NEW APPROACHES TO LEARNING

University and Non-university Teachers' Organizational Learning

Gintare Edintaite

Kaunas University of Technology
Donelaicio 73, LT-44029 Kaunas, Lithuania

Abstract

The paper reveals the specificity of organizational learning of the teachers in higher education while implementing study programmes. It provides a discussion on questions raised by the disciplines of management and education sciences regarding the challenges and opportunities of organizational learning of teachers. The following research problem is addressed in this paper: what are the factors which influence the organizational learning of the university and non-university teachers how to empower them to develop their educational competencies for successful implementation and continuous improvement of the successful study programme? The aim of the paper is to reveal the specificity of organizational learning of the university and non-university teachers who are implementing a study programme.

Keywords: university, non-university, organizational learning.

Introduction

Studies are usually regarded as a core mission of university and other institutions of higher education. Teaching the students for the future challenges is an activity that leads to forming the active creators of the societal progress. The mission of studies is directly implemented by the academic department with the main direction of activities – teaching and preparing the students for the future (Bowden and Marton, 1998; Houston, 2008).

Department consists of people who perform the work of teachers and researchers, an academic community that has to be linked together by common flows of knowledge sharing, shared identity, values and behaviour. It all unites people for working together towards a common goal, i.e. to implement successfully the studies.

The study-related activities of the department are usually described through: 1) construction of the study programme, i.e. the study aims, content, forms, methods and means are envisaged; 2) implementation of the study programme, i.e. providing students with the educational possibilities to acquire the content of the study programme (Kundrotas, 1996). Construction and implementation of the

study programmes calls for a particularly close teachers' participation in achieving the common goals of the study activities. From the perspective of knowledge management, this process leads to the creation of organizational knowing, while the organizational learning is taking place (Nonaka, 1994). Organizational learning is the learning of employees enabled by the organization that is taking place while creating the knowledge that is valuable to organization (Anantatmula and Stankosky, 2008; Grundstein, 2008; Pandya, Hon, 2008; Bandini, Petraglia and Santori, 2009; Valtolina and Mussio, 2009).

The study process-related organizational knowledge of the teachers of the academic department encompasses three levels (Juceviciene and Edintaite, 2010):
1. The explicit collective knowledge of the department study activities, particularly - mission, philosophy and vision of study activities.
2. The explicit collective knowledge of the groups of teachers of study programmes. They include a part of knowledge which remains fairly stable (knowledge of the study programme as a document), while the other part changes in the study process (knowledge of the implementation of study process and knowledge that reflects the improvement of the programme).
3. The individual knowledge that resides on the level of every teacher's module. A part of such knowledge remains relatively stable (knowledge of module as a document), while the other part changes during the process of the studies. This knowledge is about the implementation of the study process and its improvement.

In order to ensure effective daily study processes, organization needs communication and information flows. Intelligent management of knowledge is necessary for organization to become adaptive, innovative organization (Miller, 2006; Stoner et al., 2006; Harris and Nelson, 2008; Papa et al., 2008). It means that if inside the academic department a right mutual understanding is enabled, it may be expected that hereby the conditions for the creation of necessary study process organizational knowledge will be ensured.

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

The researchers define the organizational learning as the enabled processes of individual and collective learning by an organization, whereby all members of organization participate in learning, while the result of this learning is new organizational knowledge (Barnett, 1999; Hager, 2001; Walker, 2001; Duke, 2002; Vera, Crossan, 2003; Longworth, 2006). So the organizational knowledge that determines successful implementation of study programme in the context of its continuous improvement is an outcome of organizational learning (Juceviciene and Edintaite, 2010).

However, some research (Stanikuniene, 2007) leads to an observation that teachers in higher education regard themselves as learners in almost all their environments, but not at their institution. Here they consider themselves as pedagogues who teach rather than learn themselves. Yet it is an organization whose activities are not imaginable without a continuous improvement of its employees. It is first of all enabled by the organizational learning (Nonaka, Takeuchi, 1995; Landaeta, Pinto and Kotnour, 2009). So teachers' learning at the workplace should not be accidental or fragmented. More attention has to be paid by the researchers, as well as the practitioners to the teachers' organizational learning at higher education institutions.

Current changes in higher education in Lithuania are related to increasing challenges in terms of quality assurance. The number of non-university institutions of higher education is increasing; they keep developing their study programmes and increasing their number. There are debates on the issues related to teachers' competence, innovativeness and continuing learning. Non-university teachers should be innovative and receptive (Zinkeviciene, 2007); innovative competence is also characteristic of university teachers (Jezerskyte, 2011). However, teachers at traditional universities are often criticized for being conservative and not open to innovations, whereas non-university institutions of higher education are regarded as more receptive to innovations, they can learn and develop their competence more intensively. This is illustrated by the share of non-university institutions at higher education market. Thus, one may hypothesize that university teachers are reluctant to learn, whereas non-university teachers are more inclined to learn, as this is determined by their openness to practice and market changes.

The aim of this paper is to reveal the specificity of organizational learning of the university and non-university teachers who are implementing a study programme.

In the first part of the paper, drawing on the model of the creation of organizational knowing by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), the teachers' organizational learning is analysed on three levels: a) learning on the level of academic department; b) learning of the group of teachers in the study programme; c) learning on the individual level of a teacher.

In the second part, the empirical survey of teachers' organizational learning is presented and its findings analysed. The empirical research is based on the two case studies: university and non-university higher education institutions in Lithuania.

In the third part, a discussion on three questions is presented: are the teachers of non-university higher education institution more inclined to learn, are they more flexible and open for changes than the teachers of university? What factors influence their openness and flexibility for organizational leaning at the workplace?

The methods of research literature analysis and case study are employed in the article.

1. Higher education teachers' organizational learning

The content of teachers' organizational learning includes the creation of knowledge by learning on three levels: 1) academic department (organizational level); 2) group of teachers while implementing the study programme; 3) individual teacher's level in a specific study programme. However, the organizational knowledge of the academic department evolves in the study process as a group of teachers improves the study programme and the individual teachers improve their specific modules. Therefore, one has to take into account the dynamics of knowledge – how it evolves in the study process. This dynamics of organizational knowledge is related to organizational learning, when the knowledge of study activities is created in the process of organizational learning.

While analysing the process of academic department organizational knowledge creation, it is appropriate to rely on the classical theoretical framework SECI by Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995). It emphasises that in the course of social interaction between the individuals and their groups, an interaction and transformation of tacit and explicit knowledge takes place. During this social transformation, the tacit and explicit knowledge grows both in quantitative and in qualitative terms. This process consists of four transformations – socialization, externalization, combination and internalization. They all take place in an environment that provides favourable conditions for the creation of organizational knowledge, the so-called Ba. This theoretical framework provides rationale for the academic department teachers' organizational learning and its parameters.

The level of the academic department

The pedagogic staff of the academic department must first of all be aware of the mission of the department, i.e. what is its mission in relation to study activities? Does this mission prevail in overall mission of the department? What are its relations with research activities? This knowledge determines the vision of the academic department (Moore and Diamond, 2000). All this is closely related with the philosophy of studies – the main values of study activities.

The above mentioned is the knowledge on the level of the academic department as an organization, that must known to and accepted by all the teachers. Another important question – how all this knowledge is constructed? It depends on the collegial organizational behaviour of the department (Juceviciene, 2010), when the head of the department and teachers generate together the new knowledge. They are accepted by common consensus, taking into account the mission, vision, philosophy of the faculty and higher education institution, as well as the society needs for such study activities and their results. This knowledge, as the basis of study activities, is formulated, internalised, developed, again internalised, etc. by the staff

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

of the department. Thus, the processes of organizational learning are needed. What and how is it happening?

A part of the learning processes are taking place during *the formal activities* of the department when, e.g. during the formal meetings teachers attempt to understand how the mission of the department is perceived by every other teacher, the philosophy of studies is being discussed, common study vision of the department is being created. While discussing these issues, teachers always use a corresponding language (Senge, Kleiner and Roberts, 1994; Kim, 2007; Marcum, 2009): terms, concepts, etc., by trying to express their thoughts clearly.

The ideas about study mission, vision, philosophy that are provided during the department meetings are then presented for joint discussion, the selection of ideas is taking place and agreement on common knowledge is attempted, i.e. the mission, vision and philosophy of the department are formulated (Moore and Diamond, 2000). During this collective activity, the mission, vision and philosophy become a part of shared understanding (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995). The development of understanding is also taking place. The discussed thoughts can be put on paper (e.g. by taking minutes, individual notes) or just memorised (Nonaka, Toyama and Konno, 2000). If needed, special teacher training courses can be organized when they are assisted in formulating the mission, vision and philosophy of the department and studies.

Informal learning activities on the department level includes the informal conversations within and outside the department. Teachers can discuss among themselves the mission, vision and philosophy of the department study activities. It can take place by collaborating with the colleagues within the department environment. It may also happen that the teachers create the organizational knowledge of academic department by discussing with people from other organizations, in different environments, such as professional associations, etc. (Callahan, 1999; Marsick and Watkins, 2001).

The level of teachers group

The study programmes are implemented in the academic department. Every study programme is implemented by a specific group of teachers.

Teachers face a constant need to develop and upgrade the study programmes by taking into account new scientific knowledge, the changing needs of students, employers and society at large, as well as to maintain the high quality of the study process (Dill, 1999; Cullen et al., 2003; Prince, 2004). Therefore, ongoing audit of study quality, based on self-analysis and self-assessment, must become the daily routine in teachers' work (Schwarz and Westerheijden, 2005). A group of teachers, implementing the study programme, must have a shared understanding (collective knowledge) regarding the implementation of studies by linking it with the achievement of students, their satisfaction/dissatisfaction, the self-analysis and assessment system. Depending on the achieved results, the possible improvements to the study programme are envisaged.

However, in order to successfully implement and improve the study programme, a constant organizational learning must be taking place in the teachers' group. The

organizational knowledge of study programme (OKSP) includes the concept of future professional, who is being educated by the study programme, the type of the study programme, the educational paradigm of study programme implementation, the aim, tasks, content, study methods and means, assessment system, student awareness, analysis of results and improvement of the study programme (Juceviciene and Edintaite, 2010).

So how is this organizational knowledge achieved? What collective learning processes of teachers influence the creation and development of such knowledge?

First of all, all members of the group must possess such type of knowledge. If the knowledge of the study programme is not known or clearly defined, it is hard to speak of its further creation or development.

If this condition is fulfilled, then the teachers' collective learning is taking place in formal and informal environments.

As far as *formal activities* are concerned, the learning of the group is taking place during the joint meetings, in which it becomes clear what knowledge on the study programme each teacher has. In the meetings, the discussion on study programme is taking place, during which the teachers use specific terms, concepts and/or other means to express their thoughts. The expressed thoughts on all of the above mentioned important aspects and concepts of the study programme (OKSP) are then presented for the joint group discussion, during which the most important ideas are singled out (McAdam, Mason and McCrory, 2007; Wright, 2008). The teachers seek to agree on the common organizational knowledge of the study programme. If needed, this knowledge is reformulated once again during the meetings, i.e. the creation of organizational knowledge is taking place. However, while seeking this common agreement on the OKSP it is first of all important that it should become a part of all teachers' shared understanding. At the same time, in such meetings the improvement of shared understanding is taking place. The discussed knowledge must be put on written form. Ideally, it should be done by taking minutes (noting the main thoughts), while every teacher should be taking individual notes rather than just memorising the thoughts expressed (Nonaka, Toyama and Konno, 2000). Special training to the teachers of the study programme could be arranged in order to help formulate, upgrade or create the organizational knowledge in the field.

As far as *informal activities* are concerned, the learning of teachers' group takes place while teachers informally discuss all the above mentioned aspects of organizational knowledge (OKSP, i.e. type, aim, tasks, methods of the study programme, etc.). This discussion can take place in the environment of the academic department while collaborating with each other, either with other colleagues of the department (Eraut, 2004), or only with those who participate in the management of the department. The organizational learning can take place by informally sharing knowledge and understanding about study programme in the environments other than department, by interacting with people from other organizations (Callahan, 1999; Marsick and Watkins, 2001).

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

The individual level of teacher

The organizational knowledge that teacher possesses on individual level is the knowledge that he/she needs for the work in the specific module. It is usually predetermined by the specific tasks of the study programme that requires to deliver this module (Juceviciene and Edintaite, 2010).

By the way, teachers' learning on individual level is attributed to organizational learning not on the basis of the ideas of the SECI model, but takes its roots from Johnson (2007), who was critical of the SECI model and was of an opinion that organizational knowledge could also be created on the worker's individual level by learning from own experience. In addition, Juceviciene and Mozuriuniene (2011) have proved that workers can also acquire organizational knowledge on individual level by learning independently and by other means. Thus, there is enough substance to consider it as an organizational learning taking place on the individual level.

Just like the study programmes, in case of implementation of a specific module one can notice that some knowledge is more static (as determined by the module programme as a document), whereas other – more dynamic (knowledge obtained or created in the process of module implementation).

So under what processes of individual learning and how does the dynamic teacher's knowledge change?

The organizational learning on individual teacher's level is also taking place both in formal and in informal activities. The results of learning achieved during these activities (i.e. knowledge on the level of module) are realised in the process of implementation of the module. It all depends on whether the teacher himself/herself created the programme of this module or it got passed over from the colleagues.

The content of organizational learning on individual teacher's level includes the processes of learning, during which the module-related knowledge is created. It is the educational paradigm of module implementation, aim and tasks of the module, its content, subject related knowledge, sources, databases, methods necessary for the studies, assessment system, module programmes as well as knowledge related to result analysis and improvement (Juceviciene and Edintaite, 2010).

Every teacher must share its module-related knowledge with other teachers implementing the same study programme. He/she thus checks the quality of module implementation and ensures the consistency of the study programme in the context of evolving teachers' organizational knowledge.

As far as *formal activities* are concerned, the knowledge sharing usually takes place in the meetings organized by the study programme teachers' group. These meetings are meant not only for deepening and improving the common understanding about the study programmes, but also for the quality improvements of the specific modules (Bowden and Marton, 1998; Lombardozzi and Casey, 2008). Therefore, every teacher should try to share its individual knowledge about their module. They expresses thoughts by using specific terms and concepts that are characteristic to the workings of teacher's group. The teacher presents own thoughts for the common discussion of the group. It usually takes place during the formal meetings. The ideas that have been discussed are then put on written form (either as minutes or as individual notes, or by memorising). These activities are important for preserving the results of organizational learning (Nonaka, Toyama and Konno, 2000).

In *informal activities,* a teacher analyses the knowledge on module by collaborating with other colleagues in the academic department, especially with those who work in the same study programme, its management or in the same room.

Just as on the level of teachers' group, the individual teacher's learning may take place by informally analysing the module-related knowledge with the colleagues of department in other environments. The individual understanding about the module may be deepened and formed by communicating with people from other organizations and environments (Stanikuniene, 2007).

2. The organizational learning of university and non-university teachers: case studies in Lithuania

In this part, the empirical data of surveys on teachers' organizational learning are presented and the findings are analysed and compared.

The empirical research is based on the two case studies: university and non-university higher education institutions in Lithuania.

These cases were chosen by the one important criteria, is that university and non-university teachers should work in higher school and the academic department should work in business management and administration field. Also they must be implementing the bachelor degree study programme in business management and/or business administration.

Based on the three levels of parameters of organizational learning, a questionnaire was prepared.

Sample

University teachers' case. This questionnaire was presented to a group of teachers (consisting of 12 teachers) that was working in Lithuania, in an academic department of university, in the field of business management and administration and implementing bachelor study programme in business administration. This school of higher education is located in a city (around 450 thousand inhabitants), with mostly the youth from surrounding region as its main part of the students (Statistics Lithuania, 2012). A part of the surveyed teachers have working experience in business sector. The academic department consists of more teachers than the actual research sample (14 in total). By observing the environment of the department and its teachers, analyzing the documents we could observe that this school, its managers and pedagogic staff attach importance to studies, their infrastructure and quality of study programmes.

The profile of the study programme. A graduate has fundamental knowledge of management, economics, as well as other knowledge of sciences. The graduate understands concepts, principles and methods of business creation, management and development, and social business responsibility, is able to examine, analyse and evaluate business environment and business processes, can

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

motivate employees, is able to seek and find decisions that increase business competitiveness, and is ready to renew the acquired knowledge. The graduate has specific knowledge and skills in chosen specialization areas: International Business, Service Management.

The graduate can seek employment in business organizations (service, retail, wholesale, and manufacturing), institutions of public services, municipalities, and non-governmental organizations, and is ready to establish and successfully manage personal business.

Non-university teachers' case. The questionnaire was presented to a group of teachers (consisting of 7 teachers) that was working in Lithuania, in an academic department of non-university type of higher school, in the field of management and administration and implementing bachelor study programme in business management. This school of higher education is located in a small city (around 70 thousand inhabitants), with mostly the youth from surrounding region as its main part of the students (Statistics Lithuania, 2012). Part of the surveyed teachers have working experience in business sector. The academic department consists of more teachers than the actual research sample (15 in total), but they are occupied in other study programmes. By observing the environment of the department and its teachers, analyzing the documents we could observe that this school, its managers and pedagogic staff attach importance to studies, their infrastructure and quality of study programmes.

The profile of the study programme. A graduate has fundamental knowledge of management, human resources management, economics, law, marketing, finances. The graduate has specific knowledge and skills in chosen specialization areas: Marketing Management, Finance Management, Trade Business Management.

The graduate can seek employment in business organizations and is ready to establish and successfully manage personal business.

The level of the academic department

The research findings revealed that the academic departments possesses a formulated mission.

9 of 12 university teachers (UT) are aware of it and 6 out of 7 non-university teachers (NUT) are aware of it. The same number of teachers know about the vision of the department. All members of the research sample know the values underlying the study-related activities of the department in non-university institution, but just a half of UT know them.

The findings allow to conclude that one type of the knowledge on the level of the academic department – its *mission* – is formulated, analysed and refined mostly through the *informal discussions* in the department among the colleagues within or outside the study programme. Surveyed UT and NUT teachers also discuss the mission of the department with the colleagues with whom they share the same room.

In addition, one of 7 NUT respondents is in a different situation: his/her workplace is in a separate room, so he/she has less possibilities for informal communication, thus also for organizational learning. The UT do not have such

problems with environment. This problem was observed while researching the organizational learning on all three levels, i.e. creating not only the organizational knowledge on the department level, but also on the level of the teachers' group, as well as on individual level of module implementation. It is clear that teachers who have their own room share less organizational knowledge related to their module with colleagues.

It was determined that the teachers tend to analyse the questions of the mission of the department while meeting with the colleagues in the environments other than department. It occurs less often that understanding about the department would emerge out of interactions with people from other organizations and environments.

The level of teachers' group

The research findings show that all NUT know that the concept of future professional had been formulated, as well as the aim, tasks and structure of modules, but just 9 of 12 UT know that. 6 out of 7 surveyed NUT teachers know that this study programme is based on specific educational paradigm and what kind of teaching/learning forms, methods, means for the implementation of studies have been envisaged. Half of UT know the paradigm of study programme, but 9 of 12 can indicate teaching/learning forms, methods. So, the main difference between university and non-university teachers groups organizational knowledge is that non-university teachers are more how they are educating their students, i.e. they have collective knowledge on educational paradigm.

The NUT teachers are most ready to discuss the concept of future professional with the co-workers in the study programme, as well as with the colleagues with whom they work in the management of academic department. The UT are inclined to do that more in formal way: meetings, formal discussions; and by informal activities like with colleagues who work in the same room. University teachers seems to have better conception what kind of professional they what to educate.

When asked about how the concept of future professional is formed, the non-university teachers have indicated that shared understanding is rarely sought. Besides, the teachers are missing the joint activities towards shared understanding, agreement on choosing the educational paradigm of the study programme, aims and tasks. The university teachers situation is opposite, because they choose formal activities to discuss on the concept of future professional, they are using meetings for these discussions and for other important questions on study programme.

The research data analysis shows that in both cases there is no special training in the academic departments for the teachers that would help them all participate in the formulation of the concept of future professional, educational paradigm, the aim, the tasks of the study programme and etc. It shows that teachers miss managerial support in creating appropriate conditions for organizational learning.

It was noticed that non-university teachers, working in the same study programme, partially collaborate and sometimes seek common understanding while shaping the

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

structure of modules in the study programme. It was observed that in the joint meetings there are sometimes attempts to identify the teachers' individual perceptions of the structure of study programme; discussions are taking place, during which the teachers use terms and concepts in order to express clearly their thoughts and present them for the discussion. The teachers indicated that through these discussions the structure of study programme usually becomes a part of shared understanding. However, they distinguished a problem that there was a lack of special training that would help shape this structure. Thus, on the whole, the research findings show that this group has no strong traditions in constructing the study programme. The university teachers group has opposite situation, they often organize meeting in formal or informal way, formal meeting are usually regular, the informal meetings can be organized for solving some unexpected problems and it is not necessary to get together for all study programme teachers group.

Also the non-university respondents usually shape the collective understanding about the forms and methods of studies together with colleagues from their department. However, this newly created knowledge seldom takes shape of the minutes of the teachers' group meetings. The teachers only take them as individual notes or memorise them, yet in a fragmented way. Therefore it is hard to expect that this collective knowledge that is created will be formalised at the stage of combination.

These research findings allow concluding that non-university teachers lack organizational learning and shared understanding regarding the study activities.

The individual level of teachers

The research findings show that the non-university teachers are inclined to discuss the aims and tasks of their modules with the colleagues, working in the same room. However, a problem of the lack of appropriate physical space was distinguished. It was noted that in the official meetings of the study programme teachers they very rarely share their knowledge about the aim and tasks of the modules they teach. It was also noticed that teachers often analyse the aims and tasks of their modules in other environments, not the academic department.

There are some differences in organizational learning of university teachers. The UT are inclined to discuss the aims and tasks of their modules with the colleagues, but they like to do that in organised meeting of academic department, also they don't share their knowledge about modules with people from other environments.

The research of both cases revealed that all the teachers, while making the structure of their own module content, continuously collaborate with various colleagues within the environment of the department. The teachers tended to share their ideas on module structure and to discuss during the common meetings of the teachers' group of a specific study programme. So they particularly appreciate the colleagues' assistance at shaping their module structure; teachers tend to pay special attention to this issue. But, the findings show that non-university teachers avoid discussing their module methods and means during the formal meetings at the department.

So the research of organizational learning on individual teachers' level shows some differences between UT and NUT. Non-university teachers are more inclined towards this type of learning that takes place through informal rather than formal ways. Only in cases that are of greatest importance to them (module structure, content) they choose formal ways of learning. The university teachers are more inclined to share their knowledge on module in more formal way, but they don't share their knowledge with people from 'out of university'.

3. Discussion on university and non-university teachers' organizational learning

In this part two questions will be discussed: are the teachers of the non-university higher education institution more inclined to learn, are they more flexible and open for changes than the teachers of university? What factors influence their openness and flexibility for organizational leaning at the workplace?

The research findings presented in the second part of the paper have revealed the problem that non-university teachers are less inclined to share knowledge about the modules they teach. The analysis of the research results has shown that university teachers are the ones who have formal activities that involve discussions on issues related to the study programme. There is also a clear tendency that university teachers are more inclined to speak about the modules they teach during formal meetings or meetings of study programme teachers.

Non-university teachers more often discuss the issues of the study programme and the modules they teach with people from other environments, whereas university teachers tend to solve major issues related to the study programme and modules inside the academic department.

One may note that in the case of the university considered in this research study teachers have clearer activities of organizational learning and clear traditions of developing study programmes and modules. This is lacking with regard to non-university teachers.

Teachers' activities in analysing and developing study programmes or modules are not clearly defined. Teachers share the knowledge they have with other people beyond their academic departments too.

One may note that non-university teachers are more open. This may be determined by their practical experience in business. Non-university study programmes are integrated with practice, which is often a topic for criticizing the representatives of traditional universities.

Drawing on the research results, however, one may assume that non-university teachers work at institutions that do not have deep and old traditions; academic departments are not characterized by high-level culture of learning. One of the factors may also be that non-university teachers are representatives of the business sectors (many of them do not have a scientific degree) rather than academia. Therefore, being practitioners rather than researchers, they use external networks to develop their practical rather than academic knowledge related to the study programme and its modules they teach.

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

For this reason, representatives of traditional universities keep the traditions of academic community and seek to work as one academic group, thus creating the culture of learning in which traditions of learning are rooted and maintained by such values as cooperation, formal and informal meetings, opportunities for free discussions on study programmes and modules. The fact that university teachers are not afraid to discuss issues related to modules they teach shows that there is a favourable environment for teachers' learning at the university.

However, both university and non-university teachers feel certain managerial limitations related to maintaining and developing organizational learning.

The research on non-university teachers' educational competence carried out by Stasiulioniene and Juceviciene (2004) revealed that non-university institutions of higher education learning takes many different forms. These institutions are flexible and open, as the competence of teachers-practitioners is more relevant for a better understanding and response to the changes in society, market and business.

A major factor in non-university teachers' work and receptivity to learning is changes in the studies. Study programmes increasingly become similar to those at universities, as they are transformed into competence-based programmes. This means that non-university teachers should be receptive to learning, as, according to Stasiulioniene and Juceviciene (2004), meta-learning competence plays the central role in the structure of teachers' educational competence; it empowers teachers for becoming learners in order to guarantee effective learning of other individuals, to develop learning-intensive educational environments, to disseminate new knowledge to the society.

The research results presented in the second part of the paper also reveal that non-university teachers are acquainted with educational paradigms and know which paradigm is considered in educating students. Drawing on the previous research (Stasiulioniene and Juceviciene, 2004), one may note that non-university teachers are becoming more receptive to learning (Zinkeviciene, 2007) and, as members of the teaching community, understand that in terms of the paradigm of learning the central role in the structure of teachers' competence is played by meta-learning competence, which empowers teachers for continuing development of ways of understanding, for understanding one's own ways and processes of learning, i.e. for becoming learners.

Thus the initial hypothesis that university teachers are not inclined to learn, whereas non-university teachers are more inclined to learn, as this is determined by their openness to practice and changes in the market, has not been supported by the research results. Non-university tend to learn but there are no indications that their receptivity to learning is much higher than receptivity of university teachers. Inclination to learn is individual's interest in learning as a process without aiming for learning outcomes, whereas absorptive capacity is related to individual's ability to acquire, internalize, transform and use new knowledge (Zinkeviciene, 2007). Thus receptivity to learning is expressed through the process of learning

which is oriented to learning outcomes, i.e. new knowledge, ideas, skills, competences, etc. Universities that have deep traditions tend to implement the culture of learning, whereas activities of organizational learning may be recognized in daily performance related to studies. These traditions and activities of daily learning are scarce at non-university institutions of higher education.

Conclusions

1. The teachers' organizational learning in the activities related to studies takes place by creating the organizational knowledge that is needed for the study programme, its implementation and improvement. The importance of such knowledge is understood and recognised by the school and its structural unit – the academic department that is responsible for this study programme. Organizational learning takes place on three levels and corresponds to the following stages of the SECI model by Nonaka and Takeuchi: o*n the level of all academic department* – by the means of collective learning formulating the department mission, philosophy, vision acceptable to all its teachers, and formalising it by the means of documents, rules, norms, etc.; o*n the level of the teachers' group* - implementing the same study programme; o*n the individual level of every teacher* – implementing the module of the study programme.

2. The research findings presented in the second part of the paper have revealed the problem that non-university teachers are less inclined to share knowledge about the modules they teach. The analysis of the research results has shown that university teachers are the ones who have formal activities that involve discussions on issues related to the study programme. There is also a clear tendency that university teachers are more inclined to speak about the modules they teach during formal meetings or meetings of study programme teachers. Non-university teachers more often discuss the issues of the study programme and the modules they teach with people from other environments, whereas university teachers tend to solve major issues related to the study programme and modules inside the academic department. In the case of the university considered in this research study teachers have clearer activities of organizational learning and clear traditions of developing study programmes and modules. This is clearly lacking with regard to non-university teachers. Teachers' activities in analysing and developing study programmes or modules are not clearly defined. Teachers share the knowledge they have with other people beyond their academic departments too.

3. One may assume that non-university teachers work at institutions that do not have deep and old traditions; academic departments are not characterized by high-level culture of learning. One of the factors may also be that non-university teachers are representatives of the business sectors (many of them do not have a scientific degree) rather than academia. Therefore, being practitioners rather than researchers, they use

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

external networks to develop their practical rather than academic knowledge related to the study programme and its modules they teach. For this reason, representatives of traditional universities keep the traditions of academic community and seek to work as one academic group, thus creating the culture of learning in which traditions of learning are rooted and maintained by such values as cooperation, formal and informal meetings, opportunities for free discussions on study programmes and modules. The fact that university teachers are not afraid to discuss issues related to modules they teach shows that there is a favourable environment for teachers' learning at the university. However, both university and non-university teachers feel certain managerial limitations related to maintaining and developing organizational learning. The initial hypothesis that university teachers are not inclined to learn, whereas non-university teachers are more inclined to learn, as this is determined by their openness to practice and changes in the market, has not been supported by the research results. Non-university tend to learn but there are no indications that their receptivity to learning is much higher than receptivity of university teachers. Inclination to learn is individual's interest in learning as a process without aiming for learning outcomes, whereas absorptive capacity is related to individual's ability to acquire, internalize, transform and use new knowledge (Zinkeviciene, 2007). Thus receptivity to learning is expressed through the process of learning which is oriented to learning outcomes, i.e. new knowledge, ideas, skills, competences, etc. Universities that have deep traditions tend to implement the culture of learning, whereas activities of organizational learning may be recognized in daily performance related to studies. These traditions and activities of daily learning are scarce at non-university institutions of higher education.

References

1. Anantatmula, V.S., & Stankosky, M. (2008). KM criteria for different types of organisations. *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning*, 4, 1, 18–35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKL.2008.019735

2. Bandini, S., Petraglia, F., & Sartori, F. (2009). Using knowledge artifacts to support work and learning: a case study. *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning*, 5, 5/6, 389–403. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKL.2009.031505

3. Barnett, R. (1999). Learning to work and working to learn, in D. Boud, J. Garrick (eds.). *Understanding Learning at Work,* pp. 29-44, London, Routledge.

4. Bowden, J., &Marton, F. (1998). *The university of learning*. London, Kogan Page.

5. Callahan, M.H.W. (1999). *Case Study of an Advanced Technology Business Incubator as a Learning Environment.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Georgia, 1999).

6. Cullen, J., Joyce, J., Hassall, T., & Broadbent, M. (2003). Quality in higher education: from monitoring to management. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 11, 1, 5-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684880310462038

7. Dill, D.D. (1999). Academic accountability and university adaptation: The architecture of an academic learning organization. *Higher Education,* 38, 127–154. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1003762420723

8. Duke, Ch. (2002). *Managing the Learning University.* The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

9. Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education,* 26, 2, 247-273. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/158037042000225245

10. Grundstein, M. (2008). Assessing the enterprise's knowledge management maturity level. *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning*, 4, 5, 415–426. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKL.2008.022060

11. Hager, P. (2001). *Toward a Productive Conception of Productive Learning.* Productive Learning Seminar Series, Working Paper 01-13, Group for Research in Adult and Vocational Learning, and Research Centre for Vocational Education and Training, University of Technology, Sydney.

12. Harris, T.E., & Nelson, M.D. (2008). *Applied Organizational Communication.* NY, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

13. Jezerskytė, E. (2011). Innovative Activity of a University Teacher and its Content in the Context of Study Programme Development. *Social Sciences,* 1, (71), 53-61.

14. Johnson, W.H.A. (2007). Mechanisms of tacit knowing: pattern recognition and synthesis. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 11, 4, 123-139. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270710762765

15. Juceviciene, P., & Edintaite, G. (2010). Study-Relevant Organizational Knowledge of an Academic Department. *Social Sciences,* 2, (68), 16-25.

16. Juceviciene, P., & Mozuriuniene, V. (2011). Organization's Knowing or Organizational Knowing? Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management & Organisational Learning, 27-28 October 2011.

17. Jucevičienė, P. (2010). *Organizacijos elgsena: vadovėlis.* Kaunas, Technologija.

18. Kim, D.H. (2007). The link between individual and organizational learning. In K. Starkey, S. Tempest, A. McKinley (eds.). *How Organizations Learn. Managing the Search for Knowledge* (2nd edition), Thomson.

19. Kundrotas, V. (1996). *Universitetinių biznio administravimo bakalauro studijų organizavimas.* (Daktaro disertacija, Kauno technologijos universitetas, 1996).

20. Landaeta, R.E., Pinto, C.A., & Kotnour, T. (2009). Assessing faulty knowledge management systems in project-based organisations. *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning*, 5, 2, 122–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKL.2009.027898

21. Lombardozzi, C., & Casey, A. (2008). The impact of developmental relationships on the learning of practice competence for new graduates. *Journal of Workplace Learning,* 20, 5, 297-315. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13665620810882914

22. Longworth, N. (2006). Learning cities, Learning regions, Learning Communities: Lifelong learning and local government. London, Routledge.

23. Marcum, J.W. (2009). Mental models for sustainability. *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances,* 22, 2, 45-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/08880450910982620

24. Marsick, V.J., & Watkins, K.E. (2001). Informal and Incidental Learning. NEW DIRECTIONS FOR ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION, no. 89, Spring 2001. Jossey-Bass, A Publishing Unit of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

25. McAdam, R., Mason, B., & McCrory, J. (2007). Exploring the Dichotomies within the Tacit Knowledge Literature: Towards a process of tacit knowing in organisation. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 11, 2, 43-59. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673270710738906

26. Miller, K. (2006). *Organizational Communication: Approaches and Process.* Australia, Brazil: Thomson Wadsworth.

27. Moore, M.R., & Diamond, M.A. (2000). *Academic Leadership: Turning Vision into Reality.* ERNST & YOUNG LLP.

28. Nonaka, I. (1994). A Dynamic Theory of Organizational Knowledge Creation. *Organization Science,* 5, (1), 14-37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.5.1.14

29. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge Creating Company.* Oxford University Press.

30. Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). Seci, Ba, and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Rang Plan,* 33, 5-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0024-6301(99)00115-6

31. Pandya, K.V., & Hon, E.S.W. (2008). Improving corporate knowledge: a case study in China. *Int. J. Knowledge Management Studies,* 2, 2, 248–266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKMS.2008.018324

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

32. Papa, M.J., Daniels, T.D., & Spiker, B.K. (2008). *Organizational Communication. Perspectives and Trends.* Los Angeles, London: SAGE.
33. Prince, Ch. (2004). University accreditation and the corporate learning agenda. *Journal of Management Development,* 23, 3, 256-269. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02621710410524113
34. Schwarz, S., & Westerheijden, D.F. (2005). Accreditation in the Framework of Evaluation Activities: A Comparative Study in the European Higher Education Area. *Accreditation and Evaluation in the European Higher Education Area,* 1–41.
35. Senge, P.M., Kleiner, A., & Roberts, Ch. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook.* London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
36. Stanikūnienė, B. (2007). *Aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojo edukacinės kompetencijos ir mokymosi aplinkų santykis* (Daktaro disertacija, Kauno technologijos universitetas, 2007).
37. Stasiulionienė, V., ir Jucevičienė, P. (2004). Edukacinės paradigmos virsmo įgalinimas Utenos kolegijoje: verslo vadybos programos atvejis. *Mokslo taikomieji tyrimai Lietuvos kolegijose,* 1, 46-55.
38. Statistics Lithuania (2012). Population in counties and municipalities by age and sex. Retrieved 1 May, 2012, from http://www.stat.gov.lt/en/pages/view/?id=371
39. Stoner, J.A.F., Freeman, E.R., & Gilbert, D.R. (2006). *Vadyba.* Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika.
40. Valtolina, S., & Mussio, P. (2009). Knowledge and learning management in cultural contexts. *Int. J. Knowledge and Learning,* 5, 5/6, 519–538. http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJKL.2009.031513
41. Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2003). Organizational learning and knowledge management: toward an integrative framework, in M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.). *The Blackwell handbook of organizational learning and knowledge management*, pp. 124-41, USA, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
42. Walker, J. (2001). The managerial mentor-leading productive learning in the workplace: An integral view, UTS Research Centre Vocational Education & Training Productive learning seminar series November 2001, Working Paper 02-09.
43. Wright, H. (2008). Tacit Knowledge and Pedagogy at UK Universities; challenges for Effective Management. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management,* 6, 1, 49-62.
44. Zinkevičienė, N. (2007). *Dėstytojo racionalaus imlumo pedagoginėms inovacijoms raiška neuniversitetinio aukštojo mokslo aspektu* (Daktaro disertacija, Kauno technologijos universitetas, 2007).

G. Edintaitė

Universiteto ir neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojų organizacinis mokymasis

Santrauka

Straipsnyje atskleidžiami aukštojo mokslo institucijų dėstytojų organizacinio mokymosi (angl. *organizational learning*) ypatumai įgyvendinant studijų programą.

Šiuolaikiniai tyrimai atskleidžia (Stanikūnienė, 2007), jog dėstytojai laiko save besimokančiaisiais artimiausiose aplinkose, išskyrus savo darbo aplinką. Tad atrodytų, kad jie aukštojoje mokykloje jaučiasi esą tik pedagogai, kurie ugdo, bet patys – nesimoko. Tačiau taip negali būti, jeigu dėstytoją laikome organizacijos, kurioje turi vykti organizacinis mokymasis, nariu (Nonaka ir Takeuchi, 1995). Aukštojo mokslo institucija ir yra tokia organizacija, kurios veikla neįsivaizduojama be nuolatinio tobulėjimo, kurį užtikrina organizacinis mokymasis (Landaeta, Pinto, Kotnour, 2009).

Tačiau kaip turėtų vykti dėstytojų organizacinis mokymasis? Tiesioginio ir aiškaus atsakymo į šį klausimą mokslinėje literatūroje rasti nepavyko. Tiesa, galima būtų vadovautis bendruoju Nonaka ir Takeuchi (1995) SECI organizacinio mokymosi modeliu, tačiau be dėstytojų veiklos turinio šis modelis nepakankamai informatyvus.

Lietuvos aukštojo mokslo erdvėje šiuo metu vykstančios permainos kelia vis daugiau iššūkių, susijusių su studijų kokybe. Palaipsniui daugėja neuniversitetinių aukštojo mokslo institucijų, kurios nuolat plečia teikiamų studijų programų spektrą. Diskutuojama dėstytojų kompetencijos, inovatyvumo ir nuolatinio mokymosi klausimais. Teigiama, kad neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai yra inovatyvūs ir imlūs (Zinkevičienė, 2007), tačiau inovacine kompetencija taip pat pasižymi ir universiteto dėstytojai (Jezerskytė, 2011). Tradicinio universiteto dėstytojai neretai kritikuojami dėl savo konservatyvumo ir

uždarumo naujovėms, o neuniversitetinės aukštojo mokslo institucijos laikomos imlesnėmis inovacijų atžvilgiu, pasižyminčiomis mokymosi intensyvumu ir greitu kompetencijos tobulinimu - tai rodo ir neuniversitetinių mokyklų įsigalėjimas aukštojo mokslo rinkoje. Galima kelti hipotezę, kad universiteto dėstytojai nėra linkę mokytis, o neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai labiau linkę mokytis, nes mokymąsi sąlygoja jų atvirumas praktikai bei rinkos aplinkos pokyčiams.

Šiame straipsnyje pristatomo *tyrimo problema* - kokie veiksniai daro įtaką universiteto ir neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojų organizaciniam mokymuisi, kaip įgalinti dėstytojus tobulinti savo edukacinę kompetenciją, siekiant sėkmingai realizuoti ir tobulinti studijų programą?

Straipsnio tikslas – atskleisti universiteto ir neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojų, realizuojančių studijų programą, organizacinio mokymosi ypatumus.

Pirmojoje dalyje, remiantis Nonaka ir Takeuchi (1995) organizacijos žinojimo (angl. *organization knowing*) kūrimo modeliu, analizuojamas dėstytojų organizacinio mokymosi (*organizational learning*) turinys išskiriant tris lygmenis: a) mokymasis katedros (*academic department*) lygmenyje; b) studijų programos dėstytojų grupės mokymasis; c) individualus dėstytojo mokymasis.

Antrojoje dalyje pristatoma empirinio dėstytojų organizacinio mokymosi kuriant katedros studijų veiklos žinias tyrimo rezultatų analizė. Remiantis Lietuvos universiteto ir neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos atvejo studijos duomenimis, atskleidžiami dėstytojų mokymosi ir studijų veiklos žinių kūrimo ypatumai.

Trečiojoje dalyje diskutuojama šiais klausimais: ar neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai labiau linkę mokytis, ar jie lankstesni ir atviresni pokyčiams negu universiteto dėstytojai? Kokie veiksniai daro įtaką dėstytojų atvirumui ir lankstumui organizacinio mokymosi darbo vietoje atžvilgiu?

Dėstytojų organizacinis mokymasis studijų veikloje vyksta kuriant organizacines žinias, kurios reikalingos studijų programai, jos realizavimui ir tobulinimui. Tokių žinių svarbą suvokia ir pripažįsta pati aukštoji mokykla, taip pat jos struktūrinis vienetas – už studijų programą (toliau – SP) atsakinga katedra. Organizacinis mokymasis vyksta trijuose lygmenyse ir atitinka tokius Nonaka ir Takeuchi (1995) SECI modelio etapus: *visos katedros lygmenyje* kolektyvinio mokymosi būdais formuluojant visiems jos dėstytojams priimtiną padalinio misiją, filosofiją, viziją ir įvairiais dokumentais, taisyklėmis, normomis ir pan. formalizuojant naujas studijų programas bei jau realizuojamų SP pokyčius; *dėstytojų grupės, realizuojančios vieną ir tą pačią studijų programą, lygmenyje.* Kolektyvinio mokymosi būdais kuriamos organizacinės žinios, formuluojant ir tobulinant būsimo profesionalo koncepciją, SP tipą, realizavimo edukacinę paradigmą, tikslą ir uždavinius, SP turinį, studijų metodus ir priemones, studijų pasiekimų vertinimo sistemą, gilinantis į šioje SP studijuojančių studentų pažinimą, jų pasiekimus, problemas ir jų sprendimą, analizuojant SP rezultatus; *kiekvieno dėstytojo individualiame lygmenyje*, dėstant konkretų modulį. Individualaus mokymosi būdais kuriamos organizacinės individualaus lygmens žinios, leidžiančios tobulinti modulio programą ir jos realizavimo procesą.

Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidžia, kad neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai mažiau linkę dalintis savo žiniomis apie dėstomus modulius. Tyrimo rezultatų analizė atskleidė, jog būtent universiteto dėstytojai turi formalias veiklas, kurių metu jie diskutuoja studijų programos klausimais. Taip pat aiški tendencija, kad universiteto dėstytojai drąsiau kalba apie savo dėstomą modulį formalių posėdžių ar studijų programos dėstytojų susitikimų metu. Neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai dažniau diskutuoja SP ir dėstomo modulio klausimais su žmonėmis iš kitų aplinkų, tuo tarpu universiteto dėstytojai yra labiau linkę esminius SP ir dėstomų modulių klausimus spręsti viduje, t.y. katedros dėstytojų aplinkoje. Tirto universiteto dėstytojai turi aiškesnes organizacinio mokymosi veiklas ir aiškias tradicijas tobulinant SP ir joje realizuojamus modulius. Neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojams to aiškiai trūksta. Dėstytojų veikla analizuojant, tobulinant SP ar dėstomus modulius nėra aiškiai apibrėžta. Dėstytojai nevengia savo turimomis žiniomis dalintis ir su kitais žmonėmis – už katedros ribų.

Taip pat remiantis tyrimo rezultatais daroma prielaida, kad neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai dirba gilių ir senų tradicijų neturinčioje aukštojo mokslo institucijoje, o katedros nepasižymi aukšta mokymosi kultūra. Taip pat vienas iš veiksnių gali būti tai, jog neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai yra ne akademinio, o verslo sektoriaus atstovai (daugelis jų neturi mokslinio daktaro laipsnio). Todėl jie, labiau būdami praktikai, o ne mokslo krypties mokslininkai, nevengia naudotis išoriniais tinklais, kad gilintų savo praktines, bet ne

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2012. Nr. 2 (76)

G. Edintaite. University and Non-university Teachers'
Organizational Learning

akademines žinias, susijusias su realizuojama studijų programa bei joje dėstomais moduliais. Todėl tradicinio universiteto atstovai, saugodami savo akademinės bendruomenės tradicijas ir siekdami dirbti kaip viena akademinė grupė, sukuria mokymosi kultūrą, kurioje ilgainiui atsiranda mokymosi tradicijos, palaikomos tokių mokymosi vertybių: tarpusavio pagalba, formalių ir neformalių susitikimų organizavimas, galimybė drąsiai ir atvirai diskutuoti SP ir asmeniškai kiekvieno dėstytojo modulio klausimais. Tai, kad dėstytojai nebijo diskutuoti apie modulius, rodo, jog universitete palaikoma tinkama aplinka dėstytojų mokymuisi. Tačiau tiek universiteto, tiek ir neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai jaučia tam tikrus vadybinius organizacinio mokymosi palaikymo ir vystymo apribojimus.

Atmesta hipotezė, kad universiteto dėstytojai nėra linkę mokytis, o neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai labiau linkę mokytis, nes tai sąlygoja jų atvirumas praktikai bei rinkos aplinkos pokyčiams. Neuniversitetinės aukštosios mokyklos dėstytojai yra linkę mokytis, tačiau negalima teigti, jog jų imlumas yra kur kas didesnis nei universiteto dėstytojų. Polinkis mokytis - tai žmogaus potraukis mokymuisi kaip procesui, nesiekiant mokymosi rezultatų, o imlumas (angl. *absorptive capacity*) susijęs su gebėjimu įgyti, įsisavinti, transformuoti ir panaudoti naujas žinias (Zinkevičienė, 2007). Taigi imlumas reiškiasi mokymosi procese, kai tikslingai siekiama mokymosi rezultatų, t.y. naujų žinių, idėjų, įgūdžių, gebėjimų, kompetencijų ir pan. Universitetai, turintys gilias tradicijas, jau patys savaime linkę diegti mokymosi kultūrą, o jų kasdienėje studijų veikloje galima atpažinti aiškias organizacinio mokymosi veiklas. Tačiau būtent šių tradicijų, kasdienio mokymosi pasigendama neuniversitetinio aukštojo mokslo institucijose.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: universitetas, neuniversitetinė aukštoji mokykla, organizacinis mokymasis.