

Which Psychological Features do College Students Value in their Professors?

¿Qué características psicológicas valoran los estudiantes universitarios de sus profesores?

Quais são as características psicológicas valorizadas pelos estudantes universitários dos seus professores?

Sonia Casillas Martín* Marcos Cabezas González**

Facultad de Educación, Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, España

Ana María Pinto Llorente***

Facultad de Educación, Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, Salamanca, España

Received: 20/05/16

Revised: 22/08/16

Accepted: 28/10/16

ABSTRACT. For more than three decades, teaching work assessment based on the student's perception has been used. This is considered one of the most classical and most used models within institutions. This paper seeks to identify the concept of a good college professor according to the psychological traits valued by students. To this end, a longitudinal, quantitative study was conducted on a sample of more than 6000 students, in a repeated manner, over a 10-year time period. The tool used for gathering data was a questionnaire composed of an adjective scale with a Likert-type option. It underwent a pilot study and was evaluated by experts as validation procedures. The results obtained identify the psychological traits proposed by students to define a good professor. These are related to basic personal traits, personal values, as well as to sociability and participation, psycho-sociological aspects and interpersonal relationship aspects.

Keywords:
college,
teaching,
professor
efficiency,
professor
assessment,
psychological
features.

RESUMEN. Desde hace más de tres décadas se utiliza la evaluación de la labor docente basada en la percepción de los alumnos. Considerado como uno de los modelos con mayor historia y utilización en las instituciones. Este artículo trata de identificar el concepto de buen profesor universitario de acuerdo con las características psicológicas valoradas por los alumnos. Para ello se llevó a cabo un estudio longitudinal cuantitativo que investigó una muestra de más de 6000 estudiantes, de manera repetida, a lo largo de un período de 10 años. El instrumento utilizado para la recogida de la información fue un cuestionario compuesto por una escala de adjetivos con opción de respuesta tipo Likert, sometido a un estudio piloto y juicio de expertos como procedimientos de validación. Los resultados obtenidos identifican las características

Palabras clave:
universidad,
docencia,
eficacia del
docente,
evaluación
del docente,
características
psicológicas.

Cite as: Casillas, S., Cabezas, M. & Pinto, A. M. (2016). *¿Qué características psicológicas valoran los estudiantes universitarios de sus profesores? [Which Psychological Features do College Students Value in their Professors?]. Revista Digital de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria, 10(2), 1-16. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.19083/ridu.10.466>*

* E-mail: scasillasma@usal.es ** E-mail: mcabezasgo@usal.es *** E-mail: ampintoll@upsa.es

psicológicas que los alumnos proponen para definir un buen profesor, las cuales se relacionan con características personales básicas, valores personales, así como con la sociabilidad y la participación, aspectos psicosociales y de relaciones interpersonales.

RESUMO. A avaliação do ensino baseado na percepção dos alunos é usada por mais de três décadas. Considerada um dos modelos com mais história e uso nas instituições. Este artigo visa identificar o conceito de bom Professor Universitário, de acordo com as características psicológicas valorizadas pelos alunos. Foi realizado um estudo longitudinal quantitativo que pesquisou com uma amostra de mais de 6000 estudantes, repetidamente, durante um período de 10 anos. O instrumento utilizado para a coleta da informação foi um questionário composto por uma escala de adjetivos com resposta tipo Likert, com um estudo piloto e o julgamento de especialistas tais como procedimentos de validação. Os resultados identificam as características psicológicas que os alunos propõem para definir um bom professor, que se relacionam com características pessoais, valores pessoais, bem como com a sociabilidade e participação, aspectos psico-sociais e relações interpessoais.

Palavras chave:

Universidade, ensino, eficácia do professor, avaliação do professor, características psicológicas.

For more than three decades, reference has been made to the evaluation of teaching work based on the students' perception, considered as one of the models with a longer history and use at institutions, since listening to which are the features mentioned by students to identify good professors contributes to understanding what is a good education and can guide the decision-making process in the classroom (Sgrecciay & Cirelli, 2015).

There are numerous research studies on the concept of a good professor (Abadía et al., 2015; Álvarez, García & Gil, 1999a, 1999b; Casero, 2010; Casillas, 2006b; Casillas & Cabezas, 2010; Debesse & Mialaret, 1980; De la Orden, 1990; Gallego, 1988; Gargallo, Sánchez, Ros & Ferreras, 2010; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; Mañú, 1996; McKeachie, 1983; Reboloso & Pozo, 2000; Romero, Gleason, Rubio & Arriola, 2016; Sepúlveda, Opazo, Sáez & Lemarie, 2015; Tejedor & Montero, 1990; Wotruba & Wright, 1974). Most of them are focused on compiling qualities, skills and behaviors that a university professor should exhibit throughout their teaching work, and usually describe the features that are related to good communication and didactic, organizational and structural skills. They tend to emphasize the features related to the development of classes (clarity in presenting contents, preparedness, and proficiency in the subject, evaluation, interest and

motivation for the course, flexibility, attention to the students, good relations, creating a good environment in the classroom, among others); but few of them focus in some psychological or personal characteristics and always do it by proposing them next to a broad set of dimensions, factors, criteria, and variables that sum up more specifically the traits of a good professor. In general, studies referred to the students' perception regarding their professors, coincide in that "university students, regardless of the Degree they pursue or the country where they study, demand all clear explanations from a good professor, that he or she be proficient in the subject-matter, be respectful and show interest (Hamer, 2015).

When we talk about psychological features, we mean those personality traits that the students value in what they consider a good professor. If we review the state of the question, we can find research works in which the psychological features of the professor are taken into account as an additional element when creating judgment about the educational quality, and thus approach among their dimensions some referred to these personality traits of a good university professor. Different studies indicate that for a student, a good professor is: open with students, well-mannered,

assertive, self-critical, close (trusting attitude, good listener, calling students by their names), good spirits, understanding, available and accessible outside of the classroom, empathetic, flexible, fair, patient, approachable, objective, respectful, responsible, etc. (Cabalín, Navarro, Zamora & San Martín, 2008; Cataldi & Lage, 2004; Gargallo et al., 2010; Hamer, 2015; Romero et al., 2016; Sayós, Pagés, Amador & Jorba, 2014). On the other hand, Casero (2010) evidences that a good professor must instill confidence (to be or appear as a self-confident person); to show interest (the sense of being with a teacher who is interested in having the students learn; transmits excitement, enthusiasm, and a sense that he or she likes what he or she does) is a relevant aspect of a student's perception; the teacher's congeniality appears as a becoming element for the teaching-learning process, and relates to enjoyable, fun, entertaining and motivating classes; and the positive mood tone of the educational work seems to resonate greatly on the attention and motivation. This author also indicates some features that the students do not want in their professors: authoritarianism, arrogance, superiority, haughtiness, insolence, and prepotency.

This article tries to verify if the beliefs of the Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca (Spain) students with respect to the sense and meaning of the good university professor are directed toward the selection of psychological traits; in addition to describing, in a detailed manner, the psychological features that students of different Degrees value positively and negatively regarding the concept of a good university professor, and trying to find differences based on the Degree they are enrolled in.

METHOD

Design

The main purpose of this work is to identify the positive and negative psychological or personal qualities, which are chosen by the students to define the concept of a good professor and to verify if there are differences in perception between two student samples after 10 years have elapsed between one sample and the other.

A quantitative longitudinal study type was used which researched the same group repeatedly throughout a 10-year period. Concretely, it is a cohort design; studies

where it is possible to have more than one study group, in this case with two groups, followed during a ten-year period to observe the different perceptions they show before the psychological features they wish in their professors. This type of study is very appropriate for proving if the time dimension can influence the perceptions of the research subjects.

Participants

The population under study was comprised of students of Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca from all Degrees willing to participate in the research. At the time when data was collected from the first sample, in 2005, as during the second time, in 2015, the following Degrees participated: Journalism, Advertising, Audiovisual Communication, Education (Primary/Infant), Psychology, Speech Therapy, Psychopedagogy, Computer Science and Engineering, Philosophy, Social Education, Humanities, and Pedagogy. In the case of the students of the Physical Activity and Sports Sciences program Degree, they only participated in 2015 since it is a newly created Degree.

The samples were selected through the stratified random procedure, making it a unique stratified probability sampling. For that, two independent samples were chosen, one decade apart; the first comprised of students that attended their Higher Education studies in the 2005 course, consisting of 2,624 students ($N = 2,624$), and the second sample including enrolled students in this University in the 2015 course year, for a total of 3,480 students ($N = 3,480$). The final participant sample amounted to 6,104 students ($N = 6,104$), of which 73.8% are men and 26.2% women, with ages between 18 and 32, studying at 13 Degrees, of the 15 existing in said University (see Table 1).

The estimation of the adequate sample size led us to determine a population of 8,500 students ($N = 8,500$) in the two years studied and all the Degrees analyzed of said University, which translates into a confidence level of 80%. The reason for choosing this University for the study was that, besides having great prestige and recognition both nationally and internationally, it has worked deeply with the issued related to teaching assessment and quality, focusing also on continuous institutional improvement. This is a very important

Table 1
Sample distribution by gender, age and Degree

VARIABLES		TOTAL SAMPLE		SAMPLE BY YEARS	
		N	%	2005 (43%)	2015 (57%)
Gender	Female	4499	73.8	1935	2564
	Male	1605	26.2	690	915
Total		6104	100	2625	3479
Age	18-21	3015	49.4	1296	1719
	22-25	2673	43.8	1149	1524
	26-32	416	6.8	179	237
Total		6104	100	2624	3480
Degree	Journalism	385	6.3	166	219
	Advertising	521	8.5	224	297
	Audiovisual				
	Communication	384	6.3	165	219
	Education				
	(Primary/Infant)	1705	27.9	856	849
	Psychology	1124	18.4	483	641
	Speech Therapy	427	7.0	184	243
	Psychopedagogy	260	4.2	112	148
	Computer Science				
	and Engineering	608	10	262	346
	Philosophy	24	0.4	10	14
	Social Education	189	3.1	81	108
	Humanities	13	0.3	6	7
	Pedagogy	177	2.9	76	101
	Physical Activity				
and Sport Sciences	287	4.7	0	287	
Total		6104	100	2624	3480

reason for this work since it implies that its professors, besides having an ample and extensive professional and academic trajectory, are familiar with the educational quality and Higher Education improvement issues.

Information Collection Instrument

The instrument used for the collection of information was the “Questionnaire on the ideal professor,” designed and validated by Villa (1985), put under a pilot study and expert judgment as validation procedures. After a review of different instruments, this was selected because it fit the study objectives more closely.

With the data obtained for this study, its high reliability as internal consistency was verified. The resulting

Cronbach Alpha was .97; very acceptable for this type of instruments (Morales, Urosa & Blanco, 2003).

In the work of Villa, the scale was defined by 200 traits, found empirically, that the students of intermediate education had to value. In this work, we used this original scale, reducing it to 186 adjectives, doing without those qualities that were not appropriate for Higher Education. The answer options are of a Likert scale type, with values between 1 and 5, being 1 *not important at all*, 2 *a little important*, 3 *regular*, 4 *quite important* and 5 *very important*. It is organized considering a series of dimensions that were differentiated in this author’s work after completing an exhaustive factorial analysis, and those are, physical-sport, personal and

relationship, humor, imposition and exigency, and organizational dimensions.

The psychological features that are the center of attention of this work are grouped together within the dimensions mentioned by Villa, such as personal, relationship and humor. That is how we will make the distinction in the results section.

Procedure

Regarding information collection, the researchers tried not to interfere with the educational activity at the university and had the students complete the surveys at class end. A protocol was written up detailing all the steps to follow in the field work in order to maintain the same criteria in the contact and access to classrooms by all the researchers. It also included the procedure for information collection, beginning with contact with the affected professor, explaining the aims of the research and explaining the content of the project both to the students and the professors involved.

