STUDIA WARMIŃSKIE 56 (2019)
ISSN 0137-6624
DOI: 10.31648/sw.4317

Natalia Semeniuk
Department of Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Education Policy
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University[1]

Modern University in the Light of Lifelong Learning Challenges: The Issues of Philosophy of Education

Słowa kluczowe: edukacja; uniwersytet; kształcenie ustawiczne; heutagogika; światowy rynek usług edukacyjnych; misja społeczna; dywersyfikacja; synergia; autonomia.

Keywords: education; university; life-long learning; heutagogy; the world market of educational services; the social mission; diversification; synergy; autonomy.

Introduction

The modern model of the university is focused on the commercialization of its activities. This process was initiated by the United States through the adoption of the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, the purpose of which was to create jobs and commercialize research and technology. After its introduction quantitative indicators of patenting and net profit have increased significantly. Commercialization of the model of activity of the modern university naturally leads to the internationalization of the sphere of education, to the creation of an extensive network of regional, national and international ties and to the strengthening of the principles of liberalism in the organization of the educational process. Accordingly, an original conception of the definition of the strategy of university activity is formed, especially in conditions of optimization of the world market of educational services. This concept is called New Public Management (NPM), the content and logic of which are the subject of contemporary discussions and thorough analytics.

The systemic principles of management of education are transformed from a rigid vertical structure to a network model of structuring. Such

[1] Natalia Semeniuk, Department of Social Philosophy, Philosophy of Education and Education Policy, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Pirogova 9, 01601 Kyiv, Ukraine, n.v.semeniuk@npu.edu.ua, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6086-0489.

a transition is conditioned by the needs of the modern information society, which is connected with the communicative lines of the scientific and educational partnership, life-long learning and heutagogy, the integration of scientific research and its implementation into production, the growth of the level of labor migration and academic mobility. Heutagogy is a teaching about self-education of an adult. Its content is also the embodiment of so-called mixed, or hybrid learning. Modern technology development accelerates the process of changing the content demanded by the market competencies. Accordingly, the learning process essentially loses the opportunity to be completed and final, there is a need for continuous training, upgrading and updating of the acquired knowledge. It is also a specific rhizomorphous model of learning based on the belief in the fundamental incompleteness of cognition, need for lifelong learning as a successful adaptation and interaction with the social environment.

Author decided to concentrate on the issues of lifelong learning taking into account, that number of challenges for contemporary University mission is even hard to be estimated. There are some challenges, produced by new cognitive strategies of social reality (Bilyk V., Sheremet I., 2019). Some challenges have demonstrated national nature in addition to the series of ones (Bazaluk O., Fatkhutdinov V., Svyrydenko D., 2018; Pavlova O., 2018). Wiktor Mozgin rises the question about the correspondence of contemporary University mission to the University ones, formulated by Wilhelm von Humboldt, and then John Newman (Mozgin, 2019, p. 58–62). Liudmyla Savenkova and Denys Svyrydenko underline, that contemporary social system is easily described by the metaphor of mobility, thus all the social institutes (education, family, etc.) become mobile at different dimensions, thus, their traditional social roles and missions should be revised (Savenkova L., Svyrydenko D., 2018, p. 57–59). The new social roles for student with corresponding challenges for University mission are also discussed (Wach K., Wojciechowski L., 2016). The full list of approaches for understanding of contemporary crisis situation of University is too big and one's formulation transcends the scope of this article.

The condition of the competitiveness of a modern university, among other things, is the creation and maintenance of a creative space system. It is logical that creativity is needed to improve and optimize the business environment, attract investment, innovate and create products of culture, works of art and scientific and technological developments.

Studia Warmińskie 56 (2019)

Modern University: the Philosophy of Efficiency

It is clear that, at such serious challenges, the modern university is simply forced to revise its own foundations and reflects its own social mission. Thus, Yingqiang Zhang and Hualiang Fang (Zhang Y, Fang H., 2018, p. 57–67) analyze the current state of transformational processes in the model of university education. In their opinion, the absence of such changes would indicate the formalism and inefficiency of such a university management model. The authors insist that the best solution to this problem will be to preserve academic traditions with the introduction of innovative learning technologies and the creation of counseling centers, professional associations and vocational schools.

More comprehensive approach is offered by other researchers. Jill Jones, Scott Fleming and Janet Lagurnee (Jones J., Fleming S., Lagurnee J., 2018, p. 1–17) explore the transformation of a modern university model at a general and political level. The authors emphasize the diversification of the funding base of the university as one of the main factors influencing the functioning and competitiveness of the educational institution. A meaningful empirical study of this problem serves as the basis for the formulation of the so-called "model S4E", which details the algorithm of effective interaction of educational institution with profile enterprises.

This model includes the following components:

1) determining the strategic value for an enterprise of this type of interaction;

2) support of the enterprise by the latest developments and scientific inventions;

3) development of synergy of activity of the enterprise and educational institution;

4) the actual and prospective success of the enterprise.

According to the authors, the development of the interaction of education and production is relevant both for practice in academic circles and in the wider regional national and international levels. The problem of determining the social mission of the University of James Arthur reveals the example of the University of Birmingham, and exhibits the planning and refinement of national models of the University, in particular, in the German space in a broader motivational context. At the present stage, the installations and goals of the university are significantly changing, since the volume and complexity of the tasks solved by higher education has significantly increased. Accordingly, the idea of the social mission of the university also varies depending on the actual state of society.

Therefore, the civilian dimension of a modern university is determined by numerous contradictions, the main of which is the growth of the academic status of the institution of education and constant enthusiasm for the strengthening of urban and regional ties. This problem is also being developed by C.A. McLaren: "Wide variations occur from university to university in the nature of there cords in these categories. Among records of government and administration, however, there has generally been a steady increase in volume, accelerating in recent years, accompanied by a marked elaboration in form. These features reflect developments in governmental and administrative organization which are a response to the increasing complexity of the tasks which society has encouraged, and indeed ordered, the universities to undertake: burdens such as expansion in numbers and the widening of fields of study" (McLaren C.A., 1975, p.13).

William Whyte relies on the well-known work of J. Axtell, who: "Seeks to explain their success, arguing that they are institutions sustained by twelve core attributes: meritocracy, diverse sources of funding, a synergy between teaching and research, tenure for academics, competition for high-quality faculty, openness to foreign influences, intellectual freedom, strong governance, excellent education, competition for students, commitment to public service and 'generally attractive locations'" (Whyte W., 2016, p. 372).

But all these indicators are external, although they are presentable. Concerning the internal prerequisites for the development of university education, communication and their specificity should be considered important. So, Iain MacRury suggests verifying the use of object relations of the psychoanalytic concept of dialogue to relationships and relational structures in the management of the university. The author observes that the quality of dialogical relationships in creative collaboration is an important indicator of creative productivity, especially critical thinking. The domination of hard management associated with the provision, monitoring and management of creative processes can lead to distortion of the content of symbolic production and the negative impact on the development of students, the formation of the "space for thinking" necessary for the implementation of research activities. The creativity of a modern university is in demand due to the rhetoric of empowerment of students. The author criticizes existing dialogue models, feedback loops, internal and external audits, mechanisms and reporting procedures: "We witness and deliver a collapse of academic spaces and practices into administrative and managerial spaces and practices" (MacRury I., 2007, p.18).

The author's special attention is drawn to the importance of maintaining a dialogue space in the humanities and social sciences. Thus, modern institutional management models focus on managing dialogue spaces that limit natural rhythms and timelines of imagination, accentuating the value of the end and result. Therefore, Iain MacRury argues that creative thinking manifests itself as a synthesis of an object / result and corresponding thinking processes.

Gavin Moodie (Moodie G., 2017, p. 3) cites Axwell's well-known view that the United States' elite research universities have gained such efficacy through the list of factors. Denote the main content of these criteria as follows:

1) various institutions that are meritocratic in their essence;
2) diversification of funding sources for educational institutions;
3) synergy of education and research;
4) autonomy and competition of the teaching staff of the university;
5) encouraging the best research achievements and their authors;
6) academic mobility of students, researchers and teachers;
7) creativity and academic freedom in providing educational services;
8) autonomy of universities and plasticity in management practice;
9) introduction of liberal principles of education with the provision of personalized education, at least at the highest levels;
10) promoting the best student achievements;
11) interaction of university education with state authorities;
12) aesthetics of educational institutions and campuses.

Chris Shore and Mira Taitz analyze contemporary neoliberal rethinking of universities with an emphasis on commercializing their activities as a global phenomenon, but with significant local variations. Accordingly, the concept of "property" as a determinant of the definition of the content of modern education and the links between academic science and the management system of the educational institution is used. The authors are convinced that the discussion of property reveals the existing tension between institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The authors of the transformation of the modern university model state the following: "The idea of the university as a place of advanced learning and critical thinking or of higher education as a 'public good' whose social mission is to reproduce national culture and serve the public interest, summed up in the now-anachronistic phrase 'education for citizenship' has been replaced by the narrower instrumental view of university knowledge as a personal investment and form of training" (Shore C., Taitz M, 2012, p. 203).

Significant and demonstrative in the principles of the functioning of a modern university from the standpoint of its management and efficiency is the notion of stakeholders. The authors of the article point out a very interesting aspect of the etymology of this notion: "The metaphor of the 'stakeholder' is an interesting example of institutional semantics. The term has its origins in the world of gambling and banking. As the Oxford English Dictionary defines it, a 'stakeholder' is: '(in gambling) an independent party with whom each of those who make a wager deposits the money or counters wagered'. The migration of this word from a casino or betting idiom to a major principle of contemporary governance parallels the process by which neoliberalisation and New Public Management seem to have colonised the public institutions of modern capitalist societies" (Shore C., Taitz M, 2012, p. 208).

The blurring of the boundaries of the educational environment of the university, the integration of the structure of the university into a certain socio-economic and political context, and the involvement of new figures and participants that determine the content and direction of the development of university education is a controversial and little predictable phenomenon. The authors note the following: "This relegation of academic and professional staff to adjuncts of the university exemplifies how power relations within academia have shifted. Like the classification of students as just one among 'stakeholders' whom the University identifies as people to be consulted, it is a palpable signifier of how the 'idea of the university' has changed: from a corporate body composed primarily of teachers and students, the University is now increasingly defined as its Vice Chancellor and his senior managers and administrators whose job is to regulate and discipline its 'staff' according to the principles of financial accountancy and New Public Management" (Shore C., Taitz M., 2012, p. 212).

Therefore, the question arises about the necessary restrictions in this global space of liberalism. Graham Badley thinks that the ideas of his environmentality and pragmatism are fundamental to the ideas of a modern university. These concepts should not contradict, but complement each other for the productive and stable development of a modern university model. The author considers the main problem in the ability to implement such a project. The obstacle on this path is called "disastrous ideologies", namely entrepreneurship, globalization and management.

But the future of a pragmatic university, as well as the future of civilization, depends on the environmental friendliness of thoughts and actions. In this problematic field, environmental friendliness means maintaining the balance and harmony of the existence of different species.

Therefore, personal freedom is an absolute value in the sense that it does not interfere and does not ruin the space of freedom of others: "The pragmatic university would be part of a democratic and pluralist society where an individual's or group's religion, however idiosyncratic, is their own business. Society and the pragmatic university would leave free space for individuals to develop their own sense of who they are and what their lives were for" (Graham B., 2016, p. 634).

But meeting the demands and expectations of an indefinite number of individuals and their groups is a very complicated task. Therefore, the level and quality of calls faced by a modern university is growing rapidly: "For universities are now driven by agendas set by business consultants, corporate managers, financial officers, government agencies, industrial concerns and others. Universities are required by these agents and agencies to become more business-facing, more competitive, more economically literate, more entrepreneurial, more excellent, more global, more instrumental, more strategic, more vocational, more this and more that" (Graham B., 2016, p. 635).

Obviously, the role and significance of the modern university as a social institution is significantly increasing. Ashley Tull (Tull A., 2007, p. 284) observes the responsibility of the modern university not only in the context of the importance of finding the truth, but also in the leadership for the public good, even if its content does not coincide with popular opinion. Or, Richard Joseph Wheeler Selleck (Selleck R.J.W., 1999, pp. 100–104) sees the mission of a modern university not only in the study, but above all in teaching, learning knowledge. But knowledge is not just a profession (because at the current pace of technology development it is a risky investment), but knowledge of axiological, moral and ethical and socio-political nature. These are the knowledge that forms the character and outlook, but does not determine the professional activity. The author suggests the history of universities from the point of view of social demand, rather than the proposals produced by educational institutions.

The Philosophy of Lifelong Learning at Modern University

If we analyze the history and logic of the formation of the university, then we have grounds to assert the following significant transformations in the cultural context. The emergence of the university as a social institution is the apogee of the era of the written word, written text and its authoritative interpreter. With the development of printing, the range of authorized interpreters is growing, preconditions for the formation of li-

beralism and freedom of interpretation are formed. As a result of the proliferation of liberal principles it is appropriate to consider the delegitimization of the cultural status of the university as a center of knowledge and cultural values.

Eclecticism and polysemanticism of contemporary culture are reflected in the model of a modern university, in particular the idea of the multiversity of Clark Kerr (Kerr C., 1963). In his opinion, a traditional university with a dogmatic circle of people involved in the transformation of knowledge into a modern multiversity of technology-oriented intellectual oligarchy. In this trajectory of change, on the one hand, the network of structural organization of the university is branching out, and on the other, the idea of universal education is maintained. Consequently, the philosophy of the modern university becomes a determinant of utilitarianism and pragmatism, and the decisive factor in development is not human as personality, nor the value of culture, but economic needs and challenges.

Commercialization of knowledge leads to a leveling of traditional factors of human self-identification, reduces its essence and purpose to a certain technological functionality. Strengthening the influence of pragmatic and utilitarian factors in the philosophy of substantiating the idea and mission of a modern university naturally leads to the branching and differentiation of models of its functioning in accordance with the goal pursued by the institution of education. So, Michael Barber highlights four main models of a modern university: "The elite universities are the most competitive educational institutions in the global educational services market, with a recognized brand, centuries-old traditions and world-class staggers. At the same time, the mass universities are specialized educational institutions that provide quality training services for professionals who are getting employment opportunities in leading companies around the world. The niche university specializes in individual industries and areas of research, the narrow specialization of which allows them to maintain a leading position in the identified areas of work" (Barber M., 2013, p. 56).

The local university has a systemic impact on the development of economic indicators at the local and regional levels through the rapid response to local challenges and inquiries. But this classification does not cover the description of a modern university. Distribution of distance education, conceptualization of the virtual university, digitalization of the educational space form the necessary basis for the conceptualization of the hybrid model of the university, which combines various technologies and forms of providing educational services. The hybridity of the modern

model of the university is ideologically close to the concept of "open structure" by Umberto Eco, the rhizome as the structural organization of the educational institution (Eco U., 1989).

Jacques Derrida, who sees it impossible to divide the "technical" and "architectonic" basis of systematization of knowledge in the modern context, insists on the patterns of hybridization of the model of modern university (Derrida J., 2005). This is the innovation of a modern university, which reduces the modern ideologue to the priority of theoretical knowledge before the formation of professional competence. After all, professional competence is the possession of technology, and theoretical knowledge is the knowledge of determination links in the widest possible context, knowledge of the essence of things and phenomena that determine the content and direction of activity.

So Friederich Nietzsche criticizes the idea of the University's mission as a center of professional training, since a set of narrow professional knowledge does not, as a result, form the integrity of a person's culture and its outlook (Bowman W., 2016). Accordingly, practical training should be based on the appropriate theoretical and cultural basis. Otherwise, society risks ending up with a loss of reflection and reasonable prediction of the future. The newest Dark Ages, the religion of which is business and consumption, are coming.

Conclusions

Consequently, we can conclude that the model of a modern university varies both in form and content. From the hierarchical model of the university as an organized community of legitimized interpreters of true knowledge, there is a large-scale drift to the network's nomadological structure of educational resources.

In modern conditions, the university is not limited to studying and teaching, the acquisition of a special significance in the University's success is not just research activity, but is practically and pragmatically oriented. The modern university exists in a mode of permanent changes and rapid response to labor market needs, challenges of the global network economy, taking into account environmental and political threats and risks. Let's put the rhetorical question: is it possible that the number and severity of the global threats of modernity is a shortage in most of the universal education?

Therefore, we consider it appropriate to interpret lifelong learning as a demand from the society. This fact justifies the need for constant upda-

ting and improvement of professional competencies. It is logical that the university, as the center of academic culture, advanced scientific research and innovative techniques and teaching methods, has all the bases and tools for expanding the range of educational services that it provides. In addition, lifelong learning is an important component of the integration and interaction of individuals and society, the development of their own cognitive interests and spiritual culture.

NOWOCZESNA UCZELNIA W ŚWIETLE WYZWAŃ ZWIĄZANYCH Z KSZTAŁCENIEM USTAWICZNYM: KWESTIE FILOZOFII EDUKACJI

(STRESZCZENIE)

Filozoficzna analiza działania współczesnego uniwersytetu prowadzi do wniosku, że jest on miejscem komercyjnie ukierunkowanej edukacji i kształcenia lokalnych specjalistów w danej dziedzinie. Ponadto okazuje się, że współczesny uniwersytet może być np.: elitarny, masowy, niszowy, regionalny, pragmatyczny, ekologiczny. Autorka zauważa, że komercjalizacja edukacji bezpośrednio sprzężona jest ze wzrostem wpływu technologii na dynamikę rozwoju kulturowego, globalizację i informatyzację danego społeczeństwa. W związku z tym wydaje się, że wolność poszukiwań naukowych, niezależność nauki i edukacji schodzą na dalszy plan, gdyż współczesna uczelnia skupia się przede wszystkim na osiąganiu efektów naukowych i edukacyjnych, które są komercyjnie pożądane i możliwe do pragmatycznego wykorzystania. Autorka utrzymuje, że w dłuższej perspektywie czasu taki trend funkcjonowania współczesnego uniwersytetu, jeśli się utrzyma, okaże się zgubny, gdyż nie służy zrównoważonemu rozwojowi zarówno człowieka jako osoby, jak i ludzkiego społeczeństwa.

MODERN UNIVERSITY IN THE LIGHT OF LIFELONG LEARNING CHALLENGES: THE ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

(SUMMARY)

The philosophical analysis of the content of the modern university's work leads to an understanding of commercialization and professional localization in the training of specialists. The ways of determining the essence of a modern university are grounded: elite, mass, niche, regional, pragmatic, ecological, and others. It is argued that the commercialization of education is conditioned by an increase in the level of technology impact on the dynamics of cultural development, globalization and informatization of society. Accordingly, traditional notions of academic freedom and the value of science and education are inferior to considerations of pragmatic feasibility and utilitarianism. The idea of the perniciousness of such a trend in education that threatens the personality deformation and the possible risks of global catastrophes is upheld in the paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arthur James, 2017, *The First Modern University: the University of Birmingham*, British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. 65, Issue 2, pp. 183–200, https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2016.1227426.

Badley Graham, 2016, *The pragmatic university: a feasible utopia?*, Studies in Higher Education, Vol. 41, Issue 4, pp. 631–641, https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.942269.

Barber Michael, Donnelly Katelyn, Rizvi Saad, 2013, *An avalanche is coming. Higher education and the revolution ahead, The Institute for public policy research*.

Bazaluk Oleg, Fatkhutdinov Vasyl, Svyrydenko Denys, 2018, *The Potential of Systematization of the Theories of Education for Solving of Contradictions of Ukrainian Higher Education Development*, Studia Warmińskie, Vol. 55, pp. 63–79, https://doi.org/10.31648/sw.3062.

Bilyk Valentyna, Sