



What Makes a Good University Professor? Views from Students at a Brazilian University

Recibido: 16/03/2023
Evaluado: 24/06/2024
Publicado: 01/04/2025

María José Carvalho de Souza Domingues*  

Sheila Patrícia Ramos Beckhauser[†]  

Francisco Ganga-Contreras[‡]  

Nancy Alarcón-Henríquez[§]  

Abstract

The primary aim of this study is to analyze the characteristics of a good university professor from the perspective of undergraduate students in the field of applied social sciences. The research is characterized as quantitative, with a questionnaire applied to students from the courses of Business Administration, Accounting, Economic Sciences, Technology in Foreign Trade, and Technology in Marketing at a public university, obtaining 224 valid responses. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis. The research results indicate that students define a good professor as one who uses technology in the classroom and for communication, maintains a good rapport, and is skilled at linking theory with practice. The results of this study are important for educators to carry out self-assessments, as well as for the university to reconsider and reorganize its continuous training program, helping its teaching staff stay in line with the technological advancements needed to meet the students' expectations for better communication and relationships in the classroom.

Keywords

universities; university governance; university teaching; technologies in higher education

* Doctora en Ingeniería de Producción. Universidad Regional de Blumenau (FURB), Blumenau, SC, Brasil. mariadomingues@furb.br

[†] Magíster em Administração. Universidad Regional de Blumenau (FURB), Blumenau, SC, Brasil. spr8Osc@gmail.com

[‡] Doctor en Gestión Estratégica y Negocios Internacionales. Universidad de Tarapacá, Arica, Chile. franciscoganga@academicos.uta.cl

[§] Magíster en Gestión de Empresas. Universidad de los Lagos, Osorno, Chile. n.alarcon@ulagos.cl

O que distingue um bom professor universitário? olhar de estudantes de uma universidade brasileira

Abstract

O objetivo central deste trabalho é analisar as características de um bom professor universitário a partir da percepção de estudantes de cursos de graduação na área das ciências sociais aplicadas. A pesquisa se caracteriza como quantitativa, sendo aplicado um questionário nos cursos de Administração, Ciências Contábeis, Ciências Econômicas, Tecnologia em Comércio Exterior e Tecnologia em Marketing, obtendo 224 respostas válidas. Os dados foram analisados por meio da estatística descritiva e análise fatorial. Os resultados da pesquisa indicam que os estudantes definem um bom professor como aquele que utiliza tecnologias em sala de aula e em sua comunicação, mantém um bom relacionamento e tem habilidade para relacionar a teoria com a prática. Os resultados deste estudo são importantes para que os docentes realizem uma autoavaliação, assim como para que a universidade reconsidere e reorganize sua formação continuada, auxiliando o corpo docente a estar em sintonia com as demandas de atualização tecnológica para atender às expectativas dos estudantes em termos de melhor comunicação e relacionamento em sala de aula.

Palavras-chave

universidades; governança universitária; docência universitária; tecnologias no ensino superior

¿Qué distingue a un buen profesor universitario? Mirada de estudiantes de una universidad brasileña

Resumen

El objetivo central de este trabajo es analizar las características de un buen profesor universitario desde la percepción de un grupo de estudiantes de pregrado en el campo de las ciencias sociales aplicadas. La investigación se caracteriza como cuantitativa. Se aplicó un cuestionario a los cursos de Administración, Ciencias Contables, Ciencias Económicas, Tecnología en Comercio Exterior y Tecnología en Marketing de una universidad pública, obteniendo 224 respuestas válidas. Los datos se analizaron mediante estadística descriptiva y análisis factorial. Los resultados de la investigación indican que los estudiantes definen un buen docente como aquel que utiliza las tecnologías en el aula, en su comunicación mantiene una buena relación y está capacitado para relacionar la teoría con la práctica. Los resultados de este estudio son importantes para que los docentes realicen una autoevaluación y la universidad reconsidere y reorganice su formación continua. Esto contribuirá a que su cuerpo docente esté en sintonía con las demandas necesarias para la actualización tecnológica con el objetivo de cumplir con las expectativas de los estudiantes para una mejor comunicación y relaciones en el aula.

Palabras clave

universidades, gobernanza universitaria; docencia universitaria; tecnologías en la educación superior

Para citar este artículo:

Carvalho, M. de., Ramos, S., Ganga, F. y Alarcón, N. (2025). ¿Qué distingue a un buen profesor universitario? Mirada de estudiantes de una universidad brasileña. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (95), e18911, <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num95-18911>

Introduction

The higher education sector in Brazil, like in much of the world, has been experiencing significant growth, requiring consistent improvements in teaching methods, adoption of new educational technologies, and enhancement academic management and its university governance (Brunner & Ganga-Contreras 2016; Ganga-Contreras 2017; Ganga-Contreras et al., 2018; Ganga-Contreras et al., 2019; Calvo-Rubio & Ufarte-Ruíz, 2020; Acosta-Silva et al., 2021). The fundamental purpose of the university—as a cornerstone of a nation's development—also evolves alongside societal changes many of which are driven by rapid technological advancements (Bustos Martínez et al., 2019; Cerdán Martínez et al., 2020; Muñiz-Velázquez & Navazo-Ostúa, 2021).

Departing from an exclusive space for developing thinkers, the university has evolved towards a role closer to society and the labor market (Rolim et al., 2007; Jiménez-Sánchez & Vayas Ruiz, 2021). This paradigm shift requires higher education institutions (HEIs) to adopt new approaches, mainly through the role of the teacher in the classroom. The role of the university professor remains crucial across all forms of instruction, whether in-person or online (Borges et al., 2014).

Despite all technological innovations in education (Bello van del Ree & Morales Lozano, 2019; Bustos-González, 2019), teaching performance remains one of the most critical factors influencing the success of higher education (Jardim et al., 2007; Franco, 2021).

Ventura et al. (2011) state that there is a general consensus on the behaviors expected of students, and a similar consensus exists for teachers. However, the teacher's role is not the only factor impacting the educational process, as shown by Botella & Escorihuela (2020), Vilorio-Matheus & Reyes (2020), and De La Cruz Sánchez et al. (2022) highlight, teachers bear the responsibility for choosing their pedagogical approach. Through the various contexts and roles they assume in their practice, teachers represent what it means to be a “good” educator.

