

REVITALIZING PUBLIC UNIVERSITY INNOVATIVENESS THROUGH LEARNING ORGANIZATION

Subiyakto B., Widyanti R., Basuki, Syaharuddin*

Abstract: It is well-recognized from various business sectors that learning organization occupies a significant role in boosting the performance of organizations and is employed for gaining competitive advantage. Despite many studies in this management topic, there is a dearth of studies investigating public Higher Education. This study aims at investigating the implementation of learning organization at the individual, group, and organizational levels and the relationship with organizational innovativeness among academics in Indonesian public universities. Statistical results analyzed with regression analysis from 170 academics indicate significant positive associations between all variables. The finding of this research emphasizes the urgency to manage knowledge-based assets to accomplish the integration of personal knowledge to the organizational level. On the top priority, to gain competitive advantage, the public universities should create opportunities for continuous learning as well as promote a principle of inquiry and dialogue. Being one of the most essential sources of knowledge creation, it is imperative for higher education to implant organizational learning to accomplish literary greatness to contend satisfactorily in an unpredictable situation.

Key words: learning organization, organizational innovativeness, public institution, higher education

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2020.21.1.27

Article history:

Received Febryary 14, 2020; *Revised* March 11, 2020; *Accepted* April 3, 2020

Introduction

The Government of Indonesia, via the Ministry of Education, has reformed the higher education operation by crafting strategies and plans in responding the global education market competition (Sarbaini et al., 2019). This aspiration is in line with Indonesia's goal to be a focal point of literary greatness as well as center point of academic excellence and competitive education hub in Southeast Asia. This requires public universities to accomplish academic excellence not only through accreditation but also from innovativeness (Rajiani & Norain, 2019). Conditioned this way, public universities have to stay up to date with global scholarly patterns

* **Bambang Subiyakto** PhD, **Syaharuddin** PhD, University of Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin Indonesia, Faculty of Teacher Training & Pedagogy. **Rahmi Widyanti** PhD., **Basuki** PhD, Islamic University of Kalimantan, Banjarmasin, Indonesia, Faculty of Economics & Business, Indonesia.

✉ corresponding author: bambangsb@ulm.ac.id

✉ syahar@ulm.ac.id; rahmi_widyanti@uniska-bjm.ac.id; basuki@uniska-bjm.ac.id

by inspiring the general scholastic benchmark besides conveying excellent instruction (Abbas et al.,2018). However, endeavors to upgrade organizational capacities cannot be acknowledged without a conducive situation for making, sharing, and dispersing information, which in turn can prompt competitiveness and sustainability in an exceptionally unpredictable business condition (Su et al., 2019). In term of competitiveness, top Indonesian universities are still left behind the leading universities of neighboring country Malaysia. The 2020 QS World University Ranking ranks the top three Indonesia universities: Universitas Indonesia, Gajah Mada and Bandung Institute of Technology at 296, 320, and 321 respectively. In the other hand, the top three Malaysia universities: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia, and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia are in 160, 165 and 217 (World University Rankings, 2020).

Too lengthy decision making, non-competent graduate quality to compete with their counterparts, out of dated teaching methodology, inability to employ educational technology, weak administration and management are some of the apparent problems. Therefore, the application of learning organization to improve performance of public higher education in Indonesia is proposed. Since the introduction of the concept known as the fifth discipline in 1990 (Senge, 2019), it was acknowledged as one of the five most important management tools. Senge differentiates between two categories of organisational learning; adaptive learning and generative learning. Adaptive learning focuses on changing in responding to developments in the business environment. Generative learning is about building and developing new products and ways of doing business to gain a competitive edge. The concept is undeniably accepted as one of the most valuable ideas in the field and is also considered an answer to rapid change in today's world (Ortenblad, 2018).

The survey of current writing demonstrates that most research in the territory of the learning organization and organizational innovativeness focuses on private companies with the attention of assembling (Malik and Garg, 2020), nonprofit organization (Chen et al.,2019), and SMEs (D'Angelo and Presutti,2019). In this manner, there is a rare report on public organizations, especially in the public university setting. Since public organizations operate in a unique working standard contrasted with their business counterparts, it is pivotal to inspect whether it is of similar significance for public universities to distribute their assets into a learning organization. Also, there is an absence of studies on the effect of learning organization on organizational innovativeness revolving around Indonesian higher education. In this manner, this paper examines the potential connection between learning organization and organizational innovativeness concerning public universities in Indonesia.

