TOWARDS HUMAN WELL-BEING: EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT

Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

Ausra Kazlauskiene

Siauliai University
Visinskio 25, LT- 76351, Siauliai, Lithuania

Abstract

University values have lately been manifesting themselves through the culture of quality. Current society, which has progressed to post-modernity, presupposes the formation of a new culture in organisations. The given research investigates the contexts for the (self-)formation of the culture of dialogue, which are receptive to the current development of modern society. So far, the essence and manifestation of this dialogue have been more emphasised through global cultural characteristics. The article seeks to highlight multicultural characteristics and to individualise the manifestation of the culture of dialogue when managing a higher education institution. Analysing the importance of higher education quality in postmodern society and grand political narratives in maintaining the culture of dialogue, the article highlights socio-cultural contexts of managing the quality of science and studies, grounded on the dialogue of culture.

Keywords: dialogue of culture, quality of science and studies, higher education.

Introduction

As higher education is increasingly becoming a mass phenomenon and education is being maintained by lifelong learning, the need of higher education quality grows, encouraging the development of assessing the quality of the acquired education.

Article 41 of the Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania (2009) commits every higher education institution to have an internal study quality assurance system, grounded on the European higher education area assurance provisions and on the strategy for improving quality of activities, approved by the higher education institution itself. It is proposed that the assurance of quality of the provided education is achieved by projecting ways and measures of activities.

According to Krisciunas (2011), in the course of university development, the values and mission of universities have been constantly declared to society, and the relations with founders and society have been described. But the form and content, reflecting the interests of social partners of that time, have been changing. The author claims that the dialogue among the university, authority, and society has determined both the development of higher education institutions and cultural, social, and economic development of the country. The conception and content of cooperation between a higher education institution and its external partners have changed significantly. Its social coverage has particularly expanded. This has been confirmed by Rinkevicius et al. (2011) who claim that science and tendencies of technology development are moving towards social aims. Thus, the university and society have to create a closer dialogue, because society is turning into the centre of science, technologies, and innovations. As Krisciunas et al. (2011) state, society becomes a tantamount and influential partner of development. Besides, seeking effective activity, new approaches towards the quality of activity have to be sought after. According to Barnett (2011), one of the main reasons for being a university is the possession and nurturance of the 'university spirit'. Once the university has its 'spirit', it can exist, maintaining its sense in any form. Values of the university, which manifest themselves through the culture of quality, are especially important, particularly when 'culture is returning to the animate centre of social sciences' and its field is expanding (Kavolis, 1996).

Today's society, which has progressed to postmodernity, according to Jencks (2002), is assessed as a new paradigm, which changes the worldview, philosophy, religion, politics and science. The present investigation emphasises the essence of the culture of dialogue, based on the Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania (2009), European Council documents, Communiqués of the European Commission, and other documents regulating the activities of a higher

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

education institution, and on relevant research findings (Gutauskas, 2010; Rau, 2005; Welsch, 2004; Barnett, 2011; Christensen and Eyring, 2011; Bell et al., 2009). So far, the essence and manifestation of the dialogue has been more accentuated through global cultural characteristics. This article aims at highlighting multicultural characteristics and individualising the manifestation of the culture of dialogue in the contexts of higher education institution management.

Specifically, the aim of the article is to reveal social cultural contexts of managing the quality of science and studies, based on the culture of dialogue.

This article draws on Lyotard (1993) and Baudrillard's (2002) postmodern existence interpretations. Their theories are unified by the attempts to disclose the construction of social cultural contexts. Culture is perceived as a process, improvement, and purification (Kavolis, 1996). The research follows the position that the dialogue does not create generality of the world but unfolds it. This means that the dialogue cannot create a separate world. It always takes place in the horizon of the world. The dialogue takes sense not only from the field of meanings of the world, but also from perceived differences. The principle of the dialogue enables to obtain what is true, leaving subjective approaches aside (Wojtyla, 1997), and this principle is successful because 'it does not turn away from tension'. The culture of dialogue changes through individuals' resolves and intellectuals' discoveries (Kavolis, 1996). Based on Lyotard (1993), claims to objectivised universal truths are refused, and social reality is constructed without any preconceived defined criteria. It is asserted that the culture of dialogue originates from the application of social sciences for organising today's organisations from management perspectives.

The concept of communicative rationality stands as the basis, where communication participants cope with subjective approaches, seeking rational solution; it is committed to rationality and openness (Habermas, 1987). Culture of an organisation is perceived as a social structure, where the focus is on process (Valantiejus, 2007).

The attitude to the culture of dialogue as to interaction is embedded in cybernetics ideas, which explore general management processes of systems, which take place collecting, transmitting, storing and processing information.

Importance of higher education quality in postmodern society

Although scientists have different positions defining the features of postmodernity (Kant emphasises diversities whereas Welsch - links), the constructed concept attempts to find prerequisites of unity. Unity and diversity should not contradict; on the contrary, they should supplement each other (Rau, 2005). The researcher states that differences, and even contradictions, cannot ruin unity, because contradictions enable people to find new unity which is covering more. According to Gutauskas (2010), the importance of dialogue becomes relevant because it creates prerequisites for the creation of commonness of the

sense. This is particularly relevant in today's society of diversity, setting and overstepping the limits of possibilities, admissibility, and knowing. Overstepping limits in the context of the culture of dialogue means going towards another, opening, and going together (Rau, 2005). As a matter of fact, one of the tasks of a higher educational institution is to always teach two things anew: to overstep limits and to keep them.

Postmodern society is characterised by diversity, pluralism, openness to diversity of traditions, and differences of their elements, where the content is more important than chronology, models of modernity selection and progress are no longer followed. The main experience of postmodernity is the experience and multiplicity of particularly different forms of knowing, life challenges, activity models, types of thinking, and conceptions (Welsch, 2004). Although the event of dialogue is what interrupts our usual life, it never disconnects from world events. Even global anonymous relations, which are far off the essence of dialogue, act in dialogue (Gutauskas, 2010). The dialogue space distinguishes itself in the world as a space, creating an area of common sense which is important for the society of diversity. Sense in dialogue is created in the tangle of originality and anonymity. Dialogue as an approach creates conditions for common perception and gives a sense to relations with others. Dewey follows the approach that seeking the unity of science, it is most important to bridge various sciences (Nekrasas, 2010). In his words, the dialogue with society through the knowledge of science and studies copes with isolation of science from everyday life, and this way increases its power and ability to solve daily life problems. And, most importantly, the essence of the culture of dialogue is to 'see' problems as possibilities (Rau, 2005).

Every organisation has to acknowledge not only a manifold otherness and its all forms, but also the pluralism of identity of an organisation in the manifold society. This is the only way to preserve the diversity of education and cultures as a possibility of development, self-expression, creativity, and innovation.

Postmodernity has a strong ethical foundation - that is why it has become particularly relevant to every organisation to have a peculiar culture. The culture of dialogue 'brings' the approach to seek local and global endeavour of ethics (ecological consciousness, social responsibility). In the near future, global ethics will be sought, encompassing openness, solidarity, responsibility, and neighbourhood (Rau, 2005).

The approach to the culture of dialogue as an interaction has also been established on the basis of cybernetics ideas, exploring general management processes in systems, which collect, transfer, store, and process information. From the standpoint of cybernetics, the dialogue as an interaction of information is a complex factor of system management, when the governing component A, influenced by dialogue, corrects the governed component B (Bitinas, 2000).

The dialogue interaction is two-way, consisting of the governing information transferred (science knowledge, study results, environment, etc.) and feedback information, showing real changes in the system (e.g., both of society

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

and of a higher educational institution), because the emerging dialogue influences not only others but also itself.

This approach is based on the assumption that component A cannot know in advance what information is sufficient to reach the aim set; this is why, based on feedback, informational dialogic impacts can be corrected. Based on the key scheme of cybernetics, a higher education institution can treat the formation of the culture of dialogue as a self-governing system. The formation of the dialogue culture, as a process, is a self-governing and self-monitoring system, because the actors inside the organisation are not an outside force, but the participants of the process of science and studies who take part in the process of the culture of dialogue formation. The characteristic of self-governance means that the system has a direction of development. Basic is the approach that, in principle, science is unanimous. There are no limits between academic subjects which cannot be overstepped, and no one hinders scientists to develop an inter-dialogue and to agree.