In response to these evolving expectations, the profile of a university professor has become increasingly complex. Professors are now expected to demonstrate expertise in their disciplines, innovate in their teaching practices, and possess the ability to engage in critical reflection and research (Suárez-Amaya et al., 2022). They must integrate both disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge, foster a motivational and collaborative classroom environment, and ultimately aim to deliver high-quality learning experiences (Álvarez 2009; Ventura et al., 2011; Merlyn-Sacoto et al., 2018; Montesdeoca et al., 2020; Trigo Ibáñez et al., 2021; Roa-Cárdenas & González-Puebla, 2022).

The question of what defines a good teacher has been a longstanding one, and with the advancement of technology (Catalina-García et al., 2019), and the growth of distance learning, this discussion has expanded to adapt to new social realities (Tejedor et al., 2020; Salcedo & Uzcátegui Pachecho, 2021; Ascanio Rengifo, 2022). The challenges presented by the pandemic context (Barrientos-Báez et al., 2021; Sotelo González et al., 2021; Sánchez-Díaz et al., 2021). Consequently, understanding what students consider to be a good teacher has been the major focus of research over the past decade. This interest stems not only from its impact on teacher training and teaching quality but also from the influence it has on the social and professional image of the teaching profession (Beijaard et al., 2000; Cunha, 2010; Abadía et al., 2015; Alonso, 2019).

Nevertheless, numerous studies have explored the attributes of a good teacher, covering aspects such as motivational ability and interpersonal skills (Zabalza, 2016; Keeley et al., 2016; Shower, 2017; Rivera Ferrer & Guerra Guirola, 2019; Navia et al., 2020; Buraphadeja, 2020; Merellano-Navarro et al., 2021; Ripoll-Nuñez & Arrieta-Caycedo, 2022). A professor's occupational identity is often viewed as an ongoing process that integrates both professional and personal dimensions. This is because teachers are not only professionals; they are individuals whose personal lives and social interactions influence their relationships with students and their overall effectiveness in the classroom (Beijaard et al., 2004; Merellano-Navarro et al., 2021; Cuesta-García et al., 2023).

Defining the image of the teacher is inherently complex, as it involves addressing multiple, interconnected factors, including personal experiences and social context (O'Connor, 2008). Professional identity, therefore, is something that is projected, and it is generally believed that if a teacher conveys a positive image to their students, this can enhance not only their professional standing but also the reputation of the educational institution they represent.

Theoretical discussions about the role of university professors are extensive, with a central focus on teaching methods. These discussions encompass a range of issues, including assessment strategies, classroom management, student relationships, and the ideal teacher profile (Lowman 2004; Guzmán, 2021).

Consequently, the quality of teaching is of paramount importance. A good professor should possess a deep understanding of their subject matter, build positive relationships with students, choose appropriate teaching methods based on the course objectives, and show genuine interest in students' individual challenges (Bevilacqua, 2004; Escribano, 2018; López et al., 2018; Estévez & García, 2019; Jornet Meliá et al., 2020). Following this approach, Luaiza (2008) argues that to achieve better results in the teaching and learning process, teachers should incorporate a variety of class formats into their lesson plans. These may include

lectures (expository), seminars (team-based learning), workshop (practical activities) and laboratories (case study), all aimed at enhancing teaching quality.

This topic is particularly relevant to universities, as there is a close relationship between lecturers' performance in class and the perception that students have of the quality of the services provided by a Higher Education Institution (HEI) (Cerchiaro & Mota, 2010; Escribano, 2018; Chamorro-Atalaya et al., 2021).

When teachers use effective practices to explain theoretical concepts and respond clearly to students inquiries, it enhances student satisfaction. However, as Beijaard et al. (2000, p. 751) note, "teaching is much more than the transmission of knowledge." It is a complex activity (Sutherland et al., 2010) because, beyond their pedagogical duties, teachers have social responsibilities (Núñez et al., 2019), which influence their public image and the way they are perceived (Thakor, 1996). For this reason, teachers are encouraged to incorporate socially accepted values and draw on their experiences to teach academic content and core values, as this holistic approach contributes to the educational process (Pantić & Wubbels, 2010).

Teachers must, therefore, engage in continuous self-reflection on their actions and behaviors, aiming to cultivate a positive image not only within the university environment but also in the broader community (Griffiths, 2000). This kind of self-reflection is essential for shaping their professional image, as they are constantly under the scrutiny of students, many of whom come to identify with their teachers as role models (Sutherland et al., 2010; Villalta-Paucar et al., 2022).

Kagan (1992) mentions that a professor's professional image is largely shaped by students' perceptions over the course of their career. Following this perspective, Abreu & Guimarães (2003) identified factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction and can also enhance their professional image. These factors include the ability to connect theory with practice, research skills, professional qualifications and mastery of subject matter.

Morales (2006) explored students' views on the attributes a good professor and concluded that the following characteristics were central: appropriate dress, effective teaching methods, class management skills, fairness in dealing with students, attention to individual needs, concern for student performance, politeness and respect, dedication and motivation in teaching, encouragement to study, timely praise, and the ability to convey confidence and humility.

Similarly, Borges et al. (2014) conducted a study involving 502 students from a faculty in Maranhão, examining 36 items across 5 dimensions to assess the image of a university professor. The results show that the most important factors contributing to a positive image included mastery of the subject, a polite and respectful attitude, qualifications and educational background, ethical conduct, and strong commitment to the teaching profession.

Another study worth highlighting is that of Toni et al. (2006), who refined the Image Configuration Technique (TCI), an instrument designed to assess satisfaction based on the public's perception of the attributes or dimensions of a given service.

Building on this framework, the present study aims to enhance our understanding of the dimensions outlined in the literature that define a quality teacher. By analyzing university students' perceptions of their professors at the Social Sciences Center of an educational institution in southern Brazil, this study investigates which characteristics are most valued. Additionally, it examines the technological dimension, which emerged as a dominant factor in the students' perceptions—findings that contrast with those of previous studies, such as Olivera et al. (2012).

The insights from this study can assist higher education institutions in making informed decisions regarding faculty training and development, thereby enhancing the quality in the teaching-learning process. This, in turn, may lead to improved student retention and a stronger institutional image.

Methodology

A quantitative survey was conducted to examine the characteristics of a good university teacher from the perspective of students enrolled in applied social sciences programs. The questionnaire was applied face-to-face in the classroom, and the research, in terms of scope, is classified as descriptive.

The study sample included 969 students enrolled in the Administration, Accounting Sciences, Economic Sciences, Foreign Trade Technology, and Marketing Technology courses at Fundação Universidade Regional de Blumenau in 2018. Out of this group, 224 students completed all questions on the questionnaire. The sample was selected non-probabilistically, based on convenience sampling (Otzen & Manterola, 2017), and included only those students who agreed to participate.

The questionnaire was organized into two sections: the first contained questions related to the respondent's demographics, such as gender, age group, and academic program; the second section focused on identifying the characteristics of a good teacher.

This study used an instrument developed by Nogueira et al. (2012), which was based on the work of Lowman (2004), Marsh (1991), Pan et al. (2009), and Whale (2006).

Data analysis was carried out using descriptive statistics and factor analysis. The collected data were entered and analyzed in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), using exploratory factor analysis to analyze dimensions, commonalities, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure.

Results

According to the survey, the majority of participating students were enrolled in the Management program (32.6%), followed by those in the Foreign Trade Technology (25%), Accounting (20.5), Economics (11.2%), and Marketing Technology (11.2%).

Regarding the gender of the respondents, more than half of them were men (56.7%), while women represented 42.9% of the sample. A small percentage (0.4%) did not identify with either of the two genders specified in the survey.

Age-wise, the sample was predominantly young, with 70.5% of the respondents being under 21 years old. Additionally, a significant portion of respondents (46.4%) were in the first year of their program (see Table 1).

Table 1.
Respondent's data

| Gender | | age | | Course | | Time course | |
|--------|-------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| Male | 56,7% | Until 21 years | 70,5% | Management | 32,6% | 1 year | 46,4% |
| Female | 42,9% | Between 22 and 29 years | 25,9% | Countable Sciences | 20,5% | 2 year | 22,3% |
| Other | 0,4% | Between 30 and 39 years | 3,1% | Economical Sciences | 11,2% | 3 year | 4,5% |
| | | over 40 years | 0,4% | Tech. Foreign Trade | 25% | 4 year | 26,8% |
| | | | | Tech. Marketing | 10,75 | | |

Source: Research data

Initially, the means, standard deviations, and variance for each statement were calculated to analyze the university professor's image. All of this data is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.
Descriptive statistics of the questions

| Item | Average | Standard deviation | Difference | Minimum | Maximum |
|------------------|---------|--------------------|------------|---------|---------|
| Q1 | 9,692 | .7744 | .600 | 5,0 | 10.0 |
| Q2 | 9,674 | .7553 | .570 | 5,0 | 10.0 |
| Third quarter | 9,719 | .6672 | .445 | 6.0 | 10.0 |
| Fourth trimester | 8.460 | 1.6723 | 2,797 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q5 | 8.656 | 1,4649 | 2,146 | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| Q6 | 8.210 | 1.8377 | 3.377 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q7 | 9.567 | .9681 | .937 | 4.0 | 10.0 |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|-------|-----|------|
| Q8 | 9.268 | 1.0629 | 1,130 | 5,0 | 10.0 |
| Q9 | 9.295 | 1.1839 | 1.402 | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| Q10 | 9,652 | .6791 | .461 | 6.0 | 10.0 |
| Q11 | 8.844 | 1,6560 | 2.742 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q12 | 8.826 | 1.3890 | 1.929 | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| P13 | 7.250 | 1.8241 | 3.327 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q14 | 7.719 | 2.1547 | 4.643 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q15 | 8.710 | 1,5036 | 2.261 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| P16 | 9.000 | 1.3559 | 1.839 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| Q17 | 9.080 | 1.2430 | 1,545 | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| Q18 | 8.406 | 1.7969 | 3.229 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| P19 | 8.170 | 1.9769 | 3.908 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q20 | 7.353 | 2.2522 | 5,072 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q21 | 7.759 | 1.8714 | 3.502 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q22 | 6,960 | 2.2337 | 4.989 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q23 | 8.603 | 1.5147 | 2,294 | 3,0 | 10.0 |
| Q24 | 8.862 | 1.3472 | 1.815 | 4.0 | 10.0 |
| Q25 | 9.455 | 1.0057 | 1.011 | 3,0 | 10.0 |
| P26 | 9.192 | 1.3405 | 1,797 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q27 | 9.228 | 1.2765 | 1,630 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| Q28 | 7,973 | 1,8435 | 3.398 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| P29 | 7.393 | 2.3518 | 5.531 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q30 | 7.286 | 2.2981 | 5.281 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q31 | 2,982 | 2.4032 | 5.775 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q32 | 7.857 | 2.2385 | 5.011 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q33 | 7.433 | 2.1038 | 4.426 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q34 | 8.433 | 1.6553 | 2.740 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q35 | 9.397 | 1.2305 | 1.514 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q36 | 7.821 | 1,9510 | 3.807 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q37 | 8.607 | 1,6064 | 2.580 | 2.0 | 10.0 |
| P38 | 8.759 | 1.6196 | 2.623 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q39 | 8.268 | 1.8629 | 3.471 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q40 | 7.326 | 2.4688 | 6.095 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q41 | 6,804 | 2.5476 | 6.490 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q42 | 6.362 | 2.5707 | 6.609 | 1.0 | 10.0 |
| Q43 | 6.339 | 2.4661 | 6.082 | 1.0 | 10.0 |

Source: research data.

The KMO test and Bartlett's test of sphericity were used in the factor analysis to evaluate the following hypotheses:

H0: There is an insufficient level of correlation between the items for using Factor Analysis. Thus, Factor Analysis is not suitable for this study.

H1: There is a sufficient level of correlation between the items to justify using Factor Analysis. Therefore, Factor Analysis is appropriate.

The sphericity test obtained a p-value of approximately zero, which is less than the significance level of 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0) and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis.

Additionally, the KMO test, which assesses the suitability of Factor Analysis for the dataset, presented a value of approximately 0.855. According to Pestana and Gageiro (2005), this indicates a good level of correlation between the items, further supporting the rejection of the null hypothesis. Based on these tests, the use of Factor Analysis is appropriate. Furthermore, eleven factors were extracted, which together explain approximately 64% of the total variance in the items.

