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Abstract

University teachers are unique group of the employees working society-widely in each State. Improving the quality of university education, it is extremely important to pay attention to the definition of key personality competences that teachers should have and that would convey to their students through an effect of being conformed to. Purpose of study is to analyze and define the key personality competences of the university teachers, in conditions of the University of Žilina, Slovakia. The study presents the results of a sociological interview: through using a form of 3 controlled interviews with 27 teachers, we define the crucial personality competences of the teacher. In addition, the results of this qualitative searching we undergone to a quantitative survey – in the form of a questionnaire survey (which included 395 university students) were surveyed, how these competences should be defined from the viewpoint of the teacher and viewpoint of the students; we also surveyed what weight was assigned by students to the teachers’ personality competencies defined in previous qualitative research. The most significant conclusions of the research and all study consist in a definition of four clusters of the competence profile of teachers. These ones represent a unique breakthrough of the teacher’s personal competences aimed at teacher oneself, i.e. self-reflecting, self-renewing, self-motivating, and self-developing personality competences, and the personality competences focusing on the others – students, i.e. inter-reflecting, inter-renewing, inter-motivating, and inter-developing competences.

1. Introduction

A university represents the base and opportunity for free research, spreading ideas and knowledge. It is a high credibility system, where the employees are perceived as unique personalities enjoying high credibility (Soviar, 2009, p. 214) and freedom provided by the superiors.

The university teachers represent a specific category of employees in each state and intellectual cream of each nation, they are a model of erudition and permanent progress used for the benefit of other people (entire society) and passed on other people (students, colleagues, employers). According to Boyer, teaching not only involves transmitting knowledge but also involves transforming and extending it (1990, p. 24).
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The university teachers perform work rendering a lot of responsibility, which is very demanding in terms of mental conditions and personal requirements in particular. Their work is an everyday confrontation of precision, stress, commitment, enjoyment of scientific research and uncovering of new knowledge, joy of passing knowledge and skills on students who receive them and will use them throughout their lives, disappointment resulting from rejection of new or unconventional educational approaches and methods.

The teachers feel very responsible for their performance in their capacity of teachers and scientists, they are afraid of harm caused to their professional image, disregard of their results etc. This emphasizes the level of mental difficulty of their work at universities. By accepting the statements above and as a part of the project implementation supported by the European Social Fund entitled the “Development of Quality Culture at Žilina University” in line with the European university education standards, we focused in this article on defining the key competences of the university teachers and link them with the university education quality.

Due to the fact that the direct addressees of the teachers’ performance are mainly the students, this article is aimed to present the opinions of the desirable profile of a teacher not only from the perspective of the teachers and the managing employees of the university, but also from the viewpoint of the students. In the survey we applied 2 basic methods of sociological inquiry. The first method being repeated focus group interviews with a group of 27 teachers (carried out and subsequently elaborated at 3 workshops in 2012). The second method was a questionnaire survey of the students’ opinions, in which 395 university students participated at the turn of 2012/2013.

Subsequent comparison of the findings is discussed in the article, the results of which may be the incentive for further research and also for improving quality of the university management system, development of the teachers’ competences, teaching conditions etc.

2. The Role of a University Teacher and Psychological Requirements of Their Work

At present the role of the university teachers has changed along with the change in perceiving the academic profession, students, education, examinations, interpersonal relationships and life at university. This new situation may result in fear of failure, various types of conflict, loss of self-confidence or accepting wrong behaviour models or inappropriate education methods (Vašutová, 2005, p. 77). The role of a university teacher must be perceived as a highly qualified profession, which is mostly understood as a mission. A teacher is a carrier of education and guard of humanitarian and ethical values. A teacher must cultivate a student as a multilayer personality (Slavík et al., 2012, p. 73).

The role of a university teacher may be defined as summary and comprehensive teacher’s behaviour in relation to students, other teachers, university management, professional and general public, and as the overall mission to educate, develop, facilitate, revive etc. qualifications and personal potential of the students and younger colleagues. Fisher (1998) lists the following roles of a teacher:

• Teacher as a professional leading students to higher levels of understanding,
• Teacher as a mediator allowing students to explore ideas and work together,
• Teacher as a participant in the discussion contributing to the discussion in various ways.