For the final determination of beliefs of the student body regarding the psychological features characteristics that they consider a good university professor should have, a descriptive and inferential analysis of the results was performed, based on a non-experimental methodology (Arnal, del Rincón & Latorre, 1992; Kerlinger & Lee, 2002), by means of statistical package SPSS v.21. As we have previously explained, the main objective of these techniques is to see which psychological or personal adjectives or qualities are those chosen by students to define the concept of a good professor, and also which ones they think would not define it. For that, a detailed analysis of averages is made in each one of the 80 qualities selected and related to the psychological and personal features that are the object of that study. An inferential analysis was also performed on a comparison of averages. Once the normality (Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk test) and homoscedasticity (test of Levene) parametric assumptions were verified, we opted for the utilization of parametric, hypothesis contrasting tests, in particular, the Student T-test (for two samples) and ANOVA (> 2 samples), in both cases, because they were two independent samples, which allowed us to verify

the existence of differences in the valuations given ten years apart, in addition to finding out whether there are differences in terms of the Degrees involved. All of that allows us to identify the most significant basic psychological features characteristics and to point out the similarities and differences among the data.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents in hierarchical order the basic psychological features, from higher to lower average score obtained, the aspects that the students value as best in their professors.

The ten adjectives that were better valued by students reach averages of 4 or higher, so they may be considered as the psychological qualities that define a good university professor for the students. Between these aspects that they emphasize with the higher scores, the students express that the professor who is going to educate them at the University ought to be communicative, respectful, fair, understanding, accessible to students, coherent, with good personality, creates a trusting environment, humane, pleasant, helpful, objective, sociable, democratic human, does not deceive, with a vocation, recognizes mistakes, pleasant, listener, participatory, enterprising, well-mannered, honest and sincere.

However, students consider that there are psychological qualities that must be avoided in a good university professor, all of them valued with averages next to or below 2. Among them, (see Table 3) that the professor be earnest, upright, authoritarian, impulsive, meticulous, strict, harsh, superior, proud, easily upset, resentful, screamer, and dictator. All of them referred to characteristics related to the professor's emotional stability. It does not seem relevant to them for the teaching role that the professor be a joker, uninterested, paternalistic, ironic or gossipy.

When we analyzed the different samples (2005 and 2015) via the Student T-test for comparing averages, no statistically significant differences are found between them ($p > .524$). However, we found significant differences in some personality qualities if we consider the Faculty where they study.

Table 2
Basic psychological features of the ideal professor

FEATURES	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Communicative	2	5	4.682	0.521
Respectful	2	5	4.635	0.57
Fair	1	5	4.627	0.60
Understanding	3	5	4.609	0.53
Accessible to students	1	5	4.601	0.60
Coherent	2	5	4.591	0.57
Good Personality	2	5	4.575	0.57
Creates Trusting Environment	1	5	4.539	0.64
Humane	2	5	4.538	0.66
Entertaining	1	5	4.531	0.62
Helpful	2	5	4.519	0.68
Objective	1	5	4.502	0.67
Sociable	1	5	4.483	0.75
Democratic	1	1	4.479	0.75
Does not deceive	1	5	4.467	1.22
With a vocation	1	5	4.463	0.83
Recognizes mistakes	1	5	4.456	0.67
Pleasant	2	5	4.447	0.64
Listener	1	5	4.407	0.71
Participatory	1	5	4.40	0.69
Entrepreneur	1	5	4.396	0.75
Well-mannered	2	5	4.393	0.67
Honest	1	5	4.393	0.83
Sincere	1	5	4.378	0.79

Note: $N = 6,014$

When we applied the ANOVA technique as a function of the Degree factor in the adjectives related to the professor's psychological traits, we found significant differences in aspects shown in Table 4 ($p < .048$). The students consider different qualities in the concept of their ideal professor. Aspects that surely are closely related to their aspirations, needs and interests--not only professional but also personal--and to their motivations.

As a complementary measurement, we calculated the effect size by transforming Cohen's d into r^2 (variance explained by the model). The values obtained in the personal, relational, and humor qualities when we

establish differences based on the Degree (see Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7), are between 0.05 and 0.09 in most of the adjectives studied, which is equivalent to a 0.5 in Cohen's d . According to the interpretation by this author (Cohen, 1988), a medium effect size is considered, except for the optimistic trait (humor dimension), with a value of 0.1 equal to a 0.8 in Cohen's d , considered a large effect size.

Considering the dimensions established after the factorial analysis made by the creators of the instrument, we want to emphasize among them: the personnel, relation, and humor dimension, all of which affect the psychological features.

Table 3

Psychological features that the students consider less relevant for the concept of ideal professor

FEATURES	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
Earnest	1	5	2.925	1.10
Upright	1	5	2.876	1.18
Joker	1	5	2.874	1.05
Uninterested	1	5	2.800	1.57
Authoritarian	1	5	2.698	1.17
Impulsive	1	5	2.628	1.20
Paternalistic	1	5	2.622	1.17
Meticulous	1	5	2.615	1.15
Ironic	1	5	2.324	1.14
Strict	1	5	2.303	1.14
Harsh	1	5	2.221	1.10
Superior	1	5	2.016	1.06
Proud	1	5	1.914	1.08
Easily upset	1	5	1.711	1.08
Gossipy	1	5	1.505	0.86
Resentful	1	5	1.437	0.97
Screamer	1	5	1.406	0.70
Dictator	1	5	1.361	0.78

Note: $N = 6,014$

Below, we present the analysis for each one of the features comprised in the dimension.

Personal Dimension

We found significant differences as far as the characteristics of their ideal professor based on the Degree being attended (see Tables 4 and 5).

In the case of Journalism, the students do not deem it relevant for the professor to be demanding. In the Advertising Degree, they deem it important for the professor to be efficient, and not so much creative, diligent or impulsive. In Audiovisual Communication, they deem it important for the professor to be humane, resolved and natural, without being demanding.

In the Education (Primary/Infant) Degree, the positive qualities they have in mind about their ideal professor are, among others: provides advice, disciplined,

diplomatic, stable, efficient, clever, peaceful, natural, punctual, mature and enterprising; however, they prefer them not to be strict, not considering that he or she be coherent or not related to being a good professional.

The students of the Faculty of Psychology deem that a good professor ought to be humane, participatory, natural and clever; without being, however, diligent.

In the case of the Speech Therapy Degree, the students demand a creative professor, who provides advice, trusts his or her students, is humane, imaginative, diplomatic, efficient, participatory, peaceful, democratic, does not deceive, is enterprising, original and liberal, without being priggish or compassionate.

In the Psychopedagogy Degree, the students deem that their professor ought to be creative, efficient, and

Table 4
Significant differences in the qualities related to the personal dimension based on the Degree (one-way ANOVA) - part 1

DEGREE	AVERAGE SCORES																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Journalism	4	4.14	3.39	3.92	3.44	4	3.33	4.07	4.28	4.03	3.2	3.62	3.64	3.78	4.17	4.57	4.17	3.67	3.82
Advertising	3.81	3.92	3.35	3.55	3.15	3.60	3	3.89	4.36	3.73	3.47	3.18	3.78	3.63	3.89	4.60	3.92	3.28	3.60
Audiovisual																			
Communication	4.03	3.92	3.03	3.64	3.53	3.82	3.46	3.75	4.32	3.89	3.14	3.39	3.67	3.85	3.92	4.39	3.82	3.53	3.75
Education																		3.64	4.16
(Primary/Infant)	4.45	4.47	2.95	4.10	3.86	4.17	3.78	3.93	4.60	4.35	3.70	3.66	4.19	4.12	4.39	4.46	4.18	3.49	4.09
Psychology	4.40	4.39	3.50	3.81	3.32	4.08	3.34	3.84	4.65	4.24	3.45	3.18	3.76	3.87	4.19	4.75	3.97	3.77	4.12
Speech Therapy	4.58	4.35	3.48	4.12	3.80	4.38	3.43	4.09	4.70	4.38	3.40	3.60	3.96	4.10	4.29	4.64	4.19		
Psychopedagogy	4.52	4.23	3.31	3.85	3.36	4.10	3.23	4.16	4.54	4.12	3.25	3.20	3.69	3.83	4.14	4.60	3.52	3.36	3.94
Computer Science																			
and Engineering	3.62	4.25	3.25	4	3.50	3.50	2.25	4	4.50	3.87	3.25	3.25	3.50	3.50	4.37	4.37	4.12	3.50	3.62
Philosophy	4.50	2.50	3.50	2	4	4	4.50	5	4	4	4.50	3	3.50	2	4.50	4.50	4	1.50	3.50
Social Education	4.28	4.50	3.69	4	3.42	4	3.28	3.85	4.71	4.38	3.50	3.46	3.78	4.14	4.50	4.57	4.28	3.92	4
Humanities	3	4	4	3	2	3	2	2	5	2	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	2	2
Pedagogy	4.23	4.53	3.46	3.76	3.53	4.07	3.15	4.23	4.69	3.61	3.53	3.69	3.91	3.84	3.76	4.61	3.84	3.07	3.69
Physical Activity																			
and Sport Sciences	4.14	4.38	2.95	3.61	3.42	3.76	3.33	3.47	4.19	3.90	3.76	3.61	4.23	3.71	4.19	4.23	4.09	3.66	3.85
F	3.43	3.10	1.96	2.15	2.24	2.13	3.76	2.07	2.17	2.04	2.21	3.36	3.05	3.10	1.88	1.83	2.71	1.71	1.90
p	.00	.00	.02	.01	.00	.01	.00	.01	.01	.00	.05	.03	.00	.02	.02	.02	.02	.02	.00
r²	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.06

Note: 1 = creative; 2 = active; 3 = coherent; 4 = provides advice; 5 = calm; 6 = trusts the students; 7 = bold; 8 = critical; 9 = humane; 10 = imaginative; 11 = demanding; 12 = hard-working; 13 = disciplined; 14 = diplomatic; 15 = stable; 16 = efficient; 17 = humble; 18 = intuitive; 19 = clever; r² = effect size

Table 5

Significant differences in the qualities related to the personal dimension based on the Degree (one-way ANOVA) - part 2

DEGREE	AVERAGE SCORES																	
	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
Journalism	4.28	3.92	4.17	4.17	3.32	2.92	3.71	4.03	4.57	4.32	3.25	3.85	4.25	4	3.75	4	3.96	2.14
Advertising	4.07	3.76	3.71	3.68	2.52	2.84	3.39	3.89	4.44	4.60	3.07	3.57	4.13	3.64	3.13	3.81	3.68	2.16
Audiovisual																		
Communication	4.28	3.82	4.07	4.21	2.78	2.82	4.14	4.14	4.32	4.32	3.46	3.46	4.25	3.89	3.25	4	3.67	2.32
Education																		
(Primary/Infant)	4.46	4.21	4.15	4.27	2.29	2.90	3.40	4.51	4.38	4.35	3.78	4.22	4.56	4.25	3.64	4.32	3.53	2.61
Psychology	4.50	3.87	3.79	4.21	2.85	2.23	3.41	4	4.55	4.79	3.24	3.89	4.36	4.04	3.50	4.34	3.74	2.03
Speech Therapy	4.54	4.16	4.06	4.03	2.80	2.48	4.16	3.83	4.70	4.86	3.32	3.76	4.51	4.51	3.48	4.25	4.26	2.19
Psychopedagogy	4.41	3.69	3.74	3.96	2.67	2.32	3.65	3.83	4.50	4.20	3.09	4.03	4.50	3.98	3.01	4.09	3.36	2.18
Computer Science																		
and Engineering	3.75	3.62	3.75	3.12	2.12	2.62	3	3.25	4.50	4.25	2.50	2	4	3.50	3.37	3.50	2.87	1.75
Philosophy	4.50	2.50	2	2	3.50	1.50	4.50	3	4	3	2.50	3	3.50	4.50	1.50	3.50	2	1.50
Social Education	4.64	4.35	4.21	4.21	3.28	2.14	3.57	3.71	4.57	4.21	3.42	4.07	4.42	4.38	3.84	4.35	3.92	2.07
Humanities	4	3	4	2	2	4	5	3	1	5	4	1	4	2	4	2	2	2
Pedagogy	4.46	3.92	3.61	4.07	2.61	2.07	2.76	4.07	4.69	4.84	3.38	4.15	4.46	4.23	3.46	3.92	3.53	2.07
Physical Activity																		
and Sport Sciences	4.28	3.66	3.60	4.19	2.09	2.95	3.57	4.42	4.50	4.20	3.61	3.90	4.14	3.95	3.80	4.28	3.33	3.04
<i>F</i>	2.67	2.80	2.98	2.12	3.37	4.04	2.68	3.94	2.95	1.98	2.81	2.77	1.96	1.95	2.78	2.02	2.46	2.1
<i>p</i>	.01	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.03	.00	.00	.06	.00	.00	.02	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
<i>r</i> ²	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.04	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.06

Note: 20 = participatory; 21 = peaceful; 22 = resolved; 23 = natural; 24 = impulsive; 25 = meticulous; 26 = without preferences; 27 = punctual; 28 = democratic; 29 = does not deceive; 30 = priggish; 31 = mature; 32 = enterprising; 33 = original; 34 = compassionate; 35 = clever; 36 = liberal; 37 = strict; r^2 = effect size

enterprising. And should not be either demanding, nor humble, meticulous, or strict.

The students of the Faculty of Computer Science and Engineering deem that a good professor ought to be active, provide advice, humane, stable, efficient, humble, enterprising, and democratic; although they think that he or she does not need to be bold, demanding, disciplined, participatory, priggish or strict.

The students of the Faculty of Philosophy think that their professor ought to be creative, critical, bold, calm, stable and participatory, without a need to be active, provide advice, intuitive, priggish, disciplined, diplomatic, peaceful or strict.

The students of Social Education think that the best professor for them is that who is active, humane, diplomatic, participatory, peaceful, resolved, natural, democratic, does not deceive, mature, enterprising, original and clever. The qualities that are not important for them when defining a good professor are being impulsive, meticulous, and strict.

Those of the Degree in Pedagogy understand a good professor is that who is creative, active, humane, efficient, democratic, does not deceive, mature, enterprising, and original; without taking into account such features as being coherent, bold, intuitive, impulsive, meticulous, without preferences, or strict.

For those studying Humanities, the most important characteristics are being coherent, humane, demanding, diligent, stable, humble, meticulous, without preferences, does not deceive, priggish, and compassionate. They do not consider it important for the professor to be calm, trusting of their students, bold, critical, imaginative, intuitive, clever, natural, impulsive, punctual, democratic, mature, original, clever, liberal, or strict.

Finally, for the students of the Physical Activity and Sport Sciences Degree, a good professor ought to be creative, active, humane, diplomatic, stable, efficient, humble, participatory, natural, punctual, enterprising, democratic, clever, and does not deceive. Nevertheless, they think that coherence, being impulsive or meticulous, are not important traits.

Relationship Dimension

The students of different Faculties deem, without a doubt, that these types of characteristics have an influence when considering a good university professor (see Table 6).

Journalism students deem that a professor ought to be well-mannered and pleasant, but not an authoritarian. Advertising students deem that the professor ought to be pleasant, and not an authoritarian. Those from Audiovisual Communication, along the same lines of the previous group, deem the professor ought to be well-mannered and pleasant, as well as helpful and not an authoritarian, they don't think he or she should be a friend either. The students of the Education (Primary/ Infant) Degree think that he or she ought to be helpful, pleasant, and well-mannered; being also not important that he or she is authoritarian or a friend. The students of Psychology and Speech Therapy have the same opinion as the previous group.

The students of Psychopedagogy think that a professor ought to be helpful, approachable, and accessible, without being so important that he or she is authoritarian or friend. Computer Science and Engineering students think that he or she ought to be accessible and helpful and thus, not authoritarian. In Philosophy, the averages diminish considerably, although they continue emphasizing that the professor ought to be pleasant and not authoritarian. In Social Education, just like the study Degrees similar to their area of knowledge, the students think that the most important trait is for him or her to be well-mannered, pleasant, and helpful, and not authoritarian. In Humanities, they highlight all the above qualities, with a very high average. In Pedagogy, the students think that their professor ought to be well-mannered, pleasant, helpful and approachable, and not authoritarian. The Physical Activity and Sport Sciences Degree holds the same points of view as the Education (Primary/Infant), Pedagogy, and Social Education Degrees, since they are similar.

Humor Dimension

Regarding this dimension (see Table 7), the students of Journalism think that their ideal professor ought to be enthusiastic and sociable. Advertising students deem that the professor ought to be likable, in addition

Table 6

Significant differences in the dimension of qualities related to the relationship dimension based on the Degree (one-way ANOVA)

DEGREE	AVERAGE SCORES						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Journalism	3.39	4.50	4.46	4.21	2.28	4.32	4.28
Advertising	3.35	4.36	4.42	4.34	2.71	4.02	4.31
Audiovisual Communication	3.03	4.32	4.39	4.32	2.57	4.14	4.10
Education (Primary/Infant)	2.95	4.49	4.56	4.70	3.05	4.39	4.26
Psychology	3.50	4.42	4.50	4.57	2.68	4.31	4.48
Speech Therapy	3.48	4.58	4.51	4.67	2.87	4.67	4.45
Psychopedagogy	3.35	4.12	4.18	4.45	2.14	4.29	4.38
Computer Science and Engineering	3.21	4.25	3.75	4.12	2.62	3.75	4.25
Philosophy	3.50	3	4	3.50	1.50	3.50	3
Social Education	3.69	4.57	4.64	4.78	2.14	3.92	4.21
Humanities	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Pedagogy	3.46	4.30	4.46	4.30	2.61	4.30	3.76
Physical Activity and Sport Sciences	2.95	4.23	4.42	4.38	3	3.85	4.33
<i>F</i>	1.92	2.32	2.36	2.97	3.19	2.86	2.11
<i>p</i>	.03	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01
<i>r</i> ²	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.07

Note: 1 = friend; 2 = well-mannered; 3 = pleasant; 4 = helpful; 5 = authoritarian; 6 = approachable; 7 = accessible; *r*² = effect size

to being sociable. Those of Education (Primary/Infant) think that their professor ought to be good-spirited, be cheering, enthusiastic, expressive, sociable, likable, joyful, and optimistic. Psychology students think also that their professor ought to be good-spirited, cheering, enthusiastic, expressive, sociable, likable and talkative. The Speech Therapy students think that a good professor must be good-spirited, also cheering, funny, enthusiastic, expressive, in addition to being nice, sociable, likable and optimistic.

Psychopedagogy students deem that a professor ought to be enthusiastic, expressive, sociable, and optimistic. The students attending the Computer Science and Engineering Degree deem it important for their professor to be good-spirited, lowering the score for the rest of traits considerably. Those of Philosophy think that the most important trait is for him or her to be enthusiastic and expressive. Those of Social Education think that

their professor ought to be good-spirited, be cheering, expressive, sociable, likable, joyful, and optimist. The students of Humanities deem that it is central for the professor to be funny and sociable, and not a screamer. To Pedagogy students, it is important that the professor is cheering, enthusiastic, sociable, joyful, and optimistic. And finally, the Physical Activity and Sport Sciences students think that their professor ought to be sociable, followed by optimistic, joyful, and likable. Additionally, in many of the Degrees, students do not consider it important to be funny to be a good professor.

DISCUSSION

The psychological features that a good professor should have according to a university student, in most cases, are related to basic personal characteristics, personal values, as well as being compatible with sociability and participation, psychosocial, and of interpersonal relations.

Table 7
Significant differences in the qualities related to the humor dimension based on the Degree (one-way ANOVA)

DEGREE	AVERAGE SCORES													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Journalism	4.28	4.17	3.85	2.92	1.34	4.42	4.14	3.22	4	4.46	4.21	4	4.21	3.89
Advertising	3.97	3.89	3.50	2.52	1.39	3.89	4	2.78	3.76	4.07	4.07	3.55	3.76	3.26
Audiovisual														
Communication	4	3.85	3.46	2.78	1.53	3.75	4.07	2.78	3.75	4.28	3.64	3.77	4	3.46
Education														
(Primary/Infant)	4.20	4.30	3.92	2.79	1.39	4.29	4.32	2.97	3.67	4.39	4.04	4.19	4.41	3.55
Psychology	4.31	4.20	3.86	3.20	1.36	4.10	4.29	3.40	3.90	4.45	4.15	3.98	4.18	4.01
Speech Therapy	4.32	4.13	4.19	3.29	1.58	4.32	4.41	3.48	4.06	4.19	4.35	4.16	4.16	3.54
Psychopedagogy	3.85	3.94	3.56	2.72	1.31	4.40	4.16	2.61	3.48	4.16	3.94	3.60	4.25	3.20
Computer Science														
and Engineering	4.25	3.87	3.12	2.37	1.12	3.37	3.62	2.75	3.50	3.62	3.50	3.37	3.37	3.25
Philosophy	4	3.50	3.50	1.50	3	4.50	4.50	2	1	2.50	3	3	1	2
Social Education	4.42	4.64	3.85	3.14	1.57	3.78	4.28	3.42	3.78	4.57	4.57	4.50	4.28	3.78
Humanities	4	2	5	2	1	2	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4
Pedagogy	3.84	4.23	3.92	2.92	1.07	4.15	3.69	2.92	3.46	4.46	3.76	4.30	4.38	3.15
Physical Activity														
and Sport Sciences	3.95	3.71	3.52	2.61	1.57	4.28	3.85	2.66	3.61	4.52	4.04	4.10	4.28	3.42
F	1.74	2.85	2.18	2.38	1.79	2.03	3.23	3.80	2.97	1.82	2.41	3.23	1.92	1.78
p	.05	.00	.01	.00	.04	.00	.01	.00	.02	.00	.05	.00	.00	.00
r²	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.1	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.13	0.08

Note: 1 = good-spirited; 2 = cheering; 3 = funny; 4 = joker; 5 = screamer; 6 = enthusiastic; 7 = expressive; 8 = amusing; 9 = nice; 10 = sociable; 11 = likeable; 12 = joyful; 13 = optimistic; 14 = talkative; r² = effect size

Research studies with similar results have been conducted in most of the Spanish universities. Based on a study at Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, the students consider that there are certain behaviors that are synonymous to teaching quality (Tejedor & Montero, 1990). Very similar results were reached at Universidad del País Vasco in a study performed by Apodaka, Arbizu, Grao, Hornilla & Olalde, (1990), also at Universidad de Córdoba (Fernández & González, 2012), at Universidad de Barcelona (Sayós et al., 2014), and at Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca (Casillas, 2008; Casillas & Cabezas, 2009). Universidad Complutense de Madrid performed a similar study, based on the film "Dead Poets Society," resulting in psychological features very closely related to those approached in this work: "That the professor is a friend, understanding, innovative, joyful, entertaining, creative, who teaches students to know themselves, who develops every student's skills, who looks for ways to teach outside the classroom, and creates a festive climate." (Álvarez et al., 1999b, p. 275). Nevertheless, most students would not agree with having a professor who is: "disciplined and systematic," with the same conclusions as those presented in this work. The same results based on the work performed at Universidad de Sevilla by Alvarez et al. (1999b), focusing only in the professors who are among those ranked highest by the students. They mention as aspects of a "good" professor: "...an ability to stimulate and motivate, knowing how to establish a respectful and fluid relation with the student," among others. From the same perspective, Álvarez, García, Gil y Romero (2000), again conduct at the Universidad de Sevilla a very similar study, also resorting to studying the professors that are best ranked by students and focus their interest, mainly, in emphasizing the influence of the knowledge area, considering the vicissitudes and differences that a professor can have when developing their professional specialty in the different disciplines. We try to identify in each area the teaching psychological features that could be taken as own in each area and, at the same time, establish similarities and differences among the characteristic traits associated with the teaching of these professors and those who seem to be linked to teaching in other areas of knowledge. Moreover, results indicate that when a differentiation is established between the areas of knowledge, we reach the conclusion that they determine a peculiar context

that modulates the quality teaching activity from the student perspective and impresses on them particular psychological features.

In our research conducted at several Faculties and, also in different areas of knowledge, as already presented, the features that define a good teacher are close, like in the above study, to the peculiarities of each professional activity; in each case, the students give a special importance to aspects inherent to their professional activity that are intimately related to the study area. This allows us to confirm that quality teaching can adopt multiple forms, that they respond to diverse teaching profiles, styles, and strategies, and that they adjust to the discipline or Degree being taught (Rodríguez, Roque & Rodríguez, 2014). When we look for the psychological features of a good professor of the different Faculties, we see that there are multiple profiles, we did not find unique qualities. Although there are controversies in the search done by the students for the psychological features of a good professor, the different research studies seem to coincide in that there are no unique characteristics and that, also, the students' opinions can, sometimes, bias reality when contributing subjective opinions to the subject. So, despite the importance of the students' opinions, since they are the main interested party and the most direct source of teaching and interaction with the professor, the results coming from this source must be treated very carefully, as they interfere at times with the students' personal interests.