Dialogue itself cannot make a direct influence (through science, studies, or environment) on its receiver, since it is only a signal showing the necessity to correct the condition of the receiver in this dialogue. It is obvious that the object which has not mastered the thesaurus, making up the content of the dialogue, is not able to perceive the dialogue and, consequently, correct his/her state, approaches, or behaviour. In other words, feedback encourages the participants of the dialogue process to correct subjective aims, determining the very process of the dialogue.

The grand political narrative maintaining the culture of dialogue

The document of the European Commission claims that the dialogue is to contribute to the improvement of European Management Framework (European Governance: A White Paper, COM ((2001) 428)), thus increasingly involving society in decision making. The dialogue approach is also emphasised in the Communiqué of the European Commission, searching for common efforts to enhance new growth ('Working Together to Create New Growth'), where institutions are offered to proceed to a closer dialogue with the whole civil society. The emphasis on the principle of openness to the whole world in the area of education and training as one of the prerequisites of universal development and prosperity is particularly distinct in the Council conclusions ('EC 2020', 2009-C119-02). It is declared that the observance of this principle will create excellent and attractive possibilities for education, training and scientific research.

A dialogue-based approach, receptive to partnership formation, openness, correspondence to the labour market and to the needs of society at large, is mentioned in the programme of the European Council and Commission 'Education and Training 2010'. A particular emphasis is placed on the partnership between universities and enterprises, which can create suitable conditions for the increase of investments in the private sector. The dialogue

between academic, social, and business partners creates more favourable conditions to perform the public mission and common social and cultural function:

- to conduct scientific research, artistic activities, which correspond to the needs of the market and society (Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania (2009); report 'Education and Training 2010' 5394/10; A New Partnership for the Modernisation of Universities COM ((2009)158));

- to provide services receptive to science and art, develop a diversity of research trends (due to Long-Term Strategy for Scientific Research and Experimental Development and implementation of provisions of The White Paper of Lithuania on Science and Technologies (2003, No. 1646);

- to exchange skills, technologies, and best practice (The Flagship Initiative on a 'Resource Efficient Europe' of European Commission Strategy 'Europe 2020');

- to eliminate inconsistency of scientific research activities, fields and create an integrated, network infrastructure of scientific research (Green Paper. The European Research Area: New Perspectives. COM ((2007) 161));

- to implement study programmes based on scientific research, artistic activities, and cooperation;

- to fill in the cultural gap, separating education and scientific research, artistic activities, innovations implemented in the commercial area; to continue the reform of management and funding structures, thus ensuring more autonomy and accountability, so that favourable conditions for more diverse income flows and more productive cooperation with business representatives are created (Conclusions on Developing the Role of Education in the Fully-Functioning Knowledge Triangle (2009/C 302/03);

- to enhance a social role in the region and country;

- to create conditions for the university to better share the results of scientific research, artistic activities, and publicise them (Law on Science and Studies of the Republic of Lithuania (2009);

- to enhance learners' enterprise; to secure that a regular flow of students and university staff to enterprises and continuous businesspeople activities help reach the necessary changes;

- to increase the relevance of education and training programmes, involving students and scientists into the activities of business enterprises, also to improve scientists' career perspectives in all stages of their professional activities, having supplemented their scientific competencies with enterprise skills;

- to attract additional funding sources, for instance, developing the abilities of scientific research, artistic activities, or offering requalification training, which will increase the impact of scientific research, conducted at the university, on innovative activities of small and medium enterprises and regions;

- to turn lifelong learning and mobility into reality, to contribute to the inducement of active public spirit, social cohesion, and to enhancement of innovativeness

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

and enterprise (The Council conclusions of May 12 2009 on the Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training (EC 2020)).

A dialogue between academic, social, and business partners enables making an impact on the university and contributes to the *enhancement of knowledge and innovations in the region and country* (The Green Paper, COM ((2011)) 48: Europe must meet a challenge...it is proceeded to strategies grounded on innovations), *to the engagement of final users of innovations* (citizens, business enterprises, public sector), *accelerating and expanding the application of results and encouraging society to accept innovations more actively.*

Activating knowledge and interacting with society, the university has to meet high requirements (Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation COM ((2006) 208), that is why the latter has to inform about the significance of the implemented activities, first of all, related to scientific research, must share knowledge with society and enhance the dialogue with all interest groups. Due to such interaction with the external world, all the activities of the university, particularly its programmes of education, training, and scientific research will gradually become increasingly related to the needs of citizens and the whole society. This will help the university publicise its activities and persuade society, governments, and the private sector that it is worth investing in it.