The presented roles may be supplemented also by definitions of other necessary roles, which should be performed by each high quality university teacher. An interesting structure of non-substitutable roles is specified by Homolová (2003, p. 33):

• Teacher as a facilitator (helping person),
• Teacher as an advisor (in various areas and needs of students),
• Teacher as a guide (in the world of education),
• Teacher as a director (of the subsequent development of a student’s potential),
• Teacher as a role model (worth following),
• Teacher as a motivator (scrupulous learning and research) etc.

A university teacher reveals not only new knowledge and ideas to the students. They reveal their inherently inert property: their ways of thinking, they reflect and project their personality in the students’ personalities, confront their experience with the students’ experience, fight with wins and losses of their empathy and results of their social
and emotional intelligence. This is where the questions relating to the discipline in the education process arise (on the sides of both a teacher and students), the temperament of a teacher and students is examined, conflicts and tensions between various types of persons and natures occur, continuum of strictness up to/versus responsiveness of a teacher to students is demonstrated etc.

3. Desirable Profile – Key Competences of a University Teacher

The desirable profile of a university teacher endeavours to identify ambitiously designed requirements, characteristics, attributes and elements of a teacher’s personality motivating and calling to achieve demanding objectives and tasks of each highly responsible and erudite individual contributing to development of the existing knowledge and passing knowledge, skills and experience on the university students. The desirable profile should be a model, inspiration and also a standard, which should be followed by each teacher in terms of behaviour and performance of their work (Blašková & Blaško, 2012, p. 37).

Socio-constructivist approaches to education are very important in this field. These ones represent a radical turning point in how the learning process is regarded as a process of discovering, constructing and reconstructing knowledge, attitudes, competence and values on the basis of one’s own activity and existing experience with the help of the teacher and in cooperation with classmates. Stress is laid on comprehension and the ability to make use of knowledge to solve problems in real life situations, understanding the sense of learning, adopting one’s own attitudes and viewpoints, and strengthening responsibility for one’s own learning (Spilková, 2011, p. 118).

According to Dolittle & Camp (1999), in constructivist education, as a form of collaborative and cooperative learning, learning should take place in authentic and real-world environments, and teachers should provide for and encourage multiple perspectives and representations of content. Mentioned ideas indicate that one of key competences is the expert (technical) competence – teacher has to be an excellent expert in the field he/she searches, discovers, and teaches.

The considered competence is associated with the creativity competence. A teacher should be first of all creative, inventive, imaginative and brave. Creativity is a decisive factor affecting human society. Productive thinking, original ideas, discoveries and inventions are the basis for expansion of knowledge, the progress of science, development of arts, technology, production and success in practical work (Decký, 2013, p. 9).

Competence of creativity is closely related to teaching performance/dimension of the teacher’s personality. With regard to the teacher’s activities the objective means an idea of what should be achieved by the activities (Průcha, Walterová & Mareš, 1998, p. 34). If a teacher wishes that their students are provided with the best quality education, the students should reach the highest possible of 5 levels of learning (defined by Gibbs, 1992), i.e. learning as comprehending reality – experiential learning, which allows students to see the world in a different way, which is individual and performed with comprehension (Vašutová et al., 1999). It means, further of important competences is the pedagogical competence.

It is evident that the higher level of abilities and skills are demonstrated by a student, the higher flexibility, creativity and originality of stimuli and requirements must be offered, provided and required by the teacher towards a student so that the teacher does not “lose” a student, but just to the contrary, to gain the student’s desire for more in-depth study. At the same time, the teacher must always objectively and fairly assess the success of their students and respect the multifactor decision-making on the final classification of the student’s knowledge. Fourth key competence consists in assessorial competence. Cowan states that assessment is the powerhouse of learning. It is the engine that drives learning (1999). Assessment must perform double duty; not only does it assess content it must also prepare learners for future learning (Boud, 2002). Inspirational is especially a peer assessment is an interactive and dynamic process that involves learners in assessing, critiquing and making value judgment on the quality and standard of work of other learners, and providing feedback to peers to enable them enhance performance (Juwah, 2003).

The optimal educational contact and sound communication while teaching establish preconditions, e.g. for development of the students’ motivation, support characteristics of their work, affect education consequences of the teacher’s work, ensure optimal emotional atmosphere at classes and make space for wide range of specific
properties of self-fulfillment of the teacher and students (Černotová, 2005, p. 4). It means that not only information itself but also its application in an appropriate situation and communication are very contributive for learning (Šimonová, Poullová & Bílek, 2010, p. 87).

Experience has shown that the biggest problem of many university teachers is to determine the correct quantity and quality of information to be passed on to the students and required from the students that they could handle (Vidriková, 2012). It means the communicational competence represents the fourth teacher’s competence.

Psychological effect of information means the type and impact of the student’s reaction to the content and form of provided information. Professional teacher’s performance also includes the skill to communicate messages with emotional content (both positive and negative messages), (Slavík et al., 2012, p. 47). Crucial is a level of empathy applied by the teacher in relation to the students, which helps to improve the teacher-student relationship, increases the level of learning and understanding various information and phenomena etc. This means that the results of feedback in the education process may be helpful to a teacher (in their efforts to improve the communication, professional and teaching skills) as well as students (in their efforts to improve their own knowledge by improving communication skills or means of obtaining better information from the teacher).

In any education-related communication the teachers endeavour first of all to present their facts they consider the most significant, hoping that they will manage to explain their students and address their motivation in a sufficiently clear and positive manner (Rostášová, Corejová & Črenková, 2012, p. 620). Putting stress on the clearly selected parts of communication renders their emphasis, decipher the original intention of the teacher as a communicator, intensity of their preferences (motivation) so that the communicated intention is fulfilled.

On the other side a student demonstrates by reactions their consent, their passion or disagreement or opposition to communicating the content of the curriculum. The student intentionally or unintentionally expresses the level of compliance of their motivation with the communicated topic and teacher’s motivation (providing information). This means that as it is possible to motivate teachers and students to the desirable teaching and learning performance, it is also possible to motivate them to systematic improvement of communication, established communication systems and applied communication skills.

In addition to verbal and non-verbal communication skills, the paraverbal communication is also very important, i.e. the art of keeping quiet and speaking at the right moment (Helmová & Janíčková, 2012, p. 2). Also, the value of using diagrams as a methodological tool was that they afforded the teachers the opportunity to work directly with visual concepts whilst allowing the participants to express themselves in a creative and imaginative manner. Each diagram has to be accompanied by a short descriptive passage of written discourse aimed at contextualising the student’s perceptions (Clark & Andrews, 2010, p. 4).

A very important role in the teacher’s communication competence is played by communication through actions. This represents atypical, action communication, the information content of which can be derived from particular acts, deeds or measures taken and/or not taken by a teacher towards students. Information, i.e. communication content, and at the same time carriers of other teacher’s key competences can also include the following acts:

• Provision of sufficient time to students during written knowledge examination or test, explanation of unclear issues of the assignments or tasks in the case a student does not understand them = moral and ethical competence of a teacher.
• Thorough reading and objective evaluation of the students’ written projects (including references to sections, which the students may enhance and elaborate while repairing the project, or references to very well mastered sections of the project) = competence of a mature personality + motivation competence of a teacher.

All similar acts communicate quality of relationships between a teacher and students, they are indicators of successful education process.

M. Pasch et al. emphasise, in addition to the teacher’s skill of listening well, attentively, i.e. actively, also the skill of attending behaviour. This means using many verbal and non-verbal reactions indicating to a student that the teacher listens and considers the student’s words (replies, acts, skills) to be important (Pasch et al., 1998). Here the need of the teacher’s motivation competence is more strongly reflected. In the area of motivation and leading competences it is very helpful if the teachers create expert networks, where they can together enhance their knowledge and develop desirable cooperation. In this sense, for example leadership development programs may be
viewed as constituting a temporary organizational context that provides the opportunity for participants to interact with new colleagues and thereby to forge new knowledge sharing opportunities while preserving their established networks (Espedal, Gooderham & Evensen, 2012, p. 61).

On the other side of the motivation continuum, the teacher must be a personality willing and able to constantly and continuously learn and never ease up in enhancing their potential, improving strengths and removing weaknesses. They must zealously work on their qualifications growth. This is stressed by the self-motivation competence of a teacher. Self-reflecting competence also plays a very important role – the teacher must be willing to continuously make introspection. They should be objective in assessing themselves as well as all knowledge that is passed on the students and colleagues; they should be a proud professional. Simply, another competence is of high importance – competence of a critically thinking personality.

4. Methods

In order to obtain as many opinions on the desirable competence profile of a university teacher as possible we carried out a primary research composed of the qualitative survey, and based on this survey we performed subsequent quantitative survey.

4.1. Participants and characteristics of qualitative research

We carried out the qualitative survey in the form of 3 consecutive focus group interviews (workshops). The workshop participants were persons involved in the project Development of culture quality at the University of Žilina based on European standards of higher education (DEQUA), ITMS code 26110230060 (project is funded by European Social Fund), namely 27 professionals performing the activities 1.2 Design and verification of the system of internal education quality assurance on ESG basis.

Table 1. Identification of controlled interviews (workshops) participants

| Participants | [Number – % of all – average age] |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 27 – 100% – 44.93 |
| Male | PhD./Dr. | Associate Professor | Professor |
| 12 – 44.44% – 44.83 | 15 – 55.56% – 41.07 | 9 – 33.33% – 46.00 | 3 – 11.11% – 61.00 |
| Female | 15 – 55.56% – 45.00 |
| 5 – 18.52% | 10 – 37.04% | 5 – 18.52% | 4 – 14.81% | 2 – 7.41% | 1 – 3.70% |
| 35.20 | 44.00 | 46.00 | 45.00 | 64.00 | 55.00 |

The objective of the first focus group interview (workshop) was to define the content of a university teacher’s quality (university teacher’s quality = level, i.e. ratio of the expectations and their fulfillment, the set of the teacher’s qualities, i.e. their own characteristics, thanks to which they perform requirements imposed on them) and to define 6 dimensions, i.e. competences of teachers (DEQUA, 2012a):

- Education competence,
- Research competence,
- Publishing competence,
- Personality competence,
- Professional competence,
- Growth and development competence.

After the workshop the participants were provided with 4 weeks for tuning the defined competences/dimensions by their suggestions. At the subsequent (second) workshop the teachers’ competences were elaborated on the basis of the delivered suggestions and discussions as follows (DEQUA, 2012b):

- Education competence,
- Cognitive competence,
• Communication competence,
• Research competence,
• Publishing competence,
• Personality competence,
• Motivation competence,
• Professional competence,
• Growth and development competence.

After the second workshop the participants had the opportunity to comment and develop the teacher’s competences defined so far. At the third workshop all advantages and potential imperfections of the identified competences were comprehensively reviewed. The outcome of the long discussions was this final list of the personality competences of a university teacher (DEQUA, 2012c):

• Morally and ethically acting personality,
• Professional personality,
• Personality with valuable scientific effort,
• Acclaimed author and honest personality,
• Personality with excellent teaching competences,
• Personality acting as a role model,
• Mature personality,
• Critically thinking personality,
• Sophisticated and communicating personality,
• Progressive, highly motivated and always motivating personality.

4.2. Participants and characteristics of quantitative research

Based on the 10 personality competences defined by the teachers at the three workshops we considered it necessary to provide room to students, who are the addressees of all efforts rendered by teachers’ high quality performance, for expressing their opinions. We created a questionnaire, where in addition to other facts; we paid attention to the two following areas:

• Characteristics of desirable professional and personality teacher profile defined by the university students (an open question, where the students have to express their own views on the positive characteristics of a quality teacher competence).
• Allocating the level of importance to teacher’s competences defined in the qualitative survey carried out at the workshops of the members in activities No. 1.2 (closed scale question, where the students were to allocate each of 10 personality competences importance on the scale 1 – 10, where 1= the least important; 10 – extremely important, even inevitable characteristic).

395 students of University of Žilina participated in the survey at the turn of 2012/2013. The sample and basic characteristics of the respondents are listed in Table 2.

| Table 2. Identification of questionnaire survey participants |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Participants** [Number – % of all – average age]            |
| **395 – 100% – 20.84**                                       |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 279 – 70.63% – 20.85                                         |
| Level of study: Bachelor                                     |
| 346 – 87.59% – 20.48                                         |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 116 – 29.67% – 20.82                                         |
| Level of study: Master                                       |
| 49 – 12.41% – 23.39                                          |
| **First year**                                               |
| 120 – 30.38% – 19.52                                         |
| **Second year**                                              |
| 150 – 37.97% – 20.66                                         |
| **Third year**                                               |
| 76 – 19.24% – 21.62                                          |
| **First year**                                               |
| 6 – 1.52% – 23.33                                            |
| **Second year**                                              |
| 43 – 10.89% – 23.40                                          |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 79 – 20.00% – 10.38                                          |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 41 – 10.38% – 27.85                                          |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 110 – 27.85% – 10.13                                         |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 40 – 10.13% – 16.96                                         |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 67 – 16.96% – 2.28                                          |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 9 – 2.28% – 1.01%                                           |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 4 – 1.01% – 0.51%                                           |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 2 – 0.51% – 4.81%                                           |
| **Male**                                                     |
| 19 – 4.81% – 6.08%                                          |
| **Female**                                                   |
| 24 – 6.08% – 24%                                           |
In order to define desirable personality competences of the university teachers we decided to engage both the teachers and students to creation of the university teacher profile. The teachers are in the direct contact with the students, cooperate with them and pass on them their knowledge and experience. Table 3 specified the most frequent replies of the students to this open question.

Table 3. Identification of the most frequent competences of teachers expressed by student (>12.50%)

| Competence              | All students | Student boys | Student girls |
|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Number                  | 192          | 125          | 67            |
| % of all                | 48.61%       | 31.65%       | 16.96%        |
| Number                  | 147          | 102          | 45            |
| % of men                | 37.22%       | 25.82%       | 11.39%        |
| Number                  | 133          | 87           | 46            |
| % of women              | 33.67%       | 22.03%       | 11.65%        |
| Number                  | 113          | 73           | 40            |
| % of men                | 28.61%       | 18.48%       | 10.13%        |
| Tolerance               | 111          | 79           | 32            |
| % of women              | 28.10%       | 20.00%       | 8.10%         |
| Number                  | 109          | 73           | 36            |
| % of men                | 27.59%       | 18.48%       | 9.11%         |
| Patience                | 90           | 55           | 35            |
| % of women              | 22.78%       | 13.92%       | 8.86%         |
| Number                  | 89           | 50           | 30            |
| % of men                | 22.53%       | 17.72%       | 4.81%         |
| Intelligibility         | 75           | 54           | 21            |
| % of women              | 18.99%       | 13.67%       | 5.32%         |
| Number                  | 64           | 44           | 20            |
| % of men                | 16.20%       | 11.14%       | 5.06%         |
| Kind approach           | 62           | 41           | 21            |
| % of women              | 15.70%       | 10.38%       | 5.32%         |
| Number                  | 58           | 37           | 24            |
| % of men                | 14.68%       | 9.37%        | 5.32%         |
| Comprehension           | 58           | 45           | 13            |
| % of women              | 14.68%       | 11.39%       | 3.29%         |
| Sense of humor          | 58           | 45           | 13            |
| % of men                | 14.68%       | 11.39%       | 3.29%         |
| Friendliness            | 55           | 37           | 18            |
| % of women              | 13.92%       | 9.37%        | 4.56%         |
| Empathy                 | 55           | 37           | 18            |
| % of men                | 13.92%       | 9.37%        | 4.56%         |
| Creativity              | 52           | 29           | 23            |
| % of women              | 13.16%       | 7.34%        | 5.82%         |
| Ability to motivate     | 50           | 35           | 15            |
| % of men                | 12.66%       | 8.86%        | 3.80%         |

It follows from Table 3 that the students believe that the three most important personality competences include: professionalism (expertise), justice and communication skills. The ability to motivate and responsibility were at the bottom of the list of 17 most required competences (50 students out of total 395 students selected responsibility, i.e. more than 12.50%).

Table 4 specifies the importance values (lower 1 to upper 10), allocated by the students to the 10 most important characteristics (1 – 10) defined by the teachers at the preceding workshops. The individual sub-tables specify the following characteristics: 1 morally and ethically acting personality, 2 professional personality, 3 personality with excellent teaching competences, 4 personality with valuable scientific effort, 5 acclaimed author and honest personality, 6 progressive, highly motivated and always motivating personality, 7 morally and ethically acting personality, 8 critical thinking personality, 9 mature personality, 10 personality acting as a role model, 11 sophisticated and communicating personality. The sub-tables specify individual point values of the frequency, the relative frequencies in percentages, frequencies for male students (♂) and female students (♀). The asterisk * identifies the most frequent value (modus). The bottom of the sub-tables specifies other statistical characteristics: mean X, sample variance s², upper quartile X₀.₇₅, median X₀.₅₀, lower quartile X₀.₂₅.