Literature review

Organizational learning is a systematic way of empowering joint effort between individuals in the organization to improve proficiency and viability as well as new product creation (Burton and Obel, 2018). This implies that organizations that welcome learning organization ought to have the right staff and capacities to create, achieve, and use the information as well as to change people as a reflection of procuring new information and vision (Ahmad et al., 2020). In higher education, although the main product is transferring academic knowledge, it is fundamental for the institution to execute a learning organization as the center of business practice (Cierna et al., 2017). This because of the public universities are among the government-managed-business that work in a profoundly competitive environment requiring new systems and knowledge transfer to go beyond the nature of their administrations to their customers, improve performance, and preserve a competitive advantage. For the most part, public universities in Indonesia these days are moving from being public service organizations to market-driven organizations in which they are required to modify their administration rehearses, upgrade administration quality, and improve performance (Abbas et al., 2019; Rajiani and Norain, 2019; Sarbaini et al., 2019).

In the organizational learning research stream throughout recent decades, numerous hypothetical advances have been investigated. One worldview sees the person as a specialist of progress rectifying mistakes in the organization (e.g., Hsu and Lamb, 2020), while another stream identifies how the organization influences organizational learning (e.g., Ortenblad, 2018). For the reasons for this investigation, we combined both perspectives on theories of organizational learning (Brix et al., 2017; Habtoor et al., 2020) integrating the individual, group, organizational, and societal levels of achievement.

The learning organization measurements are continuous learning, dialogue and inquiry, team learning, embedded system, system connections, empowerment, and leadership (Watkins and O'Neil, 2013). The seven components of the learning organization are assembled into four levels of the organization: which are individual level, team or group level, organizational level, and societal or global level (Brix et al., 2017; Habtoor et al., 2020). Haight and Marquardt (2018) set that learning at a specific level among the four levels can impact the exhibition of the remaining three levels in a single manner or the other. This is the blatant distinction of the inter relativity among the level and availability of the measures in impacting change in execution at one level, which can affect others. The measurements at each level are subsequently as follows: two measurements for the individual level, which are creating opportunities for continuous learning, and promoting a principle of inquiry and dialogue. The team level has just one measurement, which is encouraging collaboration and team learning. The organizational level has two measurements: establishing and embedding systems to create, and share learning, and empowering people towards a collective and shared vision. At last, the societal

or global level has two measurements: providing strategic leadership that supports learning, and connecting the organization to its environment.

Since findings and conceptualization of innovation in higher education are still lacking (Rajiani & Norain, 2019), the context of organizational innovativeness used in this study is limited to the willingness of the organization to encourage and support the innovation among employees by providing the development of new knowledge and insights (Hussein et al.,2016).

To sum up, the dimension is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Dimensions of the Learning Organization

Learning Organization Level	Dimensions	Sources
Individual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ creating opportunities for continuously learning ➤ promoting a principle of inquiry and dialogue. 	Brix et al., 2017
Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ encouraging collaboration and team learning 	Brix et al., 2017
Organizational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ establishing and embedding systems to create and share learning ➤ empowering people towards a collective and shared vision 	Brix et al., 2017
Societal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing strategic leadership that supports learning 2. connecting the organization to its environment 	Habtoor et al.,2020

Organizational Innovativeness	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. encouraging and supporting the innovation 4. providing the development of new knowledge and insights 	Hussein et al.,2016
-------------------------------	--	---------------------

Nowadays, organizational innovativeness should also be implemented in higher education as they are also responsible for technology innovations (Vaikunthavasan et al.,2019). Previous research has indicated that learning organization has a positive relationship with organizational innovativeness in the service sector (Werlang & Rossetto, 2019), nonprofit organization (Shin & Choy, 2019), and small-medium enterprises (Freixanet et al.,2020). Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

1. On its recognized association to promoting a principle of inquiry and dialogue, an individual learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness in the Indonesian higher education.
2. A team learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness in Indonesian higher education since encouraging collaboration, and team learning are vital to managing innovation.
3. An organizational learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness in the Indonesian higher education since empowering people towards a collective, and shared vision are vital to managing innovation.
4. On its recognized association in connecting the organization to its environment, a societal learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness in the Indonesian higher education.

Methodology

This study was conducted using a quantitative method. The study intends to analyze the effect of learning organization on the organizational innovativeness in Indonesian higher education with lecturers as respondents. This way, the writer applies the purposive sampling technique as it is the most effective when one needs to examine a specific domain (Serra et al., 2018). Sample of 170 academics was obtained from 3 (three) public Higher Education in South Kalimantan. The sample is classified based on academic ranks, age, and tenure in organization. The general rule as outlined by Hair et al., (2017), the minimum sample is at least five times as many observations of variables to be analyzed. A more acceptable range would be a ten-to-one ratio. Since there were nine (9) indicators to be tested, a sample of 170 falls within an acceptable sample range. The data was collected from July to December 2019. The assessment instrument for learning

organizations at corporate levels was adopted from Brix et al. (2017) and Habtoor et al., (2020). Organizational innovativeness assessment instrument was adapted from Hussein et al., (2016). A five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = ‘Strongly Disagree’ to 5 = ‘Strongly Agree’ was used. The coefficient alpha was tested, and those variables must achieve above 0.60 (Bonett & Wright, 2015). The correlation analysis (bivariate) was conducted next to determine the existence of the relationships between all the variables assessed.

Results

All respondents are in the position of senior lecturers. This is because of the nature of the purposive sampling where the writers intentionally selected them for those who are in this position still struggling to gain a higher academic rank making them innovative enough and in possession of higher desire for learning. Majority of respondents (90%) are in the age of around 35-40 and been with the organization for more than 10 years. The mean score for learning organization is 4.24, whereas the means for organizational innovativeness is 4.83. This indicates that the organization has perceived the importance of learning organization to innovativeness.

The coefficient alpha was tested and those variables must achieved above 0.60. Table 1 displays the result that the Cronbach alpha coefficients for the instrument surpass 0.60 which is the threshold for accepted reliability.

Table 2: Reliability of items

Individual	Cronbach Alpha
1. The organization creates opportunities for continuously learning. 2. The organization promotes a principle of inquiry and dialogue.	0.87 0.82
Team	
3. The organization encourages collaboration and team learning.	0.85
Organizational	
4. The organization establishes and embeds systems to create and share learning.	0.76
5. The organization empowers people towards a collective and shared vision.	0.75

Social		
6. The organization provides strategic leadership that supports learning.		0.84
7. The organization connects the organization to its environment		0.80
Organizational Innovativeness		
8. The organization encourages and supports the innovation.		0.82 0.85
9. The organization provides the development of new knowledge and insights.		

Although criticized as being out of date, Raykov and Marcoulides (2019) confirm that this standard measurement is dependable as a reliability estimator and should not be abandoned as any endeavors to justify the obsolescence are mostly not referring to the original published works. A significant correlation ($R=0.791$) was found as the value is approaching 1 (Zhou et al., 2016). The t value of individual = 4.769 and significance of .000 confirms the first hypothesis that individual learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness.

Table 3: Regression Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	-.295	.458		-.643	.522
Individual	.467	.098	.494	4.769	.000
Team	.438	.125	.363	3.502	.001
Organizational	.332	.201	.321	3.325	.002
Societal	.126	.245	.238	2.234	.005

Dependent Variable: Innovativeness. $R = 0.791$ $R^2 = 0.625$

Innovativeness will occur in an organization that creates opportunities for continuous learning as well as promotes a principle of inquiry and dialogue. Similarly, the t value of team learning organization = 3.502 and significance of .001 confirms the second hypothesis that team learning organization is positively related to organizational innovativeness. This proves that innovativeness is triggered in an organization that encourages collaboration and team learning. Further examination of organizational and societal learning organization reveal the t values of 3.325, and 2.324 with the significance of .002 and .005, respectively. These values confirm the acceptance of the third and fourth hypotheses that organizational and societal learning organization are positively related to

organizational innovativeness. Thus, innovativeness further will happen in an organization that embeds systems to create and share learning and empowers people towards a collective and shared vision. Finally, the organization must provide strategic leadership that supports learning and connects the organization to its environment to allow a conducive climate for organizational innovativeness.

Discussion

In line with previous studies in business sectors (Werlang & Rossetto, 2019; Shin & Choy, 2019; Freixanet et al.,2020), this study has found out that organizational learning plays a vital role in organizational innovativeness.

In opposition from the worldwide education market (Sarbaini et al.,2019), Indonesian higher education must advertise by actualizing relevant positioning to accomplish competitive advantage. Exploiting this possibility, innovatively demands explicit information, innovative exercises, and the capacity to comprehend the market demand. (Burton & Obel, 2018). Given these necessities, the capacity to perceive opportunities partly relying upon on the individual's and organization's learning capabilities (Haight & Marquardt, 2018).