The European research area, needed by the scientific community, business, and citizens should have the following features (The Green Paper, COM ((2007) 161):

- *'Effective knowledge-sharing*, notably between public research and industry, as well as with the public at large (this should consist of: an open and easy access to the public knowledge base; a simple and harmonised regime for Intellectual Property Rights, including a cost-efficient patenting system and shared principles for knowledge transfer and cooperation between public research and industry; innovative communication channels to give access to the public at large to scientific knowledge, the means to discuss research agendas and the curiosity to learn more about science)';

- *'A wide opening of the European Research Area to the world* with special emphasis on neighbouring countries and a strong commitment to addressing global challenges with Europe's partners'.

One of the dimensions of this document is related to knowledge-sharing. It is asserted that a critical part of the framework of scientific research is knowledge generation, dissemination and usage. Higher education institutions, positioning themselves as creators of the culture of dialogue through scientific knowledge, do create conditions to ensure the dissemination of knowledge, acquisition of knowledge through studies, and its use in various sectors related to practical activities. Responding to the above-mentioned tendencies, the challenges of postmodern society and the culture of dialogue suggest the approach of operation of an organisation, when competition is replaced by cooperation. This allows avoiding the emergence of the culture of fragmentation at

an organisation, when 'everyone seeks his/her goals the way he/she understands them, temporary coalitions are formed, seeking certain goals, and later they reform' (Kavolis, 1996). Based on the fragmentation theory, everything is temporary and improvised, there are no constant relations.

It is stated in the Commission Communiqué on Scientific Information in the Digital Age: Accessibility, Dissemination and Preservation (Committee Communiqué on Scientific Information in the Digital Age: Accessibility, Dissemination and Preservation, COM (2007)) that the system, employed for announcing scientific information, is a foundation for the development of dialogue through publicising scientific information; that is why its impact on the scientific research competency is essential. Implementing the culture of dialogue is proceeded by improving electronic library services, repositories of scientific information and by creating databases of publications and public scientific research.

European universities are delegated to secure their public mission and general social and cultural function through active participation and creation of partnerships (Commission Communiqué for the Council and the European Parliament 'Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research, Innovation', COM ((2006)208). Supporting the formation of the culture of dialogue as a key value of an organisation, higher education institutions create conditions for implementing this mission. This is also confirmed by the Council conclusions (the Council conclusions of 2009 on a Strategic Framework for European Cooperation in Education and Training ('EC 2020')), which acknowledge how important it is to follow the principle of openness to the whole world. The dialogue approach enables participation in joint training or degree programmes and this creates conditions to be open and able to compete in the world. The European policy area and the world of science acknowledge that the dialogue approach is an effective approach in modern society. For this reason, the chosen development of the culture of dialogue through studies, science, and environment, empowering learning and studying, enables the implementation of the university mission.

Openness and creativity are the key characteristics of global society, enabling the operation of enterprises, organisations and, at the same time, ensuring our welfare. The absence of change, curiosity, and cooperation in science and economics, overstepping limits, will rapidly result in a decline and cultural deprivation. The refusal of change would mean separation of ourselves from the source of our power (Rau, 2005). Nourishment of the culture of dialogue is our possibility to enable the public to accept globalisation challenges so that the public does not feel neglected and has possibilities, because otherwise it will experience that globalisation takes place without it, or against it. In such a case, the public turns into an enemy of democracy and the legal state.

Responding to the challenges, mentioned above, higher education institutions implement the internal system of study quality management. The concept of the culture of dialogue is responded to by the internal system of study

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. *Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of*
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

quality management at Siauliai University. A fundamental theoretical concept of this higher education institution represents publicising/implementation of quality values in the context of the culture of dialogue through scientific knowledge, study process, and liberal environment, seeking to act and empower others to act exceptionally; continuously changing; forming and meeting the expectations of the interest groups, and nourishing valuable identity.

Since dialogue is useful to the user to the extent to which it meets his/her needs, formed before the interaction, one of the concepts maintaining the culture of dialogue, nourished at Siauliai University, is the concept of formation and meeting the interest group needs. The dialogue is determined not only by pre-set goals and content, but also by the information, obtained through it about the most relevant changes of the interest groups (of the public, students, etc.).

In sum, it can be stated that, under the culture of dialogue, institutions construct conditions for its formation and, at the same time, for meeting the needs of interest groups. It follows then that the needs of the interest groups are met employing reorganised or newly-formed knowledge. In such a way, the formed culture of dialogue is a meaningful and influential culture, as higher education is delegated the function of taking part in shifts and initiate them.

Conclusions

- Postmodern society is characterised by diversity, pluralism, openness to diversity of traditions, and differences of their elements, where the content is more important than chronology; models of modernity selection and progress are no longer followed. The main experience of postmodernity is the experience and multiplicity of particularly different forms of knowing, life challenges, activity models, types of thinking, and concepts. The dialogue with the public through the knowledge of science and studies copes with isolation of science from everyday life and thus increases its power and ability to solve daily life problems.

- In the conditions of rapid change taking place in the environment of management, the environment of shifts and a changing social structure alter a modern management paradigm, which creates specific value fields and peculiar cultural dynamics. Higher education institutions face a challenge of maintaining the balance of increasing diversity, the implementation of which is handy through the formation of the culture of dialogue.

- From the cybernetic standpoint, the formation of the culture of dialogue through the processes of science and studies can be useful, grounding the key characteristic – its purposefulness. Based on the key scheme of cybernetics, a higher education institution can treat the setup of the culture of dialogue as a self-governing system. The formation of the culture of dialogue as a process is a self-governing, self-monitoring system, because the actors inside an organisation are not outside forces but participants of the science and study process, who take part in the formation of the culture of dialogue. The characteristic of self-governance means that the system has a direction of development.

- The grand political narrative maintaining the culture of dialogue manifests itself through the culture of dialogue of higher education institutions as a condition of being open and able to compete in the world. For this reason, the chosen development of the culture of dialogue through studies, science, and the environment empowerment when studying and learning enables the implementation of the university mission.

- Contexts of managing the quality of science and studies, grounded on the culture of dialogue, manifest themselves through the changes in social inclusion, since science and tendencies of technology development move towards social aims. Therefore, the university and society have to create a closer dialogue in order to search for new efficient operation of the quality approaches, as society is turning into the centre of science, technology and innovation.

References

1. Barnett, R. (2011). *Being a University. Foundations and Futures of Education*. NY: Routledge.

2. Barnett, R., & Di Napoli, R. (2009). *Changing Identities in Higher Education*. Voicing Perspectives (Key Issues in Higher Education). Routledge.

3. Baudrillard, J. (2002). *Simuliacija ir simukliarai*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

4. Bell, L., Stevenson, H., & Neary, M. (2009). *The Future of Higher Education: Policy, Pedagogy and the Student Experience*. Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.

5. Bitinas, B. (2000). *Ugdymo filosofija*. Vilnius: Kronta.

6. Christensen, C., & Eyring, H. (2011). *The Innovative University*. Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out (Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

7. Europos ekonomikos ir socialinių reikalų komiteto nuomonė dėl komisijos komunikato Europos parlamentui, Tarybai, Europos ekonomikos ir socialinių reikalų komitetui ir Regionų komitetui „Bendrosios rinkos aktas. Dvylika svertų augimui skatinti ir pasitikėjimui stiprinti. „Bendros pastangos skatinti naująjį augimą".

8. Europos komisijos dokumentas „European Governance: A White paper", COM (2001) 428, 25-07-2001.

9. Gutauskas, M. (2010). *Dialogo erdvė. Fenomenologinis požiūris*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

10. Habermas, J. (1987). The Theory of Communicative Action. *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason,* vol. 2. Boston: Beacon Press.

11. Išvados dėl švietimo vaidmens plėtojamo visapusiškai veikiančiame žinių trikampyje (2009/C 302/03)

12. Jencks, C. (2002). *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

13. Kavolis, V. (1996). *Kultūros dirbtuvė*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

14. Komisijos komunikatas „Naujoji universitetų modernizavimo partnerystė. ES forumas „universitetų ir įmonių dialogas" KOM (2009) 158 galutinis.

15. Komisijos komunikatas strategijos „Europa 2020" pavyzdinė iniciatyva „Tausiai išteklius naudojanti Europa", COM (2011) 21.

16. Komisijos komunikatas tarybai ir Europos parlamentui universitetų modernizavimo plano įgyvendinimo rezultatai: švietimas, moksliniai tyrimai ir naujovės, COM(2006) 208.

17. Komisijos komunikatas. Universitetų modernizavimo plano įgyvendinimo rezultatai: švietimas, moksliniai tyrimai ir naujovės. COM (2006) 208 galutinis.

18. Komisijos komunikate dėl mokslinės informacijos skaitmeniniame amžiuje: prieinamumas, sklaida ir išsaugojimas, COM(2007).

19. Kriščiūnas, K., Rinkevičius, L. ir kt. (2011). *Mokslas, technologija ir visuomenės kaita*. Kaunas: Technologija.

20. Lietuvos Respublikos Mokslo ir studijų įstatymas (2009).

21. Lyotard, J. (1993). *Postmodernusis būvis*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

22. LR Mokslo ir studijų įstatymas (2009).

23. LR nutarimas dėl ilgalaikės mokslinių tyrimų ir eksperimentinės plėtros strategijos bei Lietuvos mokslo ir technologijų Baltosios knygos nuostatų įgyvendinimo (2003, nr. 1646).

24. Nekrašas, E. (2010). Pozityvus protas. Jo raida ir įtaka modernybei ir postmodernybei. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

25. Rau, I. (2005). *Kultūrų dialogas-dialogo kultūra. Tolerancija vietoj nureikšminimo.* Vilnius: Dialogo kultūros institutas.

26. Tarybos ir Komisijos ataskaita „Švietimas ir mokymas 2010" 5394/10.

27. Tarybos ir Komisijos parengta programos „Švietimas ir mokymas 2010" įgyvendinimo pažangos bendra ataskaita. COM (2009) 640 galutinis.

28. Tarybos išvados 2009 m. Dėl Europos bendradarbiavimo švietimo ir mokymo srityje strateginės programos („ET 2020").

29. Tarybos išvados 2009 m. gegužės 12 d. dėl Europos bendradarbiavimo švietimo ir mokymo srityje strateginės programos (ET d. dėl Europos bendradarbiavimo švietimo ir mokymo srityje strateginės programos (ET 2020) (2009-C119-02).

30. Tarybos išvados 2009 m. gegužės 12 d. Dėl Europos bendradarbiavimo švietimo ir mokymo srityje strateginės programos (ET 2020).

31. Valantiejus, A. (2007). *Socialinė struktūra: nuo maro prie micro modelių*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

32. Welsch, W. (2004). *Mūsų postmodernioji modernybė*. Vilnius: Alma Littera.

33. Wojtyla, K. (1997). *Asmuo ir veiksmas*. Vilnius: Aidai.

34. Žalioji knyga (Europos mokslinių tyrimų erdvė. Naujos perspektyvos, COM(2007) 161 galutinis.

A. Kazlauskiene

Dialogo kultūra grįstas mokslo ir studijų kokybės valdymo kontekstualizavimas

Santrauka

Šiandienos visuomenė, perėjusi prie postmodernaus būvio, suponuoja naujos kultūros formavimą organizacijose. Šiame straipsnyje diskutuojami dialogo kultūros formavimo(si) kontekstai. Iki šiol dialogo esmė ir raiška buvo akcentuojama per globalias kultūrines charakteristikas. Šiame straipsnyje siekiama išryškinti multikultūrines charakteristikas, labiau individualizuoti dialogo kultūros raišką aukštosios mokyklos valdymo kontekstuose. Analizuojant aukštojo mokslo kokybės reikšmę postmodernioje visuomenėje bei dialogo kultūrą palaikančius didžiuosius politinius naratyvus, išryškinami dialogo kultūra grindžiami mokslo ir studijų kokybės valdymo kontekstai.

Šiame straipsnyje remiamasi Lyotard (1993), Baudrillard (2002) postmoderniojo būvio interpretacijomis. Šių autorių teorijas vienija pastangos atskleisti, kaip konstruojami socialiniai kultūriniai kontekstai. Kultūra suvokiama kaip procesas, kaip tobulinimas, išgryninimas (Kavolis, 1996). Straipsnyje laikomasi pozicijos, kad dialogas nekuria pasaulio bendrumo, bet jį iškleidžia. Tai reiškia, kad dialogas negali sukurti atskiro pasaulio. Jis visuomet vyksta pasaulio horizonte. Remiamasi Lyotard (1993), atsisakoma pretenzijų į objektyvuotas universalias tiesas, socialinė tikrovė konstruojama be iš anksto duotų, apibrėžtų kriterijų. Laikomasi pozicijos, kad organizacijos kultūros kildinimas yra susijęs su vadybos mokslo perspektyvomis, orientuotomis į šiandieninį organizacijos veiklos organizavimą.

Remiamasi komunikacinio racionalumo koncepcija, kurioje komunikacijos dalyviai įveikia subjektyvius požiūrius, siekiant racionalaus sprendimo ir įsipareigojama racionalumui, atvirumui (Habermas, 1987). Organizacijos kultūra suvokiama kaip socialinė struktūra, kurioje atkreipiamas dėmesys į procesą (Valantiejus, 2007).

Nors mokslininkai turi skirtingas pozicijas apibrėžiant postmodernybės bruožus (Kantas pabrėžia skirtybes, Welschas – jungtis), jų konstruojama koncepcas bando surasti vienovės prielaidas. Vienovė ir įvairovė neturi prieštarauti, bet priešingai – jos turi papildyti viena kitą (Rau, 2005). Mokslinkas teigia, kad skirtumai, net ir prieštaravimai negali sugriauti vienovės, nes prieštaravimuose žmonės gali atrasti naują, labiau aprėpiančią vienovę. Anot Gutausko (2010), dialogo reikšmė tapo aktuali, nes jis sudaro prielaidas prasmės bendrumui kurti. O tai šiandieninėje įvairovės visuomenėje yra itin aktualu nusibrėžiant bei peržengiant galimybių, leistinumo, žinojimo ribas. Kiekviena organizacija turi pripažinti ne tik įvairialypį kitoniškumą ir visas jo formas, bet ir organizacijos tapatybės pliuralizmą daugialypėje visuomenėje. Tik taip įmanoma išsaugoti švietimo, kultūrų įvairovę kaip raidos, saviraiškos, kūrybos ir novatoriškumo galimybę.

Požiūris į dialogo kultūrą kaip į sąveiką įtvirtinamas remiantis kibernetikos idėjomis, kurios tiria įvairių sistemų bendruosius valdymo procesus, vykstančius renkant, perduodant, laikant ir perdirbant informaciją. Dialogo sąveika abipusė: perduodama valdančioji informacija (mokslo žinios, studijų rezultatai, aplinka ir pan.), bei grįžtamoji informacija, rodanti realius sistemos pokyčius (pvz., tiek visuomenės, tiek aukštosios mokyklos institucijos), nes dialogas vyksta ir veikia ne tik kitus, bet ir save.

Ši prieiga remiasi prielaida, kad komponentas A iš anksto negali žinoti, kokios informacijos pakanka užsibrėžtam tikslui pasiekti, todėl remdamasis grįžtamąja informacija, gali koreguoti informacinius dialoginius poveikius. Remiantis pagrindine kibernetikos schema, dialogo kultūros formavimą aukštosios mokyklos institucija gali traktuoti kaip save valdančią (savivaldžią) sistemą. Dialogo kultūros formavimas kaip procesas yra savivaldi, save reguliuojanti sistema, nes veikiantys organizacijos viduje yra ne išorinė jėga, o mokslo ir studijų proceso dalyviai, kurie dalyvauja dialogo kultūros formavimo procese. Savivaldumo požymis reiškia, kad sistema turi vystymosi kryptį. Remiamasi nuostata, kad mokslas iš esmės yra vieningas. Tarp mokslo disciplinų nėra jokių neperžengiamų ribų, niekas nekliudo mokslininkams vystyti tarpusavio dialogo ir susitarti.

