

Martina Blašková

University of Žilina, Žilina, Slovakia

martina.blaskova@fri.uniza.sk

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2760-9724

Dominika Tumová

University of Žilina, Žilina, Slovakia

dominikatumova@gmail.com

Rudolf Blaško

University of Žilina, Žilina, Slovakia

beerb@frcatel.fri.uniza.sk

Relations of University Values and Competences of University Teachers

ABSTRACT

Objective: The paper deals with the theoretical and empirical examination of university values in relation to key competences of university teachers. The combination of values that universities should prioritize and the competences that university teachers should possess is seen in the paper as an important precondition for improving the quality and acceleration of modern university progress. The theoretical part analyzes, compares and synthesizes opinions on key terms examined in the paper, i.e. higher education, university, values, and competences. The empirical part presents, on the one hand, the results of the questionnaire survey aimed at de-

fining important university values. The survey was carried out on a sample of $n = 279$ students of the University of Žilina, Slovak Republic, and obtained 1,786 statements on crucial values or sub-values of the university. On the other hand, based on results of the previous survey ($n = 27$ university teachers) which was targeted on key competences of the great university teachers, the empirical part seeks to experimentally link university key values with teachers' key competences.

Methodology: Analysis, synthesis, comparison, abstraction, questionnaire survey, thinking experiment. Hypothesis H_1 : University values defined by students will be repeated in the survey, i.e. student views on the core values of university will be identical or similar in content. Negation hypothesis H_0 : University values defined by students will not be repeated in the survey.

Findings: Respondents reported a total of $n_o = 1,786$ statements regarding the university values or sub-values. A substantial consensus was found: many of values were repeated for respondents. Defined values were subsequently grouped: from the initially defined $n_1 = 229$ values, $n_2 = 32$ complex values were generated. This leads to a rejection of H_0 , in favor of H_1 : the university values generated by students are similar in the content.

The results in the evaluative question confirmed the assumption that respondents considered most important mostly those values that the previous open question most frequently reported. Although depending on the study program is always the quality of education in the first place of importance, the order of importance of other values varies to some extent.

Value Added: Opinions on university teachers' competences and university's values were discussed. Experimental linking of university values to competences of teachers was performed based on the survey results conducted by the authors in 2012 (this one consisted of three sequential interviews/workshops with teachers of University of Žilina). A logical conclusion was formulated: All the university teachers and scientists are becoming authorities competent to build, preserve and transform universal knowledge into an ever-higher level.

Recommendations: A conclusion of the paper contains the characteristics recommended for achieve an effective process of developing university competences.

Key words: university, university teachers, values, competences, students, survey

JEL codes: M12

1. Introduction

Higher education fulfills an irreplaceable and inimitable role in the continuous, dynamic, responsible and sophisticated advancement of every country,

and a comprehensive world respectively. Highly educated people possess huge knowledge wealth, have great professional skills and competences, are characterized by above-average motivation, and enthusiastically venture to enhance and improve all processes, organizations, society, and all of humanity. The wisdom that graduates have received at the university from lectures and study literature is put by them on a new, application level and provided to everyone around them. In this context, universities represent a specific type of organization, with the specific result of their activities: strengthened knowledge and improved personal features on the side of graduates.

However, similarly as all other organizations, universities as higher education institutions are also faced with a changing environment. An increasing international competition besides changing management paradigms in higher education, make universities encounter with new challenges (Dorri, Yarmohammadian, & Nadi, 2012, p. 3842). Especially a globalization of higher education accelerates the international dimension of higher education which is very important to improve the quality of education, research and other higher education services (Jibeen & Khan, 2015). To react quickly and wisely to changes that occur unexpectedly and are usually difficult to predict, people should be actively involved in the learning process (Figurska & Sokół, 2016, p. 143). This leads to the fact that the higher education institutions have become a highly competitive market, where consumers (i.e. students) are highly involved in their choices, and managers need to focus on competitive edges (Li, Granizo, & Gardó, 2016, p. 855).

Based on the fact that higher education significantly raises the level of knowledge, the intellectual disposition, and the cognitive powers of its students (Bowen & Fincher, 2018a), the higher education provides considerable value to individuals, to the economies where educated individuals live and work, and society in general (Hill, Hoffman, & Rex, 2005, p. 4). In this sense, universities have to take a higher degree of responsiveness towards their customers (students, business firms and other employees), and more engaged and socially responsible behavior in their interaction with other

stakeholders in a broader society (Rosi et al., 2018, p. 189). It means that all higher education institutions should provide favorable responses to social needs (Dorri, Yarmohammadian, & Nadi, 2012, p. 3842).

Because higher education includes both the curricular and extracurricular influences on students, its purpose is to change students in both the cognitive and affective aspects of their personalities and to prepare them for practical affairs (Bowen & Fincher, 2018a). In this perspective, the theme of values and competences at universities becomes very important.

Aim of the paper is therefore to search dynamical relations between the university values recognized by students and the competences that should be disposed by university staff. A theoretical part of the paper is built on the analysis, synthesis and comparison of opinions on the higher education and universities, values, and competences considered needed at the university. An empirical part presents the survey results participated by $n = 279$ students of University of Žilina, Slovak Republic, the intention of which was to define the most important values of the university. Relating results of this survey to results of previous one, the authors focus an attention on competences of university teachers/lecturers which should be applied appropriately towards students. As it flows from the discussion and the conclusive part, a novelty of paper consists in the effort to assign the key competences of university teachers to the most important values defined by students, and vice-versa, and recommendations targeted on improving the quality of universities.

2. University values

When considering common themes, one connection runs a live wire: the importance of understanding the value and the values of higher education (Law, 2013, p. 81). However, there is no simple or unified approach to conceptualizing value in relationship to higher education: the term of 'value' is not unequivocal and can be defined in various ways (Majchrzak-Lepczyk, 2015) and often has a different meaning depending on the disciplinary lens being

adopted (Tomlinson, 2018, p. 713). For example, many authors consider the values of higher education from the viewpoint of economics, financial profit achieved by university and return of investment (Freeman, 1981; D'Aguiar & Harrison, 2016; Agiomirgianakis et al., 2018; etc.). Other authors consider the values from the viewpoint of marketing and/or marketization of university (Rosi et al., 2018; Sellar, 2013; Tomlinson, 2018). Other authors (including the authors of this paper) consider university values from the viewpoint of psychology, sociology, management and behaviorism (Miller & Nadler, 2016; Watts, 2017; O'Doherty et al., 2019).

In psycho-socio-behavioral considerations mentioned above, values are a unique, imaginative guide, indicator, inspiration, and limit of individuals' behavior. Values lead people lives and contribute to ethical behavior and general growth (Blašková & Hriníková, 2019). In other words, values represent difficult to define and handle qualities, states, principles, attributes, and senses that the student or teacher confesses, which s/he considers to be extremely important, even crucial in his or her professional and personal life, and which correct the appropriateness of his or her academic conduct.

According to Watts: "A key premise is that we need to understand why our universities are now the way they are. This involves avoiding abstract arguments about 'structural' factors. This matters because if we are ever promote the kinds of changes we need, we must reinstate a proper regard for the choices people make and the beliefs they entertain" (2017, p. 12). In mentioned regards, it can be stated that beliefs, expectations, hopes and visualized imaginations that are accumulated on the part of university students, teachers and scientists, *create and anchor the values*. They together are a firm subpart of the university value system. Because of this, wanting to move the higher education to the more modern level, these 'sensual and emotional' elements, i.e. values have to be intentionally discovered and analyzed, and then improved. They have to be strengthened and *transformed to as truest as possible level*. In this perspective, one of the possible ways of how to advance the university value system and overall university results

is the effort to relate and even connect the values felt by students with the competences disposed by academicians. In mentioned dynamical process, the role of *teachers' professional competences and personal insert* is crucial.

3. University competences

Similar as defining the concept of value, the concept of competence might be understood in various ways. Firstly, an idea of many scholars has to be presented that the competence has acquired remarkable importance in higher education (Grant et al., 1979; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Lozano et al., 2012; Blašková et al., 2015; Pinto, 2018; etc.). Secondly, two perspectives have to be considered in this field: (a) perspective of teacher competences, and/versus (b) perspective of student competences. According to Avalos (2011), *teacher competence* is the teachers' ability in critical analysis of teaching phenomena and education policies which enables them to design the teaching process and procedure in a way to achieve the objectives. Mohamadi & Malekshahi (2018) opine the teacher competences include: critical (teamwork, maximizing teaching quality, making tasks and initiating actions, and sharing innovations and developments); clinical (real-time teaching action focused on learners' learning); technical (related to the metacognition and pre- and post-planning of teaching act – development of professionalism), and personal competences (personal involvement and establishing a sense of community). Therefore, when striving to correspond to changing requirements, it is inevitable to be oriented towards strategic competencies and create systems consistently oriented towards development of such competences (Adamonienė, Ruibytė, & Šikšnianaitė, 2017, p. 7).