It is inspiring that each competence defined by the teachers achieved material importance on the student’s side. The least material importance was allocated to competences (from the lowest) ⑤, ② a ③ with average values X₅=6.65, X₂=6.86, X₃=7.13 and a median X₀.₅₀=7 (for all three competences). Average importance exceeding 8 was assigned to six competences, where median value of the first two was equal to 9 and value of others was 8. The competences in the following order ③, ②, ④, ⑤, ⑥ and ⑨ with average values X₃=8.64, X₂=8.51, X₅=8.22, X₆=8.19, X₁₀=8.15 and Xᵦ₆=8.10. The fact, that the competences ③ and ② are important for the students, is proved also by frequency of their replies. The highest value of 10 was assigned to the competences by 41.27% and 39.75% of students respectively.

If we look at importance of the competences from the perspectives of a teacher and student, the most frequent seventeen competences (Tab. 3) include those from Tab. 4 as follows: competence ② ranking first (192; 48.61%), competence ⑥ ranking third (133; 33.67%) and competence ⑤ ranking 16th – 17th (50; 12.66%). From this viewpoint also competence ① is interesting, which was identified by 41 (10.28%) students. As we can see, the students put more emphasis on competences of a teacher, with which they are in the direct contact (good
professional, fair, communicative, accommodating, willing to help...). The characteristics, such as good and acclaimed author, critically thinking personality or personality with valuable scientific efforts, are not sufficiently visible for the students, therefore they perceive them less intensively or to a minimum extent (characteristics ⑤, ⑥ and ⑦).

Table 4. Levels of importance of teachers’ competences from the viewpoint of students

|   | all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|---|---------|---|---|
| 10 | 74 [18.73] | 44 | 30* |
| 9  | 60 [15.19]  | 35 | 25 |
| 8  | 113 [28.61]* | 85* | 28 |
| 7  | 43 [10.89]  | 35 | 8  |
| 6  | 29 [7.34]   | 24 | 5  |
| 5  | 60 [15.19]  | 44 | 16 |
| 4  | 3 [0.76]    | 2  | 1  |
| 3  | 5 [1.27]    | 4  | 1  |
| 2  | 4 [1.01]    | 3  | 1  |
| 1  | 4 [1.01]    | 3  | 1  |
|   |           |    |    |
| ①| all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|   | 7.59 | 7.43 | 7.97 |
| ②| 8.51 | 8.40 | 8.76 |
| ③| 8.64 | 8.54 | 8.87 |
| ④| 7.13 | 7.10 | 7.21 |
| ⑤| 6.65 | 6.61 | 6.76 |
| ⑥| 8.10 | 7.96 | 8.43 |
| ⑦| 6.86 | 6.76 | 7.12 |
| ⑧| 8.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| ⑨| 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| ⑩| 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| ⑪| 3.01 | 3.05 | 2.91 |

|   | all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|---|---------|---|---|
| 10 | 157 [39.75]* | 101* | 56* |
| 9  | 65 [16.46]  | 47 | 18 |
| 8  | 87 [22.03]  | 67 | 20 |
| 7  | 35 [8.86]   | 24 | 11 |
| 6  | 21 [5.32]   | 17 | 4  |
| 5  | 22 [5.57]   | 16 | 6  |
| 4  | 6 [1.52]    | 6  | -  |
| 3  | 1 [0.25]    | -  | 1  |
| 2  | -           | -  | -  |
| 1  | -           | -  | -  |
|   |           |    |    |
| ①| all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|   | 10 | 104 [26.33]* | 77* | 27* |
| ②| 76 [19.24]  | 58* | 18 |
| ③| 117 [29.62]* | 86* | 31 |
| ④| 43 [11.9]   | 28 | 19 |
| ⑤| 52 [13.16]  | 40 | 12 |
| ⑥| 11 [2.78]   | 3  | 1  |
| ⑦| 8 [2.03]    | 5  | 3  |
| ⑧| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
| ⑨| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
| ⑩| 43 [11.9]   | 28 | 19 |
| ⑪| 52 [13.16]  | 40 | 12 |
| ⑫| 8 [2.03]    | 5  | 3  |
| ⑬| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
| ⑭| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
|   |           |    |    |
| ①| all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|   | 8.0 | 8.0 | 8.5 |
| ②| 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| ③| 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| ④| 3.01 | 3.05 | 2.91 |
|   |           |    |    |
| ①| all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|   | 10 | 120 [30.38]* | 80* | 40* |
| ②| 63 [15.95]  | 32 | 31 |
| ③| 107 [27.09] | 78 | 29 |
| ④| 51 [12.91]  | 44 | 7  |
| ⑤| 18 [4.56]   | 15 | 3  |
| ⑥| 25 [6.33]   | 21 | 4  |
| ⑦| 6 [1.52]    | 5  | 1  |
| ⑧| 2 [0.51]    | 2  | -  |
| ⑨| 2 [0.51]    | 1  | 1  |
| ⑩| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
| ⑪| 1 [0.25]    | 1  | -  |
|   |           |    |    |
| ①| all [%] |♂ |♀ |
|   | 8.22 | 8.04 | 8.66 |
| ②| 8.0 | 8.0 | 9.0 |
| ③| 7.0 | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| ④| 2.89 | 3.09 | 2.16 |
4.3. Results and discussion

At present the university must experience and bear a high social responsibility for itself as a socially beneficial institution, as an employer, but also for its teachers and managers. It must operate like any other controlled entity applying modern principles of management. The argument that management taking into account corporate social responsibility is difficult and many are not able to deal with that, is not a serious, and may be only evidence of a narrow perspective of managers declaring such opinions or simply their immense lack of knowledge in management (Zemigala, 2012, p. 127).

5. Conclusion

We can define high quality education as a teacher’s conduct resulting in effective teaching, in thorough and permanent learning of knowledge, skills and values passed on a student by a teacher or relevant institution (Felder & Brent, 1999, p. 2). It is evident that the differences between the individual students are visible, however, it is important which basic activities take place in their personality. The students’ cognitive styles vary, which include thinking, processing and epistemological styles, and result in the meta-styles replacing a number of such styles (Šimonová et al., 2010, p. 88). Only the erudite teachers are able to skillfully treat such facts. Performance and knowledge contribution of experienced teachers is measureless. They provide knowledge and inspiration not only to students but also to their younger colleagues – teachers. They become acclaimed authorities in their scientific discipline, summarise their comprehensive knowledge to creative schools and research laboratories.

Continuous improvement of quality of teaching and acquired competences by the students must be precisely planned, prepared and implemented in the everyday university practice (Kachaňáková, Staňková & Staňo, 2012, p. 35). The most crucial assumption for implementing the university education in line with the process, which creates values, stimulates progress and improves dynamically, is a continuously strengthened quality of the profile/skills and competencies of the university teachers. The teacher must improve the following qualities:

- **Science and research** (using scientific efforts they must attract students and provide them always with correct, accurate, useful and inspiring knowledge),
- **Teaching** (to be staunch professionals in the field of education),
- **Intra-personal qualities** (understand one’s mission as completion of one’s personal qualities),
- **Inter-personal** (educate in close participation with students, respecting their personality).

Combing the last two competence clusters in teachers’ profile means a unique intersection of personality competences focused on oneself, i.e. personal competences of self-reflection, self-renewal, self-motivation and self-development with personality competences focused on other people – students, i.e. competences of inter-reflection, inter-renewal, inter-motivation and inter-development. In this area it is important to continually improve direct research and educational teacher’s performance (to communicate and transfer knowledge, mediate and teach skills,
and encourage/facilitate the development of competences of students and younger colleagues. However, it is also indispensable to improve the indirect teaching performance of teachers, i.e. performance of the objective assessment of the level of knowledge, skills and competences of the students.

Acknowledgements

The paper was conducted within the project: Development of culture quality at the University of Žilina based on European standards of higher education, ITMS code 26110230060; Modern Education for the Knowledge Society/Project is funded by EU.

References

Blášková, M. & Bláško, R.: Dimenzie a atributy kvality vysokoškolského učiteľa. Human Potential Management in a Company. Banská Bystrica: University of Matej Bel, 32-43.

Boud, D. (2002). Assessment. Seminar given on Assessment at the University of Glasgow’s Centre for Research in Higher Education. 10 February 2002.