The anti-image correlation matrix was examined to assess the individual adequacy of the variables in the sample. The study variables present an MSA (sample adequacy measure) greater than 0.50, which strengthens the model's explanatory power.

The commonality of each factor was also analyzed to determine the proportion of variance explained by each item. After extracting the components, the estimated commonality ranged from 0 to 1, with 0 indicating no variance explained by common factors, and 1 indicating that the common factors explain all the variance of the variable (Pestana & Gageiro, 2005). Items that displayed a proportion of explained variance below 0.60 in the commonality matrix were excluded. Thus, items Q1, Q12, Q28, Q31, Q31, Q32, Q33, Q35, Q36, and Q39 were removed in the first round. In the second round, items Q8, Q14, Q16, and Q27 were excluded. Finally, in the third round, items Q15, Q23, and Q37 were removed, leaving a total of 28 items from the original 42 (see Table 3).

Table 3.
Descriptive variable statistics

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Q1 | | | | | 0,4% | 0,4% | 1,8% | 6,7% | 8,0% | 82,6% |
| Q2 | | | | | 0,4% | | 1,8% | 7,6% | 9,8% | 80,4% |
| Third quarter | | | | | | 0,9% | | 6,7% | 11,2% | 81,3% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Fourth trimester | 0,9% | | | 0,9% | 3,1% | 5,4% | 17,4% | 19,6% | 12,1% | 40,6% |
| Q5 | | | | 0,9% | 2,7% | 4,0% | 15,6% | 18,8% | 15,2% | 42,9% |
| Q6 | 1,8% | | 0,4% | 1,3% | 3,1% | 7,1% | 16,5% | 21,4% | 15,2% | 33,0% |
| Q7 | | | | 0,4% | 0,9% | 1,3% | 1,8% | 5,4% | 14,7% | 75,4% |
| Q8 | | | | | 0,9% | 1,8% | 4,0% | 14,7% | 20,1% | 58,5% |
| Q9 | | | | 0,4% | 1,3% | 3,1% | 2,7% | 12,5% | 15,6% | 64,3% |
| Q10 | | | | | | 0,4% | 0,9% | 6,3% | 17,9% | 74,6% |
| Q11 | 1,8% | | 0,4% | | 0,4% | 2,7% | 11,2% | 17,9% | 14,3% | 51,3% |
| Q12 | | | | 1,3% | 0,9% | 4,9% | 9,8% | 18,3% | 19,2% | 45,5% |
| P13 | 0,9% | 0,9% | 0,9% | 2,2% | 11,2% | 16,5% | 20,5% | 24,6% | 7,6% | 14,7% |
| Q14 | 0,9% | 0,9% | 2,2% | 1,8% | 12,9% | 11,6% | 9,4% | 19,2% | 8,9% | 32,1% |
| Q15 | 0,4% | | | 1,3% | 2,2% | 2,2% | 12,1% | 23,2% | 14,3% | 44,2% |
| P16 | | 0,4% | 0,4% | | 1,3% | 2,7% | 7,6% | 17,4% | 18,3% | 51,8% |
| Q17 | | | | 0,9% | 1,3% | 0,9% | 8,9% | 14,3% | 21,0% | 52,7% |
| Q18 | 0,9% | | 0,4% | 1,8% | 3,6% | 8,5% | 10,7% | 21,0% | 11,6% | 41,5% |
| P19 | 1,3% | 1,3% | 0,4% | 2,2% | 4,0% | 6,7% | 13,8% | 20,1% | 15,2% | 34,8% |
| Q20 | 3,1% | 0,4% | 2,7% | 5,4% | 8,0% | 9,8% | 16,1% | 21,4% | 11,6% | 21,4% |
| Q21 | 0,9% | 0,4% | 1,8% | 1,3% | 8,0% | 7,6% | 21,4% | 21,0% | 15,2% | 22,3% |
| Q22 | 3,6% | 1,8% | 3,1% | 2,7% | 10,7% | 14,7% | 19,6% | 19,6% | 8,9% | 15,2% |
| Q23 | | | 0,4% | 0,9% | 4,0% | 4,0% | 10,7% | 22,8% | 17,4% | 39,7% |
| Q24 | | | | 0,4% | 2,7% | 4,5% | 4,5% | 24,6% | 17,4% | 46,0% |
| Q25 | | | 0,4% | | 0,4% | 0,4% | 3,1% | 12,1% | 13,8% | 69,6% |
| P26 | 0,4% | | 0,9% | | 0,9% | 1,8% | 3,6% | 16,5% | 15,2% | 60,7% |
| Q27 | | 0,4% | 0,4% | | 0,9% | 1,8% | 6,3% | 12,1% | 16,1% | 62,1% |
| Q28 | 0,4% | 0,9% | 0,4% | 4,0% | 4,0% | 7,6% | 18,3% | 21,9% | 15,2% | 27,2% |
| P29 | 3,1% | 3,6% | 0,9% | 4,0% | 6,7% | 11,2% | 12,5% | 21,9% | 14,3% | 21,9% |
| Q30 | 2,2% | 3,1% | 2,7% | 3,6% | 5,8% | 14,7% | 17,4% | 19,2% | 7,6% | 23,7% |
| Q31 | 25,9% | 41,5% | 7,6% | 3,1% | 5,4% | 6,3% | 1,3% | 3,1% | 2,7% | 3,1% |
| Q32 | 1,3% | 1,3% | 2,7% | 3,6% | 7,1% | 8,9% | 11,2% | 17,9% | 10,7% | 35,3% |
| Q33 | 2,2% | | 2,2% | 4,9% | 8,0% | 11,6% | 15,2% | 25,0% | 9,4% | 21,4% |
| Q34 | 0,4% | 0,9% | | | 4,0% | 6,7% | 12,1% | 23,2% | 16,1% | 36,6% |
| Q35 | 0,4% | | | 0,4% | | 3,1% | 4,5% | 8,5% | 10,7% | 72,3% |
| Q36 | 0,9% | 1,3% | 1,8% | 2,7% | 6,7% | 5,4% | 13,8% | 29,9% | 14,3% | 23,2% |
| Q37 | | 0,9% | 0,4% | 0,4% | 3,1% | 4,5% | 11,6% | 21,9% | 14,3% | 42,9% |
| P38 | 0,9% | 0,4% | | 0,4% | 2,2% | 4,5% | 8,0% | 21,0% | 14,7% | 47,8% |
| Q39 | 1,3% | 0,9% | | 1,3% | 2,2% | 7,6% | 15,2% | 21,4% | 14,7% | 35,3% |
| Q40 | 4,0% | 4,9% | 2,2% | 2,2% | 3,6% | 9,4% | 17,4% | 20,5% | 14,3% | 21,4% |
| Q41 | 4,5% | 5,8% | 4,0% | 3,6% | 8,0% | 10,7% | 16,1% | 20,1% | 12,1% | 15,2% |
| Q42 | 5,8% | 7,6% | 2,7% | 4,0% | 12,5% | 13,4% | 15,6% | 18,8% | 7,6% | 12,1% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Q43 | 6,3% | 6,3% | 1,8% | 3,1% | 13,8% | 16,1% | 17,4% | 18,3% | 6,3% | 10,7% |
|-----|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|

Source: research data.

In the optimal scenario, six factors were extracted, explaining approximately 59% of the total variance in the variables. The results, shown in Table 4, indicate that the sphericity test showed a p-value of zero, which is below the significance level of 0.05. The KMO value was 0.836, demonstrating a strong correlation among the items (Pestana & Gageiro, 2005).

Table 4.
KMO and Bartlett tests

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy. | | .836 |
| Bartlett's test of sphericity | Approx. chi-square | 2501.092 |
| | df | 351 |
| | Seg. | .000 |

Source: research data.

Table 5 presents the factor analysis of the individual components and their reliability analysis. According to these results:

- Factor 1 is associated with aspects of technology and can be labeled Technology.
- Factor 2 pertains to relationship aspects and is labeled Relationship.
- Factor 3 relates to teacher qualifications and is labeled Qualification.
- Factor 4 focuses on the teacher's teaching abilities and is labeled Teaching Ability.
- Factor 5 involves aspects of the teacher's knowledge and motivation, labeled Knowledge and Motivation.
- Factor 6 is connected to the teacher's personal attributes and is labeled Personal Attributes.

Table 5.
Factor analysis with reliability analysis and Varimax rotation

| Variables | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 | Factor 6 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 20. Use of video or music resources in the classroom. | .767 | | | | | |
| 13. Use Internet content | .760 | | | | | |
| 21. Use of digital technologies to communicate with students | .754 | | | | | |
| 22. Use software to solve activities. | .731 | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 11. Is dynamic in class. | .502 | | | | | |
| 4. Is friendly with the students. | | .804 | | | | |
| 5. Be sympathetic to students | | .792 | | | | |
| 6. Act humorous in class | | .714 | | | | |
| 19. Is friendly with students | | .528 | | | | |
| 43. Has scientific production | | | .852 | | | |
| 42. Has an exclusive dedication | | | .786 | | | |
| 40. Teaching title | | | .770 | | | |
| 41. Time of experience | | | .767 | | | |
| 25. Is respectful with students | | | | .805 | | |
| 17. Is accessible to students | | | | .681 | | |
| 24. Is helpful | | | | .620 | | |
| 10. Is clear in when providing explanations | | | | .552 | | |
| 7. Ability to explain (didactic) | | | | .468 | | |
| 2. Know how to make the connection between theory and practice. | | | | | .747 | |
| 3. Possess mastery of the content they are teaching | | | | | .670 | |
| 38. Teaching methodology used | | | | | .578 | |
| 9. Hold practical expertise in the subject matter they are teaching. | | | | | .467 | |
| 26. Is enthusiastic about the delivery of content | | | | | .361 | |
| 29. Possess a pleasant tone of voice | | | | | | .662 |
| 30. Possess legible handwriting when writing on the board. | | | | | | .614 |
| 34. Possess good attendance. | | | | | | .581 |
| 18. Give feedback on test scores promptly. | | | | | | .393 |
| Cronbach's alpha | 0,825 | 0,833 | 0,824 | 0,734 | 0,613 | 0,625 |

Source: research data.

Interestingly, the results of this study reveal that the technological dimension stood out significantly in students' responses. In comparison with the findings of Nogueira et al. (2012), where the technological dimension ranked third, this study places it as a top priority for students.

Additionally, the evaluation of teachers emerged as another prominent dimension in students' perceptions, highlighting the importance they place on how teachers are assessed and rated.

Conclusions

This study highlights the importance of the university professor's profile in the academic sphere, particularly in an increasingly complex social landscape. However, certain limitations should be noted: the study was conducted with a specific sample of students from applied social sciences and the focused on a single university, which limits its generalizability to other areas and university settings.

The findings of this study reveal a consensus on the essential competencies that university professors should possess. These competencies include a combination of disciplinary expertise and innovative teaching practices, as well as skills in reflection, research, and the integration of knowledge in a stimulating and collaborative environment.

The results indicate that students place high value on the effective use of technology by professors. Specifically, they appreciate when teachers use multimedia resources such as videos or music in the classroom, integrate Internet content, employ digital tools to communicate with students, and use software to facilitate problem-solving activities. Additionally, students value qualities such as dynamism in the classroom, kindness, understanding, a sense of humor, friendliness, and respect.

The study also emphasizes the importance of professors having a strong command of their subject matter, the ability to connect theory with practice, and the use of effective teaching methodologies. Practical knowledge of the subject is essential, as the ability to convey enthusiasm while teaching. Students also appreciate a pleasant tone of voice, clear writing on the blackboard, and accessibility for guidance. Moreover, timely feedback on assessments, a solid scientific output, dedicated teaching time, relevant qualifications, and teaching experience are all seen as critical components of a quality professor.

These findings offer an opportunity for individual reflection among and call for university authorities to review their faculty's ongoing professional development processes. It is crucial for academic institutions to support their faculty in acquiring the technological skills necessary to meet student expectations.

This study also lays the groundwork for future research in other Brazilian universities and, more broadly, throughout Latin America. Expanding research in this area could further deepen our understanding of the ideal profile of university faculty and the educational needs of students in the region.

References

Abadía Valle A.R., Bueno García C., Ubieto-Artur, M.I., Márquez Cebrián, M.D., Sabaté Díaz, S., Jorba Noguera, H., & Pagès Costa, T. (2015). Competencias

- del buen docente universitario. Opinión de los estudiantes. *REDU. Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 13(2), 363-390. <https://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2015.5453>
- Alonso Martín, P. (2019). El perfil del buen docente universitario desde una perspectiva del alumnado. *Educação e Pesquisa*, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634201945196029>
- Abreu, M., Guimarães, T.D.A. (2003). Satisfação com o ensino superior de administração: o ponto de vista de discentes de IES privadas do Distrito Federal. *Encontro Nacional de Programas de Pós-graduação em Administração*, 27.
- Acosta-Silva, A., Ganga-Contreras, F., Rama-Vitale, C. (2021). Gobernanza universitaria: enfoques y alcances conceptuales. *Revista Iberoamericana De Educación Superior*, 12(33), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iissue.20072872e.2021.33.854>
- Álvarez Rojo, V. (2009). Perfiles y competencias docentes requeridas en el contexto actual de la educación universitaria. *Revista Española de Orientación y Psicopedagogía*, 20(3), 270-283. <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=338230783006>
- Ascanio, R. (2022). Profesionales universitarios venezolanos que han emigrado y la pérdida del capital intelectual para el país. *Revista de Ciencias de la Comunicación E Información*, 27(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.35742/rcci.2022.27.e133>
- Barrientos-Báez, A., González-Suazo, L., Caldevilla-Domínguez, D. (2021). Nuevos escenarios educativos a partir del COVID-19 en la educación universitaria. *Perspectivas de la comunicación*, 14(2), 149-170. <https://revistas.ufro.cl/ojs/index.php/perspectivas/article/view/2551/2117>
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P.C., Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and teacher education*, 20(2), 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001>
- Beijaard, D., Verloop, N., Vermunt, J.D. (2000). Teachers' perceptions of professional identity: An exploratory study from a personal knowledge perspective. *Teaching and teacher education*, 16(7), 749-764. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X\(00\)00023-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(00)00023-8)
- Bello van der Ree, M.E., Morales Lozano, J.A. (2019). Competencias claves de los estudiantes universitarios para el uso de las TIC. *Revista de Comunicación de la SEECI*, (50), 43-72. <https://doi.org/10.15198/seeci.2019.50.43-72>

- Bevilacqua, S. (2004). Estudo de satisfação de clientes, a validação do esquema CBF. XXIV Encontro Nac. de Eng. de Produção, Florianópolis. http://www.abepro.org.br/biblioteca/ENEGEP2004_Enegep0207_0221.pdf
- Botella Nicolás, A., Escorihuela Carbonell, G. (2020). Influencia de las escuelas flautísticas en la praxis docente del profesorado superior en España. *Vivat Academia. Revista de Comunicación*, 153, 99-116. <https://doi.org/10.15178/va.2020.153.99-116>
- Borges, G. da Rosa, da Silva Añaña, E., Pillatt, F.R., de Souza Domingues, J.C. (2014). Medindo a imagem do professor Universitário. *Educação, Ciência e Cultura*, 19(2), 101-116. <https://revistas.unilasalle.edu.br/index.php/Educacao/article/view/1590>
- Brunner, J.J., Ganga-Contreras, F. (2016). Dinámicas de transformación en la educación superior latinoamericana: Desafíos para la gobernanza. *Revista Opción*. 3(80), 12-35. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/310/31047691002.pdf>
- Buraphadeja, V. (2020). Qualities of Good University Professors: A Student Perspective. *International Journal of Assessment & Evaluation*, 27(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7920/CGP/v27i01/13-26>
- Bustos-González, A. (2019). Tránsito de universidad docente a universidad de investigación. ¿Un problema de información académica, de taxonomías o de rankings universitarios? *Profesional de la información*, 28(4), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.jul.22>
- Bustos Martínez, L., De Santiago Ortega, P.P., Martínez Miró, M.A., Rengifo Hidalgo, M.S. (2019). Discursos de odio: una epidemia que se propaga en la red. Estado de la cuestión sobre el racismo y la xenofobia en las redes sociales. *Mediaciones Sociales*, 18, 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.5209/meso.64527>
- Calvo-Rubio, L.M., Ufarte-Ruiz, M.J. (2020). Percepción de docentes universitarios, estudiantes, responsables de innovación y periodistas sobre el uso de inteligencia artificial en periodismo. *Profesional de la información*, 29(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2020.ene.09>
- Catalina-García, B., López de Ayala-López, M.C., Martínez Pastor, E. (2019). Usos comunicativos de las nuevas tecnologías entre los menores. Percepción de sus profesores sobre oportunidades y riesgos digitales. *Mediaciones Sociales*, 18, 43-57. <https://doi.org/10.5209/meso.64311>
- Cerchiaro, I., Mota, M. (2010). Avaliação da Qualidade do Serviço Educacional numa IES Particular: a visão do aluno de graduação sobre a qualidade percebida. XI Encontro Nacional de Marketing da ANPAD, Florianópolis, 23 a 25 de maio de 2010. <http://localhost:8080/tede/handle/tede/78>

