

IDENTIFICATION OF THE LEVELS OF APPLICATION OF FEEDBACK BY UNIVERSITY TEACHER

VILIAM LENDEL – MICHAL VARMUS

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to identify the level of application of feedback by university teacher on the basis of a detailed analysis of the scientific literature. The proposal specifies in detail types of university teachers on their approach to the use of feedback. The paper describes the procedure for obtaining feedback from students on the concrete example during the realization of the survey about the quality of seminars of Decision Support Systems. Paper also provides recommendations for achieving quality of education.

Keywords: quality, university teacher, management, feedback, education

JEL Classification: M12, M14

1. INTRODUCTION

In the current period can be seen various initiatives to improve the quality of work university teacher and education process. An important tool for achieving this goal can be considered feedback. Its efficiency will enable university teachers to identify weak points in his work and ideas by means of others (students, colleagues, leaders...) take appropriate measures which will lead to higher levels of achievement. Every university teacher uses feedback in a different range and by different way. Therefore it would be appropriate to identify individual application level feedback to enable a university teacher under them identify their position.

2. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The main aim of the paper is to acquire new knowledge in the field of managerial communication and human resource management with an emphasis on the quality of the area and pointed out the possibility of its application to the profession of university teacher. Proposal of application level feedback to teacher in the exercise of his profession can contribute significantly to the identification of weaknesses in this area and identify scope for further improvement. The proposed solution is intended to serve as a tool for self-assessment. University teacher will evaluate the application of level feedback.

For the acquisition and collection of information were used method of analysis of documents (when analysing current and historical data relevant to the issue), questionnaire method (data collection in empirical research), method of observation (during teaching of the subject).

For the information processing was used mainly method of quantitative assessment and the comparative method (when comparing data obtained from the relevant empirical research and the collation of data from the analysis of secondary sources).

For solve of the problem were used methods of induction, deduction, synthesis (formulation of different levels of application), abstraction and modelling.

3. LEVELS OF APPLICATION OF FEEDBACK BY UNIVERSITY TEACHER

Every university teacher uses feedback at different scale and levels. The proposal of these levels is based mainly from two basic concepts, namely:

1. Johari window
2. Communication styles

Johari Window is a model of giving and receiving feedback, which can be applied to university teacher. The model has the shape of the window divided into four quadrants depending on the extent of giving and receiving information about themselves and others:

- a) *Open area:* contains information about yourself university teacher knows, and they know the others (students, colleagues). It is a space for the free and open exchange of information between university teachers and students (peers). This area can be enhanced by increasing trust between the teacher and his students (peers) and also increase the amount of shared information.
- b) *Blind area:* contains information about yourself university teacher knows, and which others (students, colleagues) may know,
- c) *Hidden area:* contains information about yourself university teacher knows, but that others (students, colleagues) do not know. In this case, a university teacher intentionally, for some reason the information hiding (e.g., fear of rejection, assault, etc.).
- d) *Unknown area:* contains information about yourself university teacher does not know and do not know them or others (students, colleagues), this information is below the surface, but in communication and interaction can emerge (subconscious).

The Johari Window identified four basic models windows that show the situation of shared feedback and relationship of giving and applying feedback:

1. *Ideal window:* in this case, the area "open" the greatest, allowing open and honest behavior. Provision is made for less prone to error explain behavior. The relation

university teacher - student should consider the suitability degree of openness.

2. *Reporter*: in this case, is the largest area "hidden". It is a type of Master teacher who asks, but does not provide feedback. This is a situation where a university teacher wants rather than to express, to know the opinion of others, but he does not express his opinion. The risk associated with this type lies in the possibility of inducing irritated reactions, lack of confidence and a sense of concealment.
3. *Elephant in a porcelain store*: in this case, is the largest area "blind". In this case, a university teacher provides feedback, but feedback from others accepts. The risk in this type of a lack of interest on the part of others (students, colleagues) to give additional feedback to form only one-way communication.
4. *Turtle*: in this case, is the largest place of "unknown". It is a university teacher, which is only a kind of observer, which does not require feedback. The risk in this type of isolation from a group (colleagues) and the emergence of obstacles to their own self-knowledge and personal growth.

The university teacher may choose two basic tactics from communication styles used in managerial communications:

1. Raising awareness for others (students, colleagues...), i.e. open explaining the nature of the different contexts and communicating the problem, so unprotected position.
2. The use of feedback, i.e. when asking, listening to others (students, colleagues).

Based on these tactics can be university teacher selected into the four basic types:

- *Type A*: university teacher does not use unprotected location or feedback, considered necessary to raise awareness of himself and others. Such a university teacher is anxious and hostile, gives the impression that it is inaccessible to others and cool. Their presence in the workplace (and in the educational process) is not developing the effectiveness of communication and the loss of individual effort and creativity.
- *Type B*: university teacher can not use unprotected position, but it relies on feedback. Crave good relationships with their students and colleagues. They block their information and try to get the most from others. Others (students, colleagues) show that university staff a little confidence because they see how they retain their ideas and opinions to themselves.
- *Type C*: a university teacher based on their own ideas and opinions, but never from other. He uses an unprotected position at the expense of feedback. Often does not communicate with others (students, colleagues), but only speaks about himself. Therefore, the majority of others (colleagues, students) are insecure, hostile and frustrated.
- *Type D*: university teacher in a balanced form used unprotected position and feedback. Openly inform others, presents its proposals and, on the other hand, can receive information from the other.

Based on the above-mentioned concepts can be designed four levels of application of feedback to university staff:

- Insufficient level,
- Average level,
- High level,
- Excellent level.

Insufficient level of application of feedback corresponds to university teacher who has a primary interest in working with feedback on improving the quality of their work and learning process. University teacher often has a specific idea of the application of feedback in the learning process, respectively in the exercise of their profession. This ignorance is manifested mainly by seeking views on his work from his colleagues and students as prepared through interviews or questionnaires. Teacher follows the best practices and does not develop initiatives leading to renewed impetus by the surroundings. Another manifestation of ignorance and indifference is dysfunctional way communication with students, colleagues, including senior executive. This level is, however, a university teacher who already has an idea about the application of feedback, but this idea is not reflected in the actual implementation, where there is only implementation without proper evaluation and adoption of conclusions. For this level are characteristic these types of university teacher: an elephant in a porcelain store, turtle and reporter. In terms of communication styles it is type A, B and C.

Average level corresponds to university teachers who apply feedback in the average level. It has a specific idea of the areas of application of feedback. If necessary he implements feedback in the form of questions, possibly through a prepared questionnaire. Feedback is evaluated and recorded. Communication between students and colleagues is effective and helps in better understanding the content of the feedback. For this level are characterized by a university teacher ideal window.

High level of application of feedback corresponds university teacher who is well on its way to raising communication windows OPEN. Teacher supports work with feedback, notes, students and colleagues and their perceived stimuli. Thinking about their attitudes, opinions and councils in order to transfer them to their work in order to improve the quality of its performance. For this purpose, it also helps to record keeping feedback in the areas of evaluation (in the case of feedback from students to the course content, teaching style, approach and behavior of the teacher, the amount of new information, in the case of feedback from colleagues and management is mainly the way conduct lectures, research activities, publications, etc.).

Excellent level corresponds to university teachers who actively and appropriately in all areas used as feedback from the students, as well as from colleagues and management. In this case it is applied 360 degree feedback and communication style of type A.

4. DISCUSSION

Work quality of university teacher affects feedback that may receive university teacher, resp. receive from their colleagues or from the students.

Identification of the Levels of Application of Feedback by University Teacher

Some university teachers engage students in the process of improving the quality of their articles through free discussion on the subject of quality assessment for the last lecture or seminar, also in the form of a short questionnaire. The questionnaire is used in some cases, particularly to assess the level exercises, lectures and exams. These data obtained through interviews and questionnaires are processed annually and draw conclusions and recommendations for improvement course for the future on the basis of the suggestions. It can be concluded that the participation of students in evaluating the quality of provision is very important. As an interesting example is the system in use at the Swedish universities, where each subjects assigned to one faculty representative of the student union, which during the semester collects knowledge about the subject and teacher quality by students and then draw up an assessment report, which has great influence on the formation of study program in the future.

Important role plays also feedback from colleagues. At present, however, may also be encountered in cases where co-workers attending lectures his colleagues. Their observations and interpretations teacher, who on the basis of them can enrich and enhance the level lectures. This is particularly useful for novice university teachers who are experienced office senior colleagues a valuable source of their progress in learning activities.

Of course we must not forget the feedback from the head of department and faculty leadership, which significantly affects the performance of a university teacher.

Blašková and Blasko (2013) emphasize the principle of multi-source feedback, which allows evaluating the performance of each employee multiple evaluators. Follow combination and mutual alignment of a number of value judgments (judgments of multiple assessors) to power a university teacher to gain a truly comprehensive view of the quality of work output behavior and performance.

Under this approach contend that the higher performance of each employee evaluations rated the following entities/following reviewers:

- Itself a university teacher ("self"),
- 2 collaborators ("trial collaborators"),

- Students (indirectly)
- Superior to them ("top rating"), which in its opinion into account the feedback to the teacher's teaching performance (obtained by "scrubbing and averaging the" anonymous survey of faculty teaching quality by students).

As an example of the application of feedback in order to improve the method of teaching the subject and the research was performed for the purpose of the questionnaire was created with the aim to obtain from students of the subject feedback for its continuous improvement. The questionnaire included 18 questions. Students had the opportunity to review the scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = the best mark, 5 = worst mark in the following evaluation criteria: course content (2.22), time - division course (1.47), method of teaching (1.56), the amount of new information (1.76), attitude and behavior of the teacher during seminars (1.16), attitude and behavior of the teacher during lectures (2.36).

The best students rated teacher attitudes and behaviors in the seminars (1.16), time – division course (1.47) and teaching method (1.56). In other areas, the evaluation identified areas for further improvement, which was rated as the worst attitude and behavior of the teacher during lectures (2.36).

Assuming that students attach all these benchmarks equal weight, can be determined index of student satisfaction with a given subject. Based on the data index reached student satisfaction with the subject of Enterprise Resource value of 84.96 %, which can be regarded as a positive fact. The lowest level was 66.67 %.

5. CONCLUSION

Feedback is an important tool for improving the work quality of university teacher and education process as well. On example of the acquisition and evaluation of feedback from students perhaps demonstrate its importance to the continuous improvement of evaluated subjects and communication skills and behavior of university teachers of these subjects. In discussion were mentioned specific solutions for the application of feedback to give as a guide (instructions) how to apply feedback university teacher.

REFERENCES

- [1] BLÁŠKO, M. *Úvod do modernej didaktiky II*. [online]. [cit. 2013-06-15]. Dostupné na internete: <http://web.tuke.sk/kip/main.php?om=1300&res=low&menu=1310>.
- [2] BLÁŠKOVÁ, M. – BLÁŠKO, R. 2013. *Hodnotenie výkonu vysokoškolských učiteľov*. In: Rozvoj ľudského potenciálu / Human Potential Development. Žilinská univerzita v Žiline. 2013. ISBN 978-80-554-0711-1.
- [3] TUREK, I. 2010. *Kvalita vysokoškolskej výučby. Majú mať učitelia vysokých škôl aj pedagogickú kvalifikáciu?* [online]. [cit. 2013-07-01]. Available on Internet: <http://web.tuke.sk/kip/download/vuc61.pdf>.
- [4] HITTMÁR, Š. *Manažment*. Žilina: EDIS-vydavateľstvo ŽU. 2006. ISBN 80-8070-558-5.
- [5] ROVNANOVÁ, L. *Osobnosť manažéra/ky – učiteľa/ky*. Banská Bystrica: Katedra pedagogiky UMB. [online]. [cit. 2013-07-11]. Available on Internet: http://www.pdf.umb.sk/~lrovnanova/Mnz_Johari_okno_fin.pdf.

This post was created as part of application of project: Development of culture of quality at the University of Žilina based on European standards for higher education.

Modern Education for the Knowledge Society / Project is funded by EU.

Ing. Viliam LENDEL, PhD.

Ing. Michal VARMUS, PhD.

University of Žilina, Faculty Management Science and Informatics, Department of Management Theories

Univerzitná 8215/1, 010 26 Žilina, Slovak Republic

e-mail: viliam.lendel@fri.uniza.sk, michal.varmus@fri.uniza.sk