Dialogo prieiga akcentuojama ir Europos Komisijos komunikate ieškant bendrų pastangų skatinant naująjį augimą („Bendros pastangos skatinti naująjį augimą"). Jame institucijoms siūloma pereiti prie glaudesnio dialogo su visa pilietine visuomene. Atvirumo visam pasauliui principo švietimo ir mokymo srityje, kaip vieno iš būtinų visuotinės raidos ir klestėjimo sąlygų, akcentavimas Tarybos išvadose („ET 2020", 2009-C119-02) itin ryškus. Deklaruojama, kad laikantis šio principo bus

Social Sciences /
Socialiniai mokslai. 2013. Nr. 1 (79)

A. Kazlauskiene. Contextualisation of Managing the Quality of
Science and Studies, Grounded on the Culture of Dialogue

sudarytos puikios ir patrauklios švietimo, mokymo bei mokslinių tyrimų galimybės.

Partnerystės kūrimą, atvirumą, atitiktį darbo rinkos ir plačiosios visuomenės poreikiams imlią dialogo prieigą mini Europos Tarybos ir Komisijos programa „Švietimas ir mokymas 2010". Ypač akcentuojama universitetų ir įmonių partnerystė, kuri gali sukurti tinkamas sąlygas tam, kad padidėtų privačiojo sektoriaus investicijų dalis. Dialogas tarp akademinių, socialinių, verslo partnerių sudaro palankesnes sąlygas vykdyti viešąją misiją ir bendrą socialinę bei kultūrinę funkciją. Dialogas tarp akademinių, socialinių ir verslo partnerių įgalina daryti poveikį ne tik universitetui, bet kartu ir *žinių bei inovacijų stiprinimui regione bei šalyje* (Žalioji knyga, KOM (2011) 48: Europa privalo priimti iššūkį...pereinama prie inovacijomis grindžiamų strategijų), *galutinių inovacijų naudotojų* (piliečiai, verslo įmonės, viešasis sektorius) *įsitraukimui, paspartinant ir išplečiant rezultatų taikymą ir paskatinant visuomenę aktyviau priimti inovacijas*.

Komisijos komunikate "Dėl mokslinės informacijos skaitmeniniame amžiuje: prieinamumas, sklaida ir išsaugojimas" (KOM, 2007) teigiama, kad sistema, kurią naudojant skelbiama mokslinė informacija, yra pagrindas dialogo plėtojimui per mokslinės informacijos viešinimą, todėl jos poveikis mokslinių tyrimų kompetencijai yra esminis. Įtvirtinant dialogo kultūrą žengiama į priekį tobulinant elektronines bibliotekos paslaugas, mokslinės informacijos saugyklas ir kuriant leidinių bei viešosiomis lėšomis finansuojamų mokslinių tyrimų rezultatų duomenų bazes.

Dialogo kultūrą palaikantis didysis politinis naratyvas reiškia aukštųjų mokyklų dialogo kultūros prieigą kaip sąlygą būti atviriems ir gebantiems konkuruoti pasaulyje. Todėl pasirinkta dialogo kultūros plėtotė per studijas, mokslą ir studijuoti bei mokytis įgalinančią aplinką, leidžia realizuoti universitetų misiją

Dialogo kultūra grindžiami mokslo ir studijų kokybės valdymo kontekstai reiškiasi per pakitusią socialinę aprėptį, nes mokslas ir technologijų raidos tendencijos juda link socialinių tikslų. Tokiu būdu universitetas ir visuomenė turi sudaryti dar glaudesnį dialogą, nes visuomenė tampa mokslo, technologijų, inovacijų centru. Siekiant efektyvios veiklos ieškoma naujų veiklos kokybės prieigų. Mokslo ir studijų kokybės valdymo kontekstai reiškiasi per multikultūrines charakteristikas: aktyvus organizacijos narių vaidmuo tikrovėje ir su tikrove; kultūra kaip asmenų kūrinys, papildantis ne jų sukurtą pasaulį; kultūra kaip organizacijos narių darbo, jų kuriamosios ir perkuriamosios veiklos rezultatas; organizacijos narių tarpusavio santykių reikšmė; kultūra kaip sistemiškas asmens patirties įgijimas (kaip kūrybiškas perėmimas, o ne informacijos kaupimas ir išlaikymas); kultūros demokratinimas.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: dialogo kultūra, mokslo ir studijų kokybė, aukštasis mokslas.