- Cerdán Martínez, V., García Guardia, M.L., Padilla Castillo, G. (2020). Alfabetización moral digital para la detección de deepfakes y fakes audiovisuales. *CIC. Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación*, 25, 165-181. <https://doi.org/10.5209/ciyc.68762>
- Chamorro-Atalaya, O., Morales-Romero, G., Trinidad-Loli, N., Caycho-Salas, B., Gamarra-Mendoza, S., León-Velarde, C. (2021). Evaluation of Teaching Performance in the Virtual Teaching-Learning Environment, from the Perspective of the Students of the Professional School of Mechanical Engineering. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 16(15), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v16i15.23091>
- Cuesta-García, A., Batlle-Rodríguez, J. y González-Argüello, V. (2023). La construcción de la identidad docente del profesor de Español como lengua extranjera: el conocimiento en el proceso de identificación docente. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (87), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num87-13071>
- Cunha, A.C. (2010). Representação do “bom” professor: o “ bom professor em geral e o” bom” professor de educação física em particular. *Educação em revista*, 11(02), 41-52. <http://repositorium.sdum.uminho.pt/bitstream/1822/20758/1/Marilia%202010%20Representa%c3%a7%c3%a3o%20do%20bom%20professor.pdf>
- De La Cruz Sánchez, E.E., Poma Henestroza, S.L., Suárez-Calixto, R. (2022). La educación alimentaria y nutricional en la formación docente. Dos visiones, dos universidades, dos países y un compromiso: Perú-Venezuela. *Revista de Comunicación Y Salud*, 12, 21-44. <https://doi.org/10.35669/rcys.2022.12.e273>
- Escribano, E. (2018). El desempeño del docente como factor asociado a la calidad educativa en América Latina. *Revista Educación*, 42(2), 738-752. <https://doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v42i2.27033>
- Estévez, A., Garcia, E. (2019). Las formas de organización en la enseñanza superior. *RAC: Revista Angolana De Ciências*, 1(2), 304 - 330. <http://publicacoes.scientia.co.ao/ojs2/index.php/rac/article/view/25>
- Franco López, J.A. (2021). La motivación docente para obtener calidad educativa en instituciones de educación superior. *Revista Virtual Universidad Católica Del Norte*, (64), 151–179. <https://doi.org/10.35575/rvucn.n64a7>
- Ganga-Contreras, F. (2017). El flipper burocrático en las Universidades, *Revista Interciencia*. 42(1), 58-62. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/339/33949290010.pdf>
- Ganga-Contreras, F., Sáez San Martín, W., Rodríguez-Ponce, E., Calderón, A., Wandercil, M. (2018). Universidades Públicas de Chile y su Desempeño

- en los Rankings Académicos Nacionales. *Revista Fronteras*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.21664/2238-8869.2018v7i3.p316-341>
- Ganga-Contreras, F. A., Suárez-Amaya, W., Calderón, A. I., da Silva, M. W., Jung, H. S. (2019). Retos a la Gobernanza Universitaria: Acotaciones sobre la Cuestión de la Autoridad y la Profesionalización de la Gestión de las Universidades. *Fronteiras: Journal of Social, Technological and Environmental Science*, 8(3), 435-456. <https://doi.org/10.21664/2238-869.2019v8i3.p435-456>
- Griffiths, V. (2000). The reflective dimension in teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33(5), 539-555. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355\(00\)00033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(00)00033-1)
- Guzmán, J.C. (2021). Aportaciones de las Buenas Prácticas de Enseñanza para el Mejoramiento Docente en Educación Superior. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 29(109–111), 1–32. <https://www.redalyc.org/journal/551/55160059008/55160059008.pdf>
- Jardim, A.C.S., Pereira, V. S., Rezende, D.C. (2007). O papel do professor-tutor em cursos de graduação em Administração, modalidade a distância: um estudo de caso em uma universidade federal. *Anais... Rio de Janeiro: ANPAD*. http://www.anpad.org.br/diversos/down_zips/33/EPQ-A472.pdf
- Jiménez-Sánchez, Á., Vayas Ruiz, E.C. (2021). Dimensiones motivacionales en Facebook en estudiantes y trabajadores universitarios del Ecuador. *Revista de comunicación de la SEECI*, (54), 43-63. <https://doi.org/10.15198/seeci.2021.54.e656>
- Jornet Meliá, J.M., Bakieva, M., Sánchez-Delgado, P. (2020). La Cohesión Social como Objetivo de la Educación: ¿Podemos Especificar un Modelo de Calidad para Realizar la Evaluación de Sistemas Educativos?. *Fronteiras: Journal of Social, Technological and Environmental Science*, 9(3), 239-260. <https://doi.org/10.21664/2238-8869.2020v9i3.p239-260>
- Kagan, D.M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of educational research*, 62(2), 129-169. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543062002129>
- Keeley, J.W., Ismail, E., Buskist, W. (2016). Excellent teachers' perspectives on excellent teaching. *Teaching of Psychology*, 43(3), 175-179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628316649307>
- Lowman, J. (2004). *Dominando as técnicas de ensino*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Luaiza, B.A. (2008). *Didática universitária. Imperatriz: Beniros*.
- López Solé, S., Civís Zaragoza, M., Díaz-Gibson, J. (2018). Improving interaction in teacher training programmes: the rise of the social dimension in pre-service

- teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(6), 644-658. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2018.1459541>
- Marsh H. (1991). A multidimensional perspective on students' evaluations of teaching effectiveness: A reply to Abrami and d'Apollonia (1991). *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83:416-421
- Merellano-Navarro, E., Muñoz-Oyarce, M., Chandia, M.R., Macaya, M.M. (2021). Perspective of Teaching in University Professors: Case Study in a Chilean University. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(2), 140-150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n2p140>
- Merlyn-Sacoto, M.F., Acurio-Velasco, C.V., Cabezas-Guerra, C.B., Orbe-Nájera, C.E., Riera-Vásquez, W.L. (2018). Rasgos de personalidad que afectan el desempeño de los profesores de la PUCE matriz en las funciones de docencia e investigación. *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia)*, 44(1), 331-349. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052018000100331>
- Montesdeoca, D.V., Gómez-Parra, M.E., Espejo, R. (2020). Estrategias de enseñanza de la comprensión lectora aplicadas y percibidas: un estudio con docentes y estudiantes de cuarto grado de educación básica de Manabí-Ecuador. *Investigaciones Sobre Lectura*, 14, 165-180. <https://digibug.ugr.es/handle/10481/65576>
- Muñiz-Velázquez, J., Navazo-Ostúa, P. (2021). Desinformación visual en redes sociales y medios digitales: una propuesta taxonómica de la manipulación fotográfica distribuida durante la pandemia. CIC. *Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación*, 26, 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.5209/ciyc.75235>
- Olivera Carvalho, R.D., Pereira de Castro, S., Ramos Nogueira, D. (2012). O bom professor na perspectiva da geração Y: uma análise sob a percepção dos discentes de Ciências Contábeis. *Enfoque: reflexão contábil*, 31(3), 37-52. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3071/307125339004.pdf>
- Otzen, T., Manterola, C. (2017). Técnicas de Muestreo sobre una Población a Estudio. *International Journal of Morphology*, 35(1), 227-232. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022017000100037>
- Pan, D., Tan, G.S.H., Ragupathi, K., Booluck, K., Roop, R., Lp, Y.K. (2009). Profiling teacher/teaching using descriptors derived from qualitative feedback: Formative and summative applications. *Research in Higher Education* 50(1), 73-100. ScholarBank@NUS Repository. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-008-9109-4>
- Navia, C., Hirsch, A., Izarra, D. (2020). Rasgos Propuestos por Académicos de Posgrado con Respecto a lo que Significa Ser un Buen Profesor Universitario. *Trayectorias*, 22(51), 3-24.

