of the Rasch model is their stability, even though they may be used in small samples (Fisher 1997; Fisher 2005; Linacre 1994; Linacre, 2006).

When ordinal data usefully fit the Rasch measurement model, measures as estimated on scale constructed to be linear (Linacre 1995). This model assumes the probability that person will affirm on item or category within an item is a logistic function of the difference between the difficultly of item. Only function of that difference (Elhan&Atakurt 2005). Values of

observed minus expected scores (infit and outfit: MnSq, ZStd) will fall within an acceptable range when patterns of responding by individuals or patterns in the ordering of symptom severity fit a Rasch model (Bond & Fox 2001).

3. FINDINGS

When taking into consideration the analysis of post graduate seminar presentation performances of the students with many-facet Rasch measurement model the surfaces used in study (seminar presentations, severity/leniency of the juries and criteria used) and the general information concerning these surfaces are given in Figure 1.

Measurement	**Seminars**	**Judge**	**Criteras**
	High succes	Leniency	Difficult
+ 4+		J4	
+ 3 +			
+ 2 +			
		J5	
			Synthesise of the subject / Answers given to the questions
+ 1 +	S1	J1	
		J3	Expression according to learning principles
	S3		Use of body language
	S5 S7	J2	Tool – material use/ Knowledge of the subject
* **0** *	*	*	* *
	S4		
	S6		Diction / Efficient use of time
			Content
+ -1 +			
			Physical and psychological mood
	S2		
			References
+ -2 +			
	Low Success	Severity	Easy
Measurement	**Seminars**	**Judge**	**Criteras**

Figure 1. Seminars, Judges and Criterias, Summary Reports

The measure on the left side of Figure 1 is the logit measurement located between (-) and (+) and same for three surfaces.A general analysis is

involved in calibration map in Figure 1. It could be said that seminar presentation numbered 1 (S1) is successful at higher level, seminar presentation numbered 2 (S2) is successful at the lowest level. The severest member of jury is number 2 (J2) and the most lenient jury is number 4 (J4). It was observed that the most difficult criteria is "Synthesizing object" and "answers to questions" amongst the evaluation criterions of post graduate seminars. In other words, it could be said that, these criterions were met at lower level in reference to other criterions and postgraduate students were constrained to meet these criterions. The easiest criterion is "reference" amongst the evaluation criterions of post graduate seminars. "Physical and psychological situation" follows this criteria. The references used in seminars found sufficient in general according to the scoring of juries and it is the criteria that was met at the highest level amongst the criterions by the students.

3.1. Seminar Performance Analysis

A detailed measurement report including seminar presentations of the post graduate students are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Seminars Measurement Report

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Average	Fair Average	Model Measure	S.E.	Infit MnSg	Infit ZStd	Outfit MnSg	Outfit ZStd	N	Seminars
213	55	3.9	3.92	.95	.23	1.1	0	1.1	0	1	S1
201	55	3.7	3.72	.36	.22	0.9	0	1.1	0	3	S3
198	55	3.6	3.67	.21	.22	1.1	0	1.1	0	5	S5
198	55	3.6	3.67	.21	.22	0.8	-1	0.8	-1	7	S7
192	55	3.5	3.56	-.06	.22	0.8	-1	0.8	-1	4	S4
184	55	3.3	3.41	-.43	.21	1.0	0	1.0	0	6	S6
166	55	3.0	3.03	-1.25	.22	1.1	0	1.1	0	2	S2
193.1	55.0	3.5	3.57	.00	.22	1.0	-0.2	1.0	-.01	Mean (Count: 7)	
13.8	0.0	0.3	0.26	.64	.00	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.8	S.D.	
RMSE (Model): .22 Adj S.D.: .60				Separation: 2.76 Reliability: .88							
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 59.3 d.f.: 6				significance: .00							
Random (normal) chi-square: 6.0 d.f.: 5				significance: .31							

The standard error value of logit values (RMSE, Root Mean Square Error) was found 0.22 that is lower than the critical value 1.0 in standard deviation (0.64). Reliability was found 0.88 in the consequence of Rasch analysis. This reliability value shows at which reliability the seminar presentations of post graduate students were evaluated. This coefficient 0.88 shows that postgraduate students are graded in a high reliability. Null

hypothesis was rejected when "there is a measurable distinction amongst the seminar presentations of post graduate students" hypothesis that belongs to fixed effect with separation index 2.76 and reliability coefficient 0.88 was tested with chi-square test (x2=59.3, df: 6, p=0.00). This conclusion shows that there are significant distinctions between the seminar presentations of post graduate students in terms of statistical.