From the perspective of students, Rychen & Sagalnik (2003) defines the competence as "the ability to successfully meet complex demands in a particular context through the mobilization of psychosocial prerequisites (including both cognitive and non-cognitive processes)" (p. 43) while a com-

petence structure is located within the individual, who is able to incorporate its different elements after a learning process (Lozano et al., 2012). In the learning process today, a cognitive and participative learning can be considered as the most valued and effective form of the student competence development. This one engages the students into an educational process and put the responsibility for educational content and dynamics onto both the students and the teachers. According to Bowen & Fincher (2018b): "Cognitive learning is aimed at verbal and quantitative skills, substantive knowledge, rationality, intellectual tolerance, aesthetic sensibility, creativeness, intellectual integrity, wisdom, intellectual and cultural pursuits of students, and lifelong learning".

Based on all above mentioned opinions and thoughts, an idea has to be emphasized that the competences of teachers *form and improve the competences* of students and graduates, and vice versa, the improved competences of students and graduates calls for the improvement and advancement of the teacher competences. And, it is just the values which are: (a) the starting point; (b) the inspiration; (c) the final state of this developmental process. In addition, "the competence should be integrated in the academic programs, but for various skills, special time should be reserved for specific teaching and learning of these skills, such as communication, critical reflection, information literacy, teamwork, etc." (Mulder et al., 2008, p. 13). Such individual approach is inevitable especially from the perspective of diversity management concept, since this one promotes the idea of "accepting all possible – visible and invisible, innate and acquired – aspects that account for differences and similarities between people" (Cewińska & Striker, 2018, p. 47).

4. Methods

Coates (2005), based on his critical study on improving the quality at Australian universities, argues for the importance of engaging students into determination of the university education quality: "The right kinds of engagement are certainly necessary for students to learn, even if an institution is reputable,

well resourced, has impressive teachers, teaches the right content and has well-regulated governance and management systems” (p. 31). In the words of Li, Granizo, & Gardó, “It becomes fundamental to analyze and study student’s satisfaction and perceived value in higher education, as higher education institutions could greatly benefit from being able to establish long term relationship with students” (2016, p. 860). With the same intention, i.e. to disclose and obtain opinions on the set of university values, the authors have decided to perform a questionnaire survey on a sample of higher education students.

Apart from the questions on basic characteristics of respondents (sex, year of study, level of study), questionnaire consisted from 2 open and 2 evaluative questions. Task of students was to generate 10 values that are important for the great university (first open question) and 10 values that are important for the student oneself (second open question). In evaluative questions, task of respondents was to choose the one most important value of the university (from a set of values generated by the student himself or herself) and the one most important value of the student (from a set of values generated by himself or herself).

4.1. Survey sample and hypothesis

Survey, performed in February – March 2019, was participated actively by $n = 279$ students of the University of Žilina, Slovak Republic. Sample consisted of 94 female and 185 male in all three level of the university study: bachelor, master, and PhD. Structure of the respondents from the viewpoint of concrete study program is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Structure of survey respondents

Level of study	Study program Management		Study program Information Management		Study program Informatics	
	Frequency	% of all	Frequency	% of all	Frequency	% of all
Bachelor	72	25.81	–	–	154	55.20
Master	–	–	46	16.49	–	–
PhD.	5	1.80	–	–	2	0.72
Total	77	27.61	46	16.49	156	55.90

Source: own study.

The following survey assessment focuses only on the academic field, i.e. the university values while hypothesis H_1 and Hypothesis H_0 were determined for the paper. *Hypothesis H_1* : University values defined by students will be repeated in the survey, i.e. student views on the core values of great universities will be identical or similar in content. *Negation hypothesis H_0* : University values defined by students will not be repeated in the survey. The method of qualitative content analysis, the method of thought abstraction, and the method of logical comparison were used to test the relevance of the set hypotheses.

4.2. The most important results

To verify the validity of hypothesis H_1 , it was necessary to examine in more detail the substance/content of all values generated by the respondents. Respondents reported a total of $n_0 = 1,786$ statements regarding the university values or sub-values. After a detailed examination, using a qualitative content analysis, *a substantial consensus* was found in the nature of many statements: many of stated values were repeated for respondents. This means that students have defined many values identically or very similarly to their classmates. The result of this initial processing and reduction was the definition of $n_1 = 229$ values that students perceive essential to the great university.

For easier presentation of results, and especially for their possible use for the university expansion, defined values were *subsequently grouped and categorized* based on their interconnection and context. In this way, from the initially defined $n_1 = 229$ values, $n_2 = 32$ *complex values* were subsequently generated.

Table 2. The 15 most frequent complex values of university defined by students

Value of university (with defined sub-values)	Frequency	% of all
High quality of education and information (providing information, mature students, quality teachers, expertise, qualifications, education, enough teachers, topicality, wisdom)	205	11.48
Positive characteristics and skills of teachers (competence, objectivity, impartiality, fairness, inspiration, non-exaltation, professionalism, critical thinking, access to literature, respect)	160	8.96
Responsive and obliging approach to others (thoughtfulness, loyalty, humanity, support, understanding, positivism, dignity, justice, friendliness, tolerance, decency)	135	7.56
Open cooperation (participation, teamwork, cooperation among faculties and with companies, partner network, teambuilding for teachers and students, coherence)	100	5.60
Readiness for practice (practical experience, usefulness of sturdy subjects, excursions to companies, own student projects, internships in companies)	97	5.43
Marketing activities (attractiveness on the market, reputation of the university, background, history, prestige, added value, reflection of market requirements, success, recognition)	89	4.98
Keeping rules (promises, terms, laws, high goals, accountability, confidentiality, honesty, integrity, foresight, equality, equivalence)	83	4.65

Equipment quality (student houses, accommodation, facilities, teaching equipment, climate comfort, conveni- ence)	77	4.31
Open communication (courtesy, expression of opinion, personal ap- proach, open access, discretion, sincerity, active listening, directness)	76	4.26
High motivation (motivation of employees and students, enthusi- asm, creativity, intellectual stimulation, benefits, reward, joy, care for students and teachers)	74	4.14
Formal aspects of education process (difficulty of study, graduate level, science and research, time-consuming study, joint deci- sion-making, timetable adaptation to students, outdoor learning)	73	4.09
Positive conditions and atmosphere (creative atmosphere, fellowship, collective strength, university culture, peaceful and good working environment, enjoyable behavior)	72	4.03
Harmonized content of study (provided courses, programs, training, licenses, equal opportunities for individual departments, perspective)	70	3.92
Application of new trends (responding to trends, modern approaches, inno- vation, electronic enrollment and learning, infor- mation system, dynamism, flexibility)	68	3.81
Positive relations (sound relations and negotiation, positive rela- tionship with teachers, mutual aid, sociability, encourage activities with students, eliminating barriers reciprocity)	67	3.75

Source: own study.

This leads to a rejection of H_0 , in favor of H_1 : the university values generated by students are similar in the content. Table 2 lists the 15 most frequently reported complex values, including their contents, i.e. sub-values defined by students. The first place in terms of the number of statements is clearly the high quality of education and information. Of the total number of respondents (279), up to 205 respondents reported it, representing 73.48% of the total number of

respondents. Other high-ranking values include the positive characteristics and skills of teachers (160 respondents), the responsive or friendly approach to others (135 respondents), and the open cooperation (100 respondents).

Continuing to analyze the questionnaire survey results, the role of respondents in the evaluative question was to choose *the only university value* they consider *most important*. The results are shown in Table 3. These ones confirmed the assumption that respondents considered most important mostly those values that the previous open question most frequently reported. In particular, the quality of education and information has been reiterated as the most important value. Among the most important values over 20 frequencies are the positive characteristics and skills of teachers, the responsive approach towards others, and the readiness for practice.

Table 3. The most important values of university defined by all students

Value of university	Frequency	% of all
High quality of education and information	73	30.04
Positive characteristics and skills of teachers	36	14.81
Responsive and obliging approach to others	24	9.88
Readiness for practice	20	8.23
Keeping rules	9	3.70
High motivation	8	3.29
Marketing activities	7	2.88
Open cooperation	7	2.88
Harmonized content of study	7	2.88
Formal aspects of education process	6	2.47
Respect for freedom	5	2.06
Open communication	5	2.06
Target on students	5	2.06
Positive relations	4	1.65
Application of new trends	4	1.65

Source: own study

It is also interesting to note that, although depending on the study program is always the quality of education in the first place of importance, the order of importance of other university values *varies* to some extent (Table 4).

Additionally, in comparison to the overall importance of values defined by all respondents, new values of 'freedom' and 'satisfaction' occur in a case of respondents from the study program Information Management, as well as the value of 'thoroughness' in a case of respondents from the study program Informatics.

Table 4. Importance of university values depending on study program

Study program Management	Study program Information Management	Study program Informatics
Quality of education	Quality of education	Quality of education
Responsive approach	Characteristics of teachers	Characteristics of teachers
Readiness to practice	Readiness to practice	Responsive approach
Characteristics of teachers	Respect to students	Readiness to practice
Marketing activities	High motivation	Keeping rules
Keeping rules	Freedom	High motivation
Applying new trends	Responsive approach	Formal aspects of education
Open communication	Satisfaction	Correct relation
Open cooperation	Open cooperation	Open cooperation
Positive atmosphere	Marketing activities	Thoroughness

Source: own study.

4.3. Experimental linking of university values to competences of teachers

With an intention to help universities in their process of the quality improvement, it is possible to experimentally relate the most important university values to the most important competences of university teachers. For this reason it can be considered proper to link the results ascertained by the above mentioned survey (the most important university values viewed by students) with results of the survey conducted by the authors in 2012, which

was aimed to identify the most important competences of university teachers. The survey consisted of three sequential interviews/workshops with a group of $n = 27$ university teachers of University of Žilina. From the viewpoint of sex, the survey was participated by $n = 12$ male and $n = 15$ female. From the viewpoint of academic erudition, there were $n = 15$ lecturers with PhD, $n = 9$ Associated Professors, and $n = 3$ Professors.

The outcome of the survey was a list of personality competences of a university teacher which include following competences: (1) morally and ethically acting personality; (2) professional personality; (3) personality with valuable scientific effort; (4) acclaimed author and honest personality; (5) personality with excellent teaching competences; (6) personality acting as a role model; (7) mature personality; (8) critically thinking personality; (9) sophisticated and communicating personality; (10) progressive, highly motivated and always motivating personality (Blašková et al., 2014).

Based on repeated discussions and harmonization of authors' opinions from 2012 with the present knowledge and acquired experiences, Table 5 shows the *experimental linkages* between the 3 most important university values defined by students and the 10 most important competences of university teacher defined by scholars. Table reflects a conviction that there have to exist *active and facilitative relations* between the most important values and the most valued competences at the university. In other words, if the system of the most required competences of lecturers is functional and works correctly, the most appreciated values of university can be achieved.

In addition to defined linkages, the practical experience based on the utilized feedback confirms that *the most expected university values really act as a pressure of/for the future competence improvement*.

Table 5. Experimental linkages of the most important values and competences at university

No	Most important values	No	Most important competences of teachers
1	High quality of education and information	2	Professional personality
		5	Personality with excellent teaching competences
		9	Sophisticated and communicating personality
2	Positive characteristics of teachers	1	Morally and ethically acting personality
		3	Personality with valuable scientific effort
		4	Acclaimed author and honest personality
		7	Mature personality
		8	Critically thinking personality
3	Responsive (obliging) approach to others	6	Personality acting as a role model
		10	Progressive, motivated and motivating personality

Source: own study.

4.4. Discussion and implications

Overall success and prosperity depends directly on the quality of employees, their efforts to participate in the development, which is mainly related to the quality of performance (Čandík, 2018, p. 44). In this view, the competence represents all predispositions which the individual performs or can perform in achieving his or her tasks (Krasnova, 2017, p. 69).

Opening the discussion to presented surveys, *the high quality of education and information* provided at the university is at the first place in the listed most important university values. As Coates believes (2005), although the specification, assurance and enhancement of quality is often complex and problematic, strong interest in the phenomenon has been stimulated and maintained by a range of factors. Students need accurate information about educational quality to help them choose between different courses of study. Academics and university administrators need information to help them monitor and improve their courses and programs. Institutions need information about quality to help them benchmark and market their

performance. Governments and other bodies need information to assist with funding, policy development and accountability. For these and other reasons, quality assurance has become part of the fabric of many higher education systems (Coates, 2005, p. 25).

However, according to e.g. Report of House of Commons Education Committee, United Kingdom is facing a serious skills deficit (House of Commons Education Committee, 2018, p. 16). Two thirds of businesses surveyed in the 2017 CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey said that skills gaps are a threat to the UK's global competitiveness and 61% of participated business were "not confident there will be enough people available in the future with the necessary skills to fill their high-skilled jobs" (CBI, 2017, p. 11, 16). This highlights the need for having teachers and scientists who are the professionals in their field, who are perfectly able to transfer an enthusiasm and wisdom on students, and who communicate with students sophisticatedly, inspirationally and without any barriers.

When disputing on importance of *the teacher positive characteristics* which takes second place in mentioned above list of university values, especially the competences of moral sustainability, ethics, scientific and publication responsibility are on the foremost. Naturally, these ones have to be accompanied by the personal maturation and objective thinking of the teacher, i.e. his or her appropriate criticism combined with a sufficiently high level of tolerance. In this regard, an empathy as a specific personal competence also has to be considered. Empathy occurs most often in those with strong attitudinal similarity and attraction (Grover & Brockner, 1989) while through the projection of own thoughts and feelings, the individual shows his/her own individuality and uniqueness (Kim & Chu, 2011). This means that sadness, shame, guilt, sympathy, and empathy are emotional ingredients in the development of prosocial behavior (Reeve, 2009).

The responsive (obliging) approach to others is put on the third position in the list of values defined by students. In this field, especially the competence of acting as a role model and the motivation competence should be

emphasized. The role of university teacher must be perceived as a highly qualified profession, which is mostly understood as a mission. Teacher is a carrier of education and guard of humanitarian and ethical values. Teacher must cultivate the student as a multilayer personality (Slavík et al., 2012, p. 73). Teacher has to inspire students for achieve an appropriate feeling of dignity (Figurska, 2017). And, this is possible only if the teacher has the high motivation and is willing to share with and transfer it on students.

5. Conclusion

Active connection and mutual harmonization of values that universities should prioritize with the competences that should be disposed by teachers is an important prerequisite for improving the quality and accelerating the progress of higher education. It is essential for modern universities to carefully consider the mission, roles, and complex and particular outputs to be achieved. In other words, universities must be thoroughly focused on the values favored by their addressees or customers. The primary addressees of universities action are mainly students. Secondary addressees are student parents and employers who incorporate graduates into their work teams. Tertiary addressee of universities is the entire society. This means that if the university wants to become *the great university*, it must target its system of values to all three of these groups.

Generally, it is not easy to achieve the harmonization of the values of all customer groups with the values naturally defined by and defined for all the teachers, scientists, administrative staff and university managers. It can be stated that respect for and fulfillment of any values is always conditioned by the actions of the authorities respected at the university and ensured by the common belief in the correctness of the defined values. The peculiarity of universities is that, as centers with the highest intellectual capacity of a given country, they have a specific structure of their staff. In this sense, only the top university officials cannot be considered as authorities. *All the*

university teachers and scientists are becoming authorities competent to build, preserve and transform universal knowledge into an ever-higher level. This is because it is precisely the teachers who recognize the values favored by students, parents, employers and society. Teachers, through their professional behavior and performed competences, actively link values of all addressees of university action to their own values, and then jointly fulfill them. The quality of teacher competences is a determining and decisive factor in this process.

For mentioned above reasons, the development of competences must become one of the most important and most supported processes. In particular, in order to develop the competences of teachers (and, consequently, of students), the following characteristics can be recommended in the university environment:

- 1) Efficiency – competence development must not be random; the university must analyze in detail what competences need to be developed.
- 2) Sustainability – development of competences must become a solid part of the day-to-day work as well as strategic advancement and created mechanisms of the university.
- 3) Systematism – it must be respected that any competence (development) is related to all other competences and the personality profile of the teacher concerned.
- 4) Consequence – current positive development will lead to a positive development in the future, and conversely, the current failure will cause future displeasure and fear.
- 5) Support – every process of exiting former stereotypes and acquiring better competences is hard and challenging, so support, assistance and facilitation are essential for the teachers.
- 6) Conditions – it is necessary to ensure appropriate material, spatial and capacity conditions for the competence development (on the part of teachers, departments, faculties).

- 7) Motivation – not only the self-motivation of teachers is necessary for the development, but also targeted encouragement and inspiration from the university must be pursued.
- 8) Reward – if teachers develop their potential conscientiously, they should be positively valued and adequately rewarded for it.
- 9) Differentiation – teachers who develop their competences permanently should be distinguished not only by higher wages, but should also be posted as a model for others.
- 10) Validation – it is necessary to continuously evaluate whether the competence development is correct and whether strengthened competences contribute to increase the quality of university processes.

It is correct to note that such a system of competence development has the highest chance of success which meets all the above characteristics. If any of them is not followed, it threatens the essence and potential impacts of the university progress.

The ideas in the paper can also be expressed in this way: the quality of university depends on the quality of understanding and grasping the values of the main participants and addressees of the university activity, while the quality of understanding, grasping and fulfilling all values depends on the quality of university teachers and scientists' competences. Simply, the quality of university depends on the quality of competences available at the university.

Acknowledgement:

This article is supported by the Ministry of Education of Slovak Republic – Project KEGA No. 041ŽU-4/2017 Experimental Mathematics Accessible for All.

References

Adamonienė, R., Ruibytė, L., & Šikšnianaitė, N. (2017). Problematic Aspects of the Police Personnel Education System: Sight from Organization's and Employees' Perspectives. *Human Resources Management and Ergonomics*, 11(2), 6–14.

Agiomirgianakis, G., Lianos, T., & Tsounis, N. (2018). Returns to Investment in Higher Education: Is There a Difference between Distance Learning and Traditional Universities in the Fields of Physics, Mathematics, Social Studies, Computer Science and Economics?. *Creative Education*, 9(16), 19. doi: 10.4236/ce.2018.916220.

Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher Professional Development in Teaching and Teacher Education over Ten Years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(1), 10–20.

Blašková, M., Blaško, R., Jankalová, M., & Jankal, R. (2014). Key Personality Competences of University Teacher: Comparison of Requirements Defined by Teachers and/vsersus Defined by Students. *ELSEVIER: Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science*, 114(2014), 466–475. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.731.

Blašková, M., Blaško, R., Matuska, E., & Rosak-Szyrocka, A. (2015). Development of Key Competences of University Teachers and Managers. 4th World Conference on Educational Technology Researches (WCETR-2014), Barcelona, October 2014. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 182(2015), 187–196. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.755.

Blašková, M., & Hriníková, D. (2019). Axiological Management in Higher Education and Values Defined by Students. *Aksiologičeskije aspekty v sovremennykh nauchnykh issledovanijach*. Omsk, Russia: Omskij gosudarstvennyj universitet soobscenia. 5–14.

Bowen, H. R., & Fincher, C. (2018a). *Efficiency and accountability in higher education*. In H. R. Bowen (Ed.), *Investment in Learning*. (Chapter 1). e-Book. (Online). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351309929>. Access: 3.04.2019.

Bowen, H. R., & Fincher, C. (2018b). Cognitive learning. In H. R. Bowen (Ed.), *Investment in Learning* (Chapter 3). e-Book (Online). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351309929>. Access: 1.04.2019.

Čandík, M. (2018). New Trends in Education of Employees of State Organizations. *Human Resources Management and Ergonomics*, 12(1), 32–46.

CBI (2017). *Helping the UK Thrive: CBI/Pearson Education and Skills Survey 2017*, July 2017.

Cewińska, J., & Striker, M. (2018). Lifestyle as a Determinant of Managerial Decisions. *Human Resources Management and Ergonomics*, 12(1), 47–58.

Coates, H. (2005). The Value of Student Engagement for Higher Education Quality Assurance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 11(1), 25–36. doi: 10.1080/13538320500074915.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

D'Aguiar, S., & Harrison, N. (2016). Returning from Earning: UK Graduates Returning to Postgraduate Study, with Particular Respect to STEM Subjects, Gender and Ethnicity. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29, 584–613. doi: 10.1080/13639080.2014.1001332.

Dorri, M., Yarmohammadian, M. H., & Nadi, M. A. (2012). A Review on Value Chain in Higher Education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), 3842–3846. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.157.

Figurska, I. (2017). Dignity Management as a New Approach to Human Resources Management. *Human Resources Management and Ergonomics*, 11(2), 23–37.

Figurska, I., Sokół, A. (2016). The Process of Knowledge Acquisition with the Use of Various Teaching Methods and Its Effect on the Creativity of Employees... *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 143–151.

Freeman, R. B. (1981). The Changing Economic Value of Higher Education in Developed Economies: A Report to the O.E.C.D. *NBER Working Paper*, 820. doi: 10.3386/w0820.

Grant, G., Elbow, P., Ewens, T., Gamson, Z., Kohli, W., Neumann, W., Olesen, V., & Riesman, D. (1979). *On Competence: A Critical Analysis of Competence-Based Reforms in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Grover, S. L., & Brockner, J. (1989). Empathy and the relationship between attitudinal similarity and attraction. *Journal of Research Personality*, 23, 469–479.

Hill, K., Hoffman, D., & Rex, T. R. (2005). *The Value of Higher Education: Individual and Societal Benefits (With Special Consideration for the State of Arizona)*. Arizona State University: W. P. Carey School of Business, Productivity and Prosperity Projects (P3).

House of Commons Education Committee (2018). *Value for Money in Higher Education*. Seventh Report of Session 2017–2019. (Online). Available at: www.parliament.uk/education-committee. Access: 6.04.2019.

Jibeen, T., & Khan, M. A. (2015). Internationalization of Higher Education: Potential Benefits and Costs. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 4(4), 196–199.

Kim, H. S., & Chu, T. Q. (2011). *Cultural variation in the motivation of self-expression*. In D. Dunning (Ed.), *Social Motivation*. New York: Psychology Press.

Krasnova, A. (2017). Competences of Coworkers Responsible for Decruitment, Viewed from the Perspective of Young Employees – Survey Results. *Proceedings of 14th International Scientific Conference Human Potential Development* (pp. 68–78). Benešov near Prague, 6 – 8 June, 2017. Prague: Institute for Public Administration.

Law, D. (2013). Educational Values and the Values of Higher Education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 81–83. doi: 10.1080/13603108.2013.856355.

Li, D., Granizo, M. G., & Gardó, T. F. (2016). The Value Trade-off in Higher Education Service: A Qualitative Intercultural Approach to Students' Perceptions. *Intangible Capital*, 12(4), 855–880. doi: 10.3923/ic.706.

Lozano, J. F., Boni, A., Peris, J., & Hueso, A. (2012). Competencies in Higher Education: A Critical Analysis from the Capabilities Approach. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 46(1), 132–147. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9752.2011.00839.x.

Majchrzak-Lepczyk, J. (2015). Logistyczno-marketingowe aspekty w sieci tworzenia wartości (Logistics and Marketing Aspects in the Value Creation Network). *Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach*, 217, 72.

Miller, M. T., & Nadler, D. P. (2016). Creating a Value Added College Environment: The Role of the Hidden Curriculum. In W. Nuninger, J.-M. Chatelet (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Quality Assurance and Value Management in Higher Education* (pp. 85–100). Hershey: Information Science Reference – IGI Global.

Mohamadi, Z., & Malekshahi, N. (2018). Designing and Validating a Potential Formative Evaluation Inventory for Teacher Competences. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(6). (Online). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0059-2>. Access: 24.04.2019.

Mulder, M., Guligers, J., Wesselink, R., & Biemans, H. (2008). *The New Competence Concept in Higher Education: Error or Enrichment?*. International Scientific Conference AERA. New York, March 25.

O'Doherty, D., O'Hare, J. A., Hyde, S., & McGrath, D. (2019). Humanities in Medicine: A Qualitative Study of Graduate and Student Experiences of Completing a Student Selected Component. *Creative Education*, 10(2), 15. doi: 10.4236/ce.2019.102022.

Pinto, S. (2018). Intercultural competence in higher education: academics' perspectives. *On the Horizon*, 26(2), 137–147. doi: 10.1108/OTH-02-2018-0011.

Reeve, J. (2009). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Rosi, M., Tuček, D., Potočan, V., & Jurše, M. (2018). Market Orientation of Business Schools: A Development Opportunity for the Business Model of University Business Schools in Transition Countries. *Economics and Management (E & M)*, 21(4), 175–194.

Rychen, D. S., & Salganik, L. H. (2003) *Key Competencies for a Successful Life and a Well-Functioning Society*. Gottingen: Hogrefe and Huber Publishers.

Sellar, S. (2013). Equity, markets and the politics of aspiration in Australian higher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 34(2), 245–258.

Slavík, M. et al. (2012). *Vysokoškolská pedagogika (Higher Education Pedagogy)*. Prague: Grada.

Tomlinson, M. (2018). Conceptions of the value of higher education in a measured market. *Higher Education*, 75, 711–727. doi: 10.1007/s10734-017-0165-6.

Watts, R. (2017). *Public Universities, Managerialism and the Value of Higher Education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-53599-3.