Another excellent contribution of this research is that the students have well-defined ideals of the professor they like. In this sense, we find a basic profile for the students of each one of the Faculties, with the following characteristics: communicative, accessible to students, must know how to motivate, be fair and entertaining, coherent, humane, stable, humble, helpful, approachable, sociable, and likeable, among others. All of them considered as personal and psychological features. On the other hand, they consider it less important for a quality teaching that the professor be calm, trusting of their students, bold, critical, imaginative, intuitive, clever, natural, impulsive, punctual, democratic, mature, original, liberal, or strict. However, if we gather the results

of some studies such as that of Mc Comas (1965), it is proven that students consider the following as important psychological features of a good professor: that he or she fosters independent thought, has a deep and proven enthusiasm for the subject, has a sense of humor, is fair when grading, exhibits enthusiasm and inclination to teaching, shows interest in students, is available, methodical and structured, respects students, articulated, skillful in human relations, personal and original thinking. Many of these qualities agree with those prioritized in our study.

Studies on the subject (Alvarez, 1977; Anderson, Evertson & Brophy, 1982; Cerviño & Salvador, 1995; Cohen, 1981; Feldman, 1976, 1979; Hamer, 2015; Iwanicki and Mcechern, 1984; Marsh, 1987; Marsh, Smith & Barnes, 1983; Mcnaught & Anwyl, 1992; Rodriguez & Martinez, 1979) give as a result, in the same sense, a series of personality and psychological features that students value the most in their ideal professor: having sense of humor, being fair, expressive, listener, understanding, patient, tidy, to see the amusing side of life in his or her interaction with students, maximum expressiveness, knowing how to listen patiently, to put themselves in the other's shoes (empathy), not to raise the voice, serenity and naturalness, approachable and accepting of students, integrity and commitment, personal contact, help, good treatment of students (friendship, trust, aid, understanding), etc.

On the other hand, we have tried to determine also those aspects that prevent from being a good university professor, concluding in some psychological features that should be avoided in every good professor and some that are not relevant for a quality teaching, among them: being gossipy, sports fan, thin, tall, resentful, athletic, stopped smoking, screamer, religious or dictator.

When we analyzed the different samples, on the one hand, the students who were studying in the 2005 year, and on the other hand, those who studied 10 years later, in 2015, we did not find statistically significant differences as far as the psychological features that define their model of the ideal professor. Also, other research studies in our country (Casillas, 2006a; Casillas, Cabezas & Pinto, 2015; Cerviño & Salvador,

1995; García-Valcárcel, 1992; Fernandez & González, 2012) pursue a clear objective consisting of the interpretation and description of the types of professors starting off with the perceptions of students, that proposes the existence of differences among these perceptions according to some variables.

REFERENCES

- Abadía, A. R., Bueno, C., Ubieto-Artur, M. I., Márquez, M. D., Sabaté, S., Jorba, H. & Pagès, T. (2015). Competencias del buen docente universitario. Opinión de los estudiantes [Competencies of good university teachers. Students's opinion]. *REDU. Revista de docencia Universitaria*, 13(2), 363-390.
- Álvarez, J. L. (1977). *Investigación psicosocial sobre los profesores*. Madrid: Marova.
- Álvarez, V., García, E. & Gil, J. (1999a). Características de la docencia mejor evaluada por los alumnos en las diferentes áreas de enseñanza universitaria. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 57(214), 445-465.
- Álvarez, V., García, E. & Gil, J. (1999b). La calidad de la enseñanza universitaria desde la perspectiva de los profesores mejor valorados por los alumnos. *Revista de Educación*, 319, 273-290.
- Álvarez, V., García, E., Gil, J. & Romero, S. (2000). *Propuestas del profesorado bien evaluado para potenciar el aprendizaje de los estudiantes*. Sevilla: ICE Universidad de Sevilla.
- Anderson, L., Evertson, C. M. & Brophy, J. E. (1982). *Principles of small group instruction in elementary reading*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for research on teaching.
- Apodaka, P., Arbizu, F., Grao, J., Hornilla, T & Olalde, C. (1990). Experiencias evaluativas en la Universidad del País Vasco: consideraciones en torno a la puesta en marcha del proceso. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 48(186), 327-336.
- Arnal, J., Del Rincón, D. & Latorre, A. (1992). *Investigación educativa. Fundamentos y metodología*. Barcelona: Labor.
- Cabalín, D., Navarro, N., Zamora, J & San Martín, S. (2010). Concepción de estudiantes y docentes del buen profesor universitario. Facultad de Medicina de la Universidad de La Frontera [Thinking of Students and Teachers of Good University Teacher. Faculty of Medicine Universidad de La Frontera]. *International Journal of Morphology*, 28(1), 283-290. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022010000100042>
- Casero, A. (2010). ¿Cómo es el buen profesor universitario según el alumnado? [What is a good university professor, according to students?] *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 63(246), 223-242.
- Cataldi, Z. & Lage, F. (2004). Un nuevo perfil del profesor universitario. *Revista de informática educativa y medios audiovisuales*, 1(3), 28-33.
- Casillas, S. (2006a). Las percepciones de los alumnos sobre el

- desempeño docente de sus profesores en función de distintas variables. *Revista de Ciencias de la Educación*, 208, 519-539.
- Casillas, S. (2006b). Percepciones de alumnos y profesores sobre el "buen" docente universitario [The notions of students and lecturers about the "good" university lecturer]. *Revista Papeles Salmantinos de Educación*, 7, 271-282.
- Casillas, S. (2008). El proceso de evaluación de la docencia en la Universidad [Teaching Evaluation Process at University]. *Revista Papeles Salmantinos de Educación*, 11, 89-105.
- Casillas, S. & Cabezas, M. (2009). La evaluación del profesorado universitario [The evaluation of university teaching]. *Revista Galego-Portuguesa de Psicología e Educación*, 17(1-2), 75-84.
- Casillas, S. & Cabezas, M. (2010). Distintas concepciones sobre la buena docencia universitaria. *Revista de Ciencias de la Educación*, 223, 351-369.
- Casillas, S., Cabezas, M. & Pinto, A. M. (2015). Evaluación del profesor universitario: ¿a mayor categoría profesional mejor profesor? [University Professor's evaluation: Does a higher category make a better professor?] *Educational In The Knowledge Society*, 16(3), 106-123. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14201/eks2015163106123>
- Cerviño, C. & Salvador, J. (1995). Una aproximación al perfil del profesor ideal a partir de las preferencias expresadas por un grupo de alumnos de 10 años. *Revista de Psicología de la Educación*, 17, 55-64.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, P. A. (1981). Student ratings instruction and student achievement: a meta- analysis of multisection validity studies. *Review of educational Research*, 51(3), 281- 309. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543051003281>
- De la Orden, A. (1990). Evaluación, selección y promoción del profesorado universitario. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 1(1), 11-29.
- Debesse, M & Mialaret, G. (1980). *La función docente*. Barcelona: Oikos-Tau.
- Feldman, K. A. (1976). Grades and Collage Student's Evaluations of their courses and teachers. *Research in Higher Education*, 4(1), 69-112. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00991462>
- Feldman, K. A. (1979). The significance of circumstances for college student's ratings of their teachers and courses. *Research in Higher Education*, 10(2), 149-173. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00976227>
- Fernández, M. A. & González, S. (2012). El perfil del buen docente universitario. Una aproximación en función del sexo del alumnado [The profile of good university teaching. An approach based on gender of the students]. *REDU. Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 10(2), 237-249.
- Gallego, P. (1988). El perfeccionamiento del profesorado: un proyecto en clase formativa y multidimensional. En *Actas del II Congreso mundial Vasco* Tomo IV (p. 124- 129). Servicio Central de Publicaciones de Gobierno Vasco .
- García- Valcárcel, A (1992). Características del "buen profesor" universitario según estudiantes y profesores. *Revista Investigación Educativa*, 10(19), 31-50.
- Gargallo, B., Sánchez, F., Ros, C. & Ferreras, A. (2010). Estilos docentes de los profesores universitarios. La percepción de los alumnos de los buenos profesores. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 51(4), 1-16. Recuperado de <http://rieoei.org/3236.htm>
- Hamer, A. (2015). La percepción del buen profesor en alumnos de nuevo ingreso a la enseñanza universitaria: el caso de ETEA (Córdoba) [The perception of new students to University of a good teacher: the example of ETEA (Cordoba)]. *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 26(2), 227-240.
- Iwanicki, E.F., & Mcechern, L. (1984). Using teacher self- assessment to identify staff development needs. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(2), 38- 42. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/002248718403500209>
- Kerlinger, F. & Lee, H. (2002). *Investigación del Comportamiento, Métodos de Investigación en Ciencias Sociales* (4ª. ed.). México: McGrawHill.
- Kulik, J. A., & Mckeachie, W. J. (1975). The evaluation of teachers in higher education. *Review of Research in Education*, 3(1), 210-240. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732X003001210>
- Mañú, J. M. (1996). *Ser profesor hoy*. Pamplona: Ediciones Universidad de Navarra.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: research findings, methodological issues, and direction on for future research. *Internacional Journal of Educational Research*, 11(3), 5-13. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355\(87\)90001-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(87)90001-2)
- Marsh, H. W., Smith, I., & Barnes, J. (1983). Multitrait- Multimethod Analises of the self-description Questionnaire: Student-Teacher Agreement on multidimensional Rating of student self- concept. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20(3), 333-357. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00028312020003333>
- Mc Comas, J. D. (1965). Profile of teacher. *Improving College and University teaching*, 18, 135- 136.
- Mckeachie, W. J. (1983). The role of Faculty Evaluation in Enhancing College Teaching, National Forum. *Phi Kappa Journal*, 63(2), 37-39.
- Mcnaught, C., & Anwyl, J. (1992). Awards for teaching excellence at Australian universities. *Higher Education review*, 25(1), 31-44.
- Morales, P., Urosa, B. & Blanco, A. (2003). *Construcción de escalas de actitudes tipo Likert*. Madrid: La Muralla.
- Reboloso, E. & Pozo, C. (2000). Las actitudes de los estudiantes universitarios hacia sus profesores: implicaciones para la mejora de la calidad docente. *Psicología Educativa*, 6(1), 27-50.
- Rodríguez, J. L. & Martínez, A. (1979). *Estudios sobre el maestro. Cuadernos de didáctica 2*. Valencia: ICE Universidad de Valencia.
- Rodríguez, M. T., Roque, Y. & Rodríguez, M. (2014). ¿Cómo relacionarnos en la universidad del siglo XXI? [How to Establish Relationships in The Twenty-First-Century University] *Revista Digital de*

Investigación en Docencia Universitaria, 8(1), 51-58. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.19083/ridu.8.389>

- Romero, M. C., Gleason, M., Rubio, J. & Arriola, M. A. (2016). Validación de un modelo de competencias docentes en una universidad privada mexicana [Validation of a Faculty Competency Model in a Private Mexican University]. *Revista Digital de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria*, 10(1), 1-15. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.19083/ridu.10.455>
- Sayós, R., Pagés, T, Amador, J.A. & Jorba, H. (2014). Ser buen docente, ¿qué opinan los estudiantes de la Universidad de Barcelona? *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología y Salud*, 5(2), 135-149.
- Sepúlveda, A., Opazo, M., Sáez, D. & Lemarie, R. (2015). ¿Existe diferencia significativa, en la enseñanza, entre profesores y docentes en la Universidad?: Percepción de los estudiantes [Is There any Significant Difference in Teaching Between the Students and Teachers in the University?: *Student's Perception*]. *Revista de Orientación Educativa*, 29 (56), 88-123.
- Sgrecciay, N. & Cirelli, M. (2015). Cualidades de docentes memorables destacadas por aspirantes a profesor en matemática [Qualities of memorable teachers emphasized by aspirants to teacher in mathematics]. *Profesorado. Revista de currículum y formación del profesorado*, 19(2), 333-350.
- Tejedor, F. J. & Montero, L. (1990). Indicadores de la Calidad Docente para la evaluación del profesorado universitario. *Revista Española de Pedagogía*, 48(186), 259- 279.
- Villa, A. (1985). *Un modelo de profesor ideal*. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- Wotruba, T. R., & Wright, P. L. (1974). How to develop a teacher- rating instrument: A research approach. *Journal of Higher Education*, 46(6), 653- 663.