3.2. Analysis of Judge

Severity/leniency comparison of evaluators is given in Table 2.Evaluators separation index is 7.23 and reliability coefficient is 0.98 in Table. Null hypothesis was rejected when "there is distinction between severity/leniency of evaluators" hypothesis was tested with chi-square test (x2=225.6, df=4, p=0.00). According to these results, there is a significant distinction between severity/leniency points of the five evaluators statistically.It could be said that the scorer numbered 4 is "the most lenient" and scorer numbered 2 is "the severest" when evaluators are sequenced from the most lenient towards the severest in Table 2. Evaluators may be sequenced from the severest to the most lenient as 4-5-1-3-2.

Table 2. Judge Measurement Report

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Average	Fair Average	Model Measure	S.E.	Infit MnSg	Infit ZStd	Outfit MnSg	Outfit ZStd	N	Seminars
338	77	4.4	4.40	3.99	.22	0.9	0	1.1	0	4	J4
281	77	3.6	3.68	1.73	.19	0.9	0	1.0	0	5	J5
259	77	3.4	3.39	1.02	.18	0.6	-2	0.6	-2	1	J1
243	77	3.2	3.17	.52	.18	1.2	1	1.1	0	3	J3
231	77	3.0	2.99	.15	.18	1.1	0	1.2	1	2	J2
270.4	77.0	3.5	3.53	1.48	.19	1.0	-0.3	1.0	-.01	Mean (Count: 5)	
37.7	0.0	0.5	0.49	1.36	.02	0.2	1.4	0.2	1.4	S.D.	

RMSE (Model): .19 Adj S.D.: 1.35 Separation: 7.23 Reliability: .98
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 225.6 d.f.: 4 significance: .00
Random (normal) chi-square: 4.0 d.f.: 3 significance: .26

3.3. Criteria Difficulties Analysis Regarding Evaluation of Seminar Presentation

Item difficulty analysis results are given for the criteria used evaluation of seminars in Table 3.

Table 3. Criteras Measurement Report

Obsvd Score	Obsvd Count	Obsvd Average	Fair Average	Model Measure	S.E.	Infit MnSg	Infit ZStd	Outfit MnSg	Outfit ZStd	Nu Criterias
108	35	3.1	3.11	1.07	.27	1.1	0	1.1	0	8 Answers given to the questinons
108	35	3.1	3.11	1.07	.27	0.5	-2	0.5	-2	9 Synthesise of the subject
115	35	3.3	3.34	.58	.27	0.5	-2	0.5	-2	5 Expr.Accor.to learn.princip.
117	35	3.3	3.40	.44	.27	0.7	-1	0.7	-1	7 Use of body language
118	35	3.4	3.43	.37	.27	0.8	-1	0.7	-1	6 Tool-material use
121	35	3.5	3.52	.16	.27	0.9	0	0.9	0	4 Knowledge of the subject
128	35	3.7	3.72	-.35	.27	1.3	1	1.3	1	3 Diction
129	35	3.7	3.74	-.42	.28	1.4	1	1.3	1	10 Efficient use of time
131	35	3.7	3.80	-.57	.28	1.6	2	1.6	2	2 Content
138	35	3.9	3.98	-1.14	.29	0.6	-1	0.6	-1	1 Phy.andpsy. Mood
139	35	4.0	4.01	-1.23	.30	1.4	1	1.7	2	11 Referencesss
122.9	55	3.5	3.56	.00	.27	1.0	-0.3	1.0	-.03	Mean (Count: 11)
10.4	55	0.3	0.30	.77	.01	0.4	1.7	0.4	1.8	S.D.

RMSE (Model): .27 Adj S.D.: .72 Separation: 2.61 Reliability: .87
Fixed (all same) chi-square: 82.6 d.f.: 10 significance: .00
Random (normal) chi-square: 10.0 d.f.: 9 significance: .35

Separation index was found 2.61 and reliability coefficient was found 0.87. Null hypothesis was rejected when “there is significant distinctions between difficulties of items used in evaluation of seminars” hypothesis was tested with chi square (x2= 82.6, df: 10, p=0.00). According to these results, there is a significant distinctions between articles used in evaluation of seminars statistically. The articles for which the persons who are presenting seminars are constrained mostly are firstly “answers to questions”, “synthesizing subject” and “expression according to teaching principles”

according to Table 3. The simplest articles which students were subjected are "reference", "physical and psychological situation" and "content".