Organizations create and keep up learning frameworks that impact not only their immediate members, but also transfer to others by way of organizational corporate culture. However, as a learning organization is a complex and multidimensional concept that has been analyzed through an assortment of disciplinary points of view (Haight & Marquardt (2018), cautious steps must be carefully examined before implementing the learning organization at various levels.

Public universities in Indonesia are among the organizations that operate in highly competitive environments. This way, they require a new system and knowledge transfer to build the nature of their administrations to their customers, improve performance, and sustain competitive advantage. Generally, public universities are shifting from being public service organizations to market-driven organizations, in which they are required to modify their administration rehearses, upgrade administration quality, and innovativeness to improve performance. Improving higher education' performance requires numerous agents of change and factors to work together, which at long last can lead to a change in routine. Organizational innovativeness through a learning organization can fill in as a reason for accomplishing improved execution.

In summary, an organization that embraces the appropriate strategies would achieve a competitive advantage better than its competitors. As indicated by & Bouckaert (2018), the particular heap of knowledge combined with organizational practices, for example, learning organization practices and appropriate competitive strategies would guarantee more customers. This activity will assist in solidifying the organization's market position, which, in turn, can help to achieve a competitive advantage. When the learning organization is adequately accomplished, this would definitely improve the performance of the organization. Further, if the performance

of the organization is enhanced in a highly volatile environment and fierce competition, this would create an opportunity for more significant competitive advantage. Indonesia universities should learn from Asian countries like Malaysia (Ghaffari et al.,2017), Thailand (Khunsoonthornkit & Panjakajornsak,2018), Japan (Flanagan & Ogata, 2018), Korea (Heo et al.,2018) and China (Zhixing, 2019), that have successfully achieved academic excellence through learning organization.

Managerial Implications

The present study suggests some implications for public universities' top management on the significance of instilling the habit of continuous learning in boosting higher performance and organizational innovativeness. As the production and innovativeness of public universities are highly dependent on their academics, it is reasonable to encourage that relevant resources to be apportioned and endeavors should be made to impart learning in the organization. Besides, acknowledging the significance of learning implies that executives ought to contribute to improving learning ability towards retaining and transforming new knowledge and applying it to innovative products, processes or services. Persistent learning openings through grants, training programmes, and research awards ought to be made accessible to the the academics to increase the value of their current skills and knowledge for innovativeness. Joint effort openings and the team learning culture through work activities and research group collaboration should be improved and fortified to offer better advancement in the organization. Also, platform ought to be accommodated the academics for their thoughts and perspectives to be heard and exchanged to energize development. In accomplishing the nation's aspiration to be the center point of education excellence, public universities need to remain relevant and stay on the new statures. In this manner, applying the practice of learning organization is essential in securing high performance and innovativeness.

Conclusion

In the turbulent condition, learning organization is a valuable idea to guide organization in the making, and sharing knowledge among employees with an end to improve organizational innovativeness. The requirement for people to make, share and spread knowledge inside an organization makes learning organization more significant for the advancement of the organization and is also a practical instrument for creating competitive advantage. The abilities of employees to confront difficulties and to improve performance are inevitably credited to the organization capabilities in making and spreading knowledge through an effective and compelling procedure of learning at the individual, team, organizational, and societal levels. However, enhancements cannot be accomplished without

understanding the working condition and the abilities of the organization to consider the encompassing components. This investigation explicitly focuses on the immediate connection between learning organization and organizational innovativeness. Future inquiries ought to incorporate mediating variables to comprehend the associations between these factors. Thus, to improve innovativeness of public universities in Indonesia, there must be ecological filtering and capacity appraisal of the public universities before the foreseen outcomes could be acquired. Therefore, we suggest an investigation utilizing strategy adoption as a mediating variable to study the relationship between learning organization and public university innovativeness in the country.

References

- Abbas, E. W., Hadi, S., & Rajiani, I. (2018). The prospective innovator in public university by scrutinizing particular personality traits. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 18(1), 9-19.
- Ahmad, N., Hoda, N., & Alahmari, F. (2020). Developing a Cloud-Based Mobile Learning Adoption Model to Promote Sustainable Education. *Sustainability*, 12(8), 3126.
- Bonett, D. G., & Wright, T. A. (2015). Cronbach's alpha reliability: Interval estimation, hypothesis testing, and sample size planning. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(1), 3-15.
- Brix, J. (2017). Exploring knowledge creation processes as a source of organizational learning: A longitudinal case study of a public innovation project. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 33(2), 113-127.
- Burton, R. M., & Obel, B. (2018). The science of organizational design: fit between structure and coordination. *Journal of Organization Design*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Chen, I. S., Fung, P. K., & Yuen, S. S. (2019). Dynamic capabilities of logistics service providers: Antecedents and performance implications. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, (31), 4, 1058-1075.
- Cierna, H., Sujová, E., Hbek, P., Horská, E., & Kapsdorferová, Z. (2017). Learning organization at higher education institutions in the EU: proposal for implementing philosophy of learning organization--results from research. *Quality and Quantity*, 51(3), 1305.
- D'Angelo, A., & Presutti, M. (2019). SMEs international growth: The moderating role of experience on entrepreneurial and learning orientations. *International Business Review*, 28(3), 613-624.
- Freixanet, J., Rialp, A., & Churakova, I. (2020). How do innovation, internationalization, and organizational learning interact and co-evolve in small firms? a complex systems approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1-34.
- Flanagan, B., & Ogata, H. (2018). Learning analytics platform in higher education in Japan. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal*, 10(4), 469-484.
- Ghaffari, S., Burgoyne, J., Shah, I., & Nazri, M. (2017). Perceptions of Learning Organization Dimensions among Non-academic Employees of Top Public Universities in Malaysia. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 11(1), 107-116.

- Habtoor, A. S., Arshad, D. A., & Hassan, H. (2020). Learning Organization, Strategy Adoption and Knowledge Transfer as Factors for Improving Performance of Public universities: A Literature Review. *Journal of Business Management and Accounting*, 8(1), 85-103.
- Haight, V. D., & Marquardt, M. J. (2018). How chief learning officers build learning organizations. *The Learning Organization*, 25 (5), 331-343.
- Hair, J., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B., & Chong, A. Y. L. (2017). An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 117 (3), 442-458.
- Heo, H., Leppisaari, I., & Lee, O. (2018). Exploring learning culture in Finnish and South Korean classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(4), 459-472.
- Holba, A. M., Bahr, P. T., Birx, D. L., & Fischler, M. J. (2019). Integral Learning and Working: Becoming a Learning Organization. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 185, 85-99.
- Hsu, S. W., & Lamb, P. (2020). Still in search of learning organization?. *The Learning Organization*, 27 (1), 31-41.
- Hussein, N., Omar, S., Noordin, F., & Ishak, N. A. (2016). Learning organization culture, organizational performance and organizational innovativeness in a public institution of higher education in Malaysia: A preliminary study. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 37, 512-519.
- Khunsoonthornkit, A., & Panjakajornsak, V. (2018). Structural equation model to assess the impact of learning organization and commitment on the performance of research organizations. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(3), 457-462.
- Mahdi, O. R., Nassar, I. A., & Almsafir, M. K. (2019). Knowledge management processes and sustainable competitive advantage: An empirical examination in private universities. *Journal of Business Research*, 94, 320-334.
- Malik, P., & Garg, P. (2020). Learning organization and work engagement: The mediating role of employee resilience. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 31(8), 1071-1094.
- Örtenblad, A. (2018). What does “learning organization” mean?. *The Learning Organization*, 25 (3), 150-158.
- Rajiani, I., & Ismail, N. (2019). Management innovation in balancing technology innovation to harness universities performance in the era of community 4.0. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19, 309-321.
- Rajiani, I., & Pyplacz, P. (2018). National culture as modality in managing the carbon economy in Southeast Asia. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 18(1), 296-310.
- Raykov, T., & Marcoulides, G. A. (2019). Thanks coefficient alpha, we still need you!. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 79(1), 200-210.
- Sarbaini, Jumadi, Abbas E., W., Rajiani, I. (2019). Managing e-learning in public universities by investigating the role of culture. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 20 (1), 394-404.
- Senge, P., & von Ameln, F. (2019). We are not in control—embrace uncertainty and trust in what emerges. Peter Senge on the legacy and future of Change Management. *Gruppe. Interaktion. Organisation. Zeitschrift für Angewandte Organisationspsychologie (GIO)*, 50(2), 123-127.