- Nogueira, D.R., Casa Nova, S., Carvalho, R.C.O. (2012). O bom professor na perspectiva da geração Y: uma análise sob a percepção dos discentes de Ciências. *Enfoque: Reflexão Contábil*, 31(3), 37-52. <https://doi.org/10.4025/enfoque.v31i3.16895>
- Núñez Lira, L.A., Lescano López, G.S., Iburguen Cueva, F.E., Neyra Huamani, L. (2019). Consideraciones teóricas en torno a la Responsabilidad Social de la Educación. *Revista Venezolana De Gerencia*, 24(87), 725-735. <https://doi.org/10.37960/revista.v24i87.24634>
- O'Connor, K.E. (2008). "You choose to care": Teachers, emotions and professional identity. *Teaching and teacher education*, 24(1), 117-126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.008>
- Pantić, N., Wubbels, T. (2010). Teacher competencies as a basis for teacher education—Views of Serbian teachers and teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(3), 694-703. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.005>
- Pestano, M.H., Gageiro, J.N. (2005). *Análise de dados para Ciências Sociais. A complementaridade do SPSS* (4ª Ed.). Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.
- Ripoll-Nuñez, K. y Arrieta-Caycedo, C. A. (2022). ¿Qué es un docente de calidad? Perspectivas de docentes y estudiantes de una institución de educación superior en Colombia. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (85), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num85-11690>
- Rivera Ferrer, N., Guerra Guirola, G. (2019). Gestión de participación popular como ejercicio docente y participativo para el autodesarrollo comunitario. *Revista de Ciencias de la Comunicación e Información*, 24(2), 31-44. [https://doi.org/10.35742/rcci.2019.24\(2\).31-44](https://doi.org/10.35742/rcci.2019.24(2).31-44)
- Roa-Cárdenas, F. L. y González-Puebla, F. J. (2022). Revisión de investigaciones sobre riesgo psicosocial en docentes universitarios. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (86), 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num86-12511>
- Rolim, R.C., Oliveira, M.D., Silva A, Mesquita, M. A. B. (2007). Satisfação com o curso de graduação: um estudo junto aos estudantes de Administração da Universidade Federal de Lavras. *Encontro da ANPAD*, XXX. http://www.anpad.org.br/diversos/down_zips/33/EPQ-A2699.pdf
- Salcedo, A., Uzcátegui Pacheco, R.A. (2021). Docentes universitarios migrantes: una mirada cuantitativa a un problema cualitativo. *Vivat Academia. Revista de Comunicación* (154), 101-131. <https://doi.org/10.15178/va.2021.154.e1277>

- Sánchez-Díaz, L.C., Sánchez García, J.E., Palomino Alvarado, GdelP., Verges, I.Y. (2021). Desafíos de la educación universitaria ante la virtualidad en tiempos de la pandemia. *Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, 27, 32-48. <https://doi.org/10.31876/rce.v27i.36992>
- Shawer, S.F. (2017). Teacher-driven curriculum development at the classroom level: Implications for curriculum, pedagogy and teacher training. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 63, 296-313. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.12.017>
- Sotelo González, J., Díaz Arias, R., López Frías, C. (2021). El Estado nos protege. Encuadre de la Covid-19 en los informativos de televisión estatales. *Historia y Comunicación Social*, 26(2), 617-642. <https://doi.org/10.5209/hics.79159>
- Suárez-Amaya, W., Rodríguez-Altamirano, M., Ganga-Contreras, F.A. (2022). Estrategias para promover la producción científica universitaria en Chile. *Revista De Ciencias Sociales*, 28(2), 350-363. <https://doi.org/10.31876/rce.v28i2.37943>
- Sutherland, L., Howard, S., Markauskaite, L. (2010). Professional identity creation: Examining the development of beginning preservice teachers' understanding of their work as teachers. *Teaching and teacher education*, 26(3), 455-465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.006>
- Thakor, M.V. (1996). Brand origin: conceptualization and review. *Journal of consumer marketing*, 13(3), 27-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363769610147929>
- Tejedor, S., Cervi, L., Tusa, F., Parola, A, (2020). Educación en tiempos de pandemia: reflexiones de alumnos y profesores sobre la enseñanza virtual universitaria en España, Italia y Ecuador. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, 78, 1-21. www.doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2020-1466
- Toni, D., Paese, C., Larentis, F., MATTIA, A., & Schuler, M. (2006). Análise de satisfação com instituições de educação superior e imagem: comparando instrumentos. *Anais do Encontro Nacional dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Administração*, Salvador-BA, 30. http://www.anpad.org.br/diversos/down_zips/10/enanpad2006-epqa-3083.pdf
- Trigo Ibáñez, E., Santos Díaz, I.C., Jiménez López, G. (2021). Comunicarse en la escuela plurilingüe: la formación en lengua extranjera del futuro profesorado. *Revista Latina De Comunicación Social*, 79, 53-75. <https://doi.org/10.4185/RLCS-2021-1497>

- Ventura, M.C.A.A., Neves M.M.A.M.D., Loureiro, C.R.E.C., Ferreira, M.M.F., Cardoso, E.M.P. (2011). O bom professor: opinião dos estudantes. *Revista de Enfermagem Referência*, 3(5), 95-102. <https://doi.org/10.12707/RIII1167>
- Viloria-Matheus, H., Reyes, S. (2020). Competencias tecnológicas en docentes para uso del multimedia en programas de comunicación social colombianos. *Perspectivas de la Comunicación*, 13(1), 129-135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-48672020000100219>
- Villalta-Paucar, M. A., Martinic-Valencia, S. y Assael-Budnik, C. (2022). Interacción y práctica reflexiva del docente en la sala de clase. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, (86), 95-118. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num86-12270>
- Whale, D. (2006). Technology Skills as a Criterion in Teacher Evaluation. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14 (1), 61-74. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/5252/>.
- Zabalza, M.Á. (2016). Ser profesor universitario hoy. *La cuestión universitaria*, (5), 68-80. <http://polired.upm.es/index.php/lacuestionuniversitaria/article/view/3338/3403>