3.4. Judge Bias Analysis

The bias analysis of the evaluators is given in Table 4.

Table 4. Bias/Interaction Calibration Report

Obsvd Score	Exp. Score	Obsvd Count	Obs-Exp Average	Bias + Measure	Model S.E.	Z Score	Infit MnSg	Outfit MnSg	Sq	N	Sem	Measr	N	Jud	meas
29	35.7	11	-.61	1.44	.48	3.00	1.2	1.0	19	5	S5	.21	3	J3	.52
26	31.1	11	-.47	1.22	.52	2.34	0.4	0.5	2	2	S2	-1.25	1	J1	1.02
29	34.0	11	-.45	1.07	.48	2.24	0.3	0.4	14	7	S7	.21	2	J2	.15
30	34.7	11	-.42	.99	.47	2.10	0.4	0.4	10	3	S3	.36	2	J2	.15
34	38.4	11	-.40	.93	.46	2.05	1.6	1.5	34	6	S6	-.43	5	J5	1.73
52	49.0	11	.28	-1.17	.69	-1.69	0.8	0.6	26	5	S5	.21	4	J4	3.99
33	27.4	11	.51	-1.26	.46	-2.75	0.6	0.6	9	2	S2	-1.25	2	J2	.15
38.6	38.6	11.0	.00	-.02	.50	-.03	0.8	0.8	Mean (Count: 35)						
6.7	6.0	0.0	.25	.64	.05	1.29	0.8	0.4	S.D.						

Fixed (all= 0) chi-square: 58.1 d.f.: 35 significance: .01

It could be said that, some of the jury members were extremely severe or lenient against some post graduate students according to bias analysis. It was observed that, number 3 scorer (J3) made an extremely severe scoring by giving 29 point for the seminar presentation S5 even though he was expected to give approximately 36 point in the evaluation concerning post graduate seminar presentations (Z= 3.00). This severe evaluation process continued like scorer numbered 1 (J1) gave 26point instead expecting to give 31 point approximately for S2 seminar presentation (Z= 2.34) and 2 (J2) gave 29 point instead expecting to give 34 point approximately for S7 seminar presentation (Z=2.24). At the same time, lenient scoring was also observed like scorer numbered 2 (J2) gave 33 point instead expecting to give 27 point approximately for S2 seminar presentation (Z= 2.75 and scorer numbered 4 gave 52 point instead expecting to give 49 point approximately for S5 seminar presentation (Z= -1.69). The biases which appeared may have various reasons. Although Rasch measurement model doesn't reveal biases, it indicates the references of biases and to which evaluator or evaluators do biases belong to.

4. CONCLUSION

In this study, the analysis of post graduate seminar presentation performances with many-facet Rasch model. The surfaces used in researches simultaneously (seminar presentations, severity/leniency of the juries and criteria used) are arranged in respective contextes. The seminar S1 coded was found to be the most successful and seminar coded S2 was found the most unsuccessful according to the study conclusions. S1 took 213 point and S2 took 166 point. The most lenient jury is J4 and the severest jury is J2. J1 became the most lenient scorer with observed point 338 and neutrality average point 4.40 and J2 became the severe scorer with observed point 231, and neutrality average point 2.99. The easiest task carried out by students is "Reference (139 point and 4.01 neutrality average)" and "Physical and psychological situation (138 point and 3.98 neutrality average)" in seminar presentations. The most difficult task carried out by students is "Answers to questions (108 point and 3.11 neutrality average)" and "Synthesizing subject (108 point and 3.11 neutrality average)".

Constraining of the students under the context of "answers to questions" and "Synthesizing subject" is an indicator that they are at the beginning in academician and scientific research job yet during seminar presentation of post graduate students. In addition, it could be said that, these students do not have a good command of subject and do not think critically.

Results show that tutors dominate the seminars. For example, They take 111 turns per tutor versus 77 per student and use up 47% of the overall speaking time, but the nature of turns was indicate of a high degree of authoritativeness: they enjoyed 61% of all formally legitimate external turns, by virtue of their role as tutors, and 30% of all legitimate open floors (Klerk 1995). In addition, academic members of faculty designate that seminar courses were not performed in accordance with the aim and necessary importance was not given to the course (Öztürk, Sapanca&Kuyumcu 2007).

It was observed that the juries who are academic members had biases in the study. Some of the jury members acted severity to some students and acted leniency to some others in study. Juries acted more leniency to students who are close their fields in scoring when jury evaluations are investigated. They made severe scoring to other students.

These may be recommended as a conclusion of application of Rasch model concerning seminar courses: (1) Measurement instruments should be

used in addition multifaceted Rasch measurement model in order to set forth the biases reasons of juries more specifically. (2) A jury that consisted of 3 persons should be established, members of the jury should have signature in seminar booklet, and the successful/unsuccessful decision should be given by the academic member of the course due to result. (3) Failures observed at the end of Rasch analysis will be minimum if seminars have credits and standards are established. In that case, the differences in the implementation will be disappear (In some places delivering booklet only, absence of seminar presentation, no audience to attend the presentation, etc).

References

Adams, S. M. &Rytmeister, C. (2000). *Beginning The Academic Career: How Can It Best Be Supported in Changing Unversity Climate?*.Retrieved March 17, 2010, from http://www.ascilite.org.au/aset-archives/confs/aset-herdsa2000/procs/adams.html.

Arizona State Universty. (2010). *Doctoral Seminar B: Early and Adult Literacy/Biliteracy.* Retrieved December 12, 2010, from http://www.langlit.asu.edu/seminar_B_emerg_lit.pdf

Bond, T. G. & Fox, C. M. (2001). *Applying TheRasch Model: Fundamental Measurement in The Human Science*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Elhan, A. H. &Atakurt, Y. (2005). Why Is It Necessary Do Use Rasch Analysis When Evaluting Measures?. *Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 58, 47-50.

Fisher, W. P., Jr. (1997). *Blind Guides to Measurement.Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 11(2), 566-567. Retrieved December 1, 2009, from http://www.rasch.org/mrt/rmt112g.htm

Fisher, W. P., Jr. (2005). *Meaningfulness, Measurement and Item Response Theory (IRT).Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 19 (2), 1018-1020. Retrieved December 1, 2009, from http://www.rasch.org/mrt/rmt192d.htm

Gözütok, D. (2007). *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri.* Ankara: EkinoksYayınları.

Kent University. (2010). *Masters / Doctoral Seminar Syllabus*. Retrieved March 31, 2010, from http://www.cs.kent.edu/~walker/classes/msphdsem.s07/syllabus.html

Klerk, V. D. (1995).The Discourse of Post-Graduate Seminars. *Linguistics and Education*, 7 (3), 157-174.

Linacre, J. M. (1993). Generalizability Theory and Many Facet RaschMeasurement. *Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association.* (April, 13, 1993), (ED 364 573). Atlanta Georgia.

Linacre, J. M. (1994). *Sample Size and Item Calibration Stability. Rasch at The Measurement Transactions*, 7 (4), 328. Retrieved December 1, 2009, from http://www.rasch.org/mrt/rmt74m.htm

Linacre, J. M. (1995). *ANOVA with Rasch Measures.Paper Presented Annual Meeting of The AERA*, San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

Linacre, J. M. (2006). *Winsteps.RaschMeasurement Computer Program.Chigago: Winsteps*. Retrieved December 1, 2009, from http://www.winsteps.com/winman/index.htm

Official Gazette (1996, 1 July). *Regulations of Post-Graduate Education and Teaching*, Num.22683.The Council of Higher Education, Turkey.

Oğuzkan, A. F. (1993). *Eğitim Terimleri Sözlüğü.* Ankara: EmelMatbaacılık.

Öztürk, F., Sapancı, A. & Kuyumcu A. (2007). Lisansüstü Eğitim Seminer Dersine İlişkin Öğretim Üyelerinin Görüş ve Beklentilerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *III. Lisansüstü Eğitim Sempozyumu: Lisansüstü Eğitimde Sorunlar ve Çözüm Önerileri,* 17-20 Ekim 2007, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Smith, L. E. (1987). *Discourse Across Cultures*.NewYork: Prentice Hall.

Tan, Ş. &Erdoğan, A. (2004). *Öğretimi Planlama ve Değerlendirme.* Ankara: Pegem A. Yayıncılık.