Boyer, J. B. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, R. & Andrews, J. (2010). Promoting Scholarship – The Way Forward: Learning & Teaching Research in a Complex Environment – A Typology. Learning & Teaching Research Team, CLIPP, Aston University.

Čerňotová, M. (2005). Ako komunikovať so žiakmi. Prešov: Methodical-pedagogical Centre in Prešov

Cowan, J. (1999). Assessing Reflection. Workshop presented at the Year of Assessment. Aberdeen: The Robert Gordon University.

Decký, M. (2013). Tvorivost v konvergentnom a divergentnom myšlení v edukačnom procese technického, humanitného a umelstvá charakteru. Žilina: University of Žilina, 1-29.

DEQUA. (2012a). Improving quality of university teachers. Evidence from workshop of activity 1.2. Žilina: University of Žilina. March 23, 2012.

DEQUA. (2012b). Improving quality of university teachers. Evidence from workshop of activity 1.2. Žilina: University of Žilina. April 20, 2012.

DEQUA. (2012c). Improving quality of university teachers. Evidence from workshop of activity 1.2. Žilina: University of Žilina. May 15, 2012.

Dooslittle, P. E. & Camp, W. G. (1999). Constructivism: The Career and Technical Education Perspective. Journal of Vocational and Technical Education 16 (1), 23-46.

Espedal, B., Gooderham, P. & Evensen, H. (2012). The Impact of Global Leadership Development Programs on Social Networks and Knowledge Sharing in Multinational Enterprises. Human Potential Management and Ergonomics, 17(2), 45-65.

Felder, R. M. & Brent, R. (1998). How to Improve Teaching Quality. Quality Management Journal, 6(2), 9-21.

Fisher, R. (1998). Účinek děti myslí a učí se. Prague: Portál.

Gibbs, G. (1992). Improving the Quality of Student Learning. Bristol: Technical and Educational Service, Ltd.

Helmová, M. & Janíčková, E. (2012). Aspekty interkulturného komunikácie v globálnom hospodárskom prostredí. Bratislava: University of Economics in Bratislava.

Homolová, E. (2003). Upláňovanie princípov komunikatívneho vyučovania prostredníctvom učiteľských rolí. Banská Bystrica: UMB.

Juwah, Ch. (2003). Using Peer Assessment to Develop Skills and Capabilities. United States Distance Learning Association Journal, 17(1), 39-50.

Kachanáková, A., Stachová, K. & Stacho, Z. (2012). Performance Management in the Way towards Advancement of Organization. Human Potential Management and Ergonomics, VI(1), 30-39.

Pasch, M. et al. (1998). Od vzdělávacího programu k vyučovací hodině. Prague: Portál.

Průcha, J., Walterová, E. & Mareš, J. (1998). Pedagogický slovník. Praha: Portál.

Rostašová, M., Čerejová, T. & Chrenková, A. (2012). Creation of quality assurance in lifelong learning in the Slovak Republic. In Proceedings of International Conference on Engineering Education 2012. Turku: Turku University of Applied Sciences, 615-622.

Slavík, M. et al. (2012). Vysokoškolská pedagógika. Prague: Grada.

Soviar, J. (2009). Vybrané prístupy k štúdiu riadenia práce v modernnej spoločnosti. Manažment ’09. Žilina: EDIS, 212-216.

Spílková, V. (2011). Development of Student Teachers’ Professional Identity through Constructivist Approaches and Self-reflective Techniques. Orbis Scholar, 5(2), 117-138.

Šimonová, I., Poullová, P. & Bilek, M. (2010). Students’ Communication in On-line Courses. In Advanced Educational Technologies, 87-92. Tunis: WSEAS Press.

Vašatová, J. (2005). Pedagogické vzdělávání vysokoškolských učitelů jako aktuální potřeba. Aula, 13(3), 73-78.

Vašatová, J. et al. (1999). Vybrané otázky vysokoškolské pedagogiky (pro vzdělavače učitelů). Prague: Charles University.

Vidrižová, D. (2012). Implementation of the selected methods of the strategic management into private security services. In Engineering management and competitiveness (EMC 2012). Žrenjanin: University of Novi Sad, 97-101.

Zemigala, M. (2012). Controversies over Corporate Social Responsibility. Human Potential Management and Ergonomics, VI(1), 118-128.