- Serra, M., Psarra, S., & O'Brien, J. (2018). Social and physical characterization of urban contexts: Techniques and methods for quantification, classification and purposive sampling. *Urban Planning*, 3(1), 58-74.
- Shin, J., & Choi, Y. K. (2019). Organizational innovativeness and its determinants in South Korean nonprofit human service organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 30(1), 51-68.
- Su, J., Zhang, S., & Ma, H. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation, environmental characteristics, and business model innovation: a configurational approach. *Innovation*, 1-23.
- Vaikunthavasan, S., Jebarajakirthy, C., & Shankar, A. (2019). How to make higher education institutions innovative: An application of market orientation practices. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 31(3), 274-302.
- van Acker, W., & Bouckaert, G. (2018). What makes public sector innovations survive? An exploratory study of the influence of feedback, accountability and learning. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 84(2), 249-268.
- Watkins, K. E., & O'Neil, J. (2013). The dimensions of the learning organization questionnaire (the DLOQ): A nontechnical manual. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 15(2), 133-147.
- Werlang, N. B., & Rossetto, C. R. (2019). The effects of organizational learning and innovativeness on organizational performance in the service provision sector. *Gestão & Produção*, 26(3), 1-18.
- World University Rankings, 2020. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-university-rankings/2020/world-ranking>. Accessed: May5, 2020.
- Zhou, H., Deng, Z., Xia, Y., & Fu, M. (2016). A new sampling method in particle filter based on Pearson correlation coefficient. *Neurocomputing*, 216, 208-215.
- Zhixing, Z. H. A. N. G. (2019). An Innovative Research on the Work of Financial Aiding in Colleges and Universities from the Perspective of Learning Organization Theory of New Generation. *Journal of Higher Education*, (2), 4.

REWITALIZACJA INNOWACYJNOŚCI PUBLICZNEGO UNIwersytetu POPRZEZ ORGANIZACJĘ EDUKACYJNĄ

Streszczenie: Z różnych sektorów biznesu dobrze wiadomo, że organizacja ucząca się odgrywa znaczącą rolę w zwiększaniu wydajności organizacji i jest wykorzystywana do uzyskiwania przewagi konkurencyjnej. Pomimo wielu badań w tym temacie zarządzania, brakuje badań dotyczących publicznego szkolnictwa wyższego. Niniejsze badanie ma na celu zbadanie wdrożenia organizacji uczenia się na poziomie indywidualnym, grupowym i organizacyjnym oraz związku z innowacyjnością organizacyjną wśród naukowców na indonezyjskich uniwersytetach publicznych. Wyniki statystyczne analizowane za pomocą analizy regresji 170 naukowców wskazują na znaczące pozytywne powiązania między wszystkimi zmiennymi. Wyniki tych badań podkreślają pilną potrzebę zarządzania zasobami opartymi na wiedzy, aby osiągnąć integrację wiedzy osobistej z poziomem organizacyjnym. Nadrzędnym celem, aby uzyskać przewagę konkurencyjną, publiczne uniwersytety powinny stworzyć możliwości ciągłego uczenia się, a także promować zasadę dochodzenia i dialogu. Będąc jednym z najistotniejszych źródeł tworzenia wiedzy, konieczne jest, aby szkolnictwo wyższe zaimplementowało uczenie się organizacji, aby osiągnąć dużą zdolność do skutecznego radzenia sobie, w nieprzewidywalnych sytuacjach.

Słowa kluczowe: organizacja nauki, innowacyjność organizacyjna, instytucja publiczna, szkolnictwo wyższe

通过学习型组织振兴公立大学的创新能力

摘要:学习型组织在提升组织绩效中起着重要作用, 并被用来获得竞争优势, 这在各个行业中都得到了广泛认可。尽管在此管理主题上进行了许多研究, 但缺乏研究公共高等教育的研究。这项研究旨在调查在个人, 团体和组织层面上学习型组织的实施情况, 以及印度尼西亚公立大学中学者与组织创新性之间的关系。用来自170位学者的回归分析对统计结果进行分析, 结果表明所有变量之间均存在显著的正相关。这项研究的结果强调了管理基于知识的资产以实现将个人知识整合到组织级别的紧迫性。为了获得竞争优势, 公立大学应首先创造持续学习的机会, 并倡导探究和对话的原则。作为知识创造的最重要来源之一, 高等教育必须植入组织学习以实现文学上的卓越才能在无法预测的情况下令人满意地竞争。

关键词:学习型组织组织创新公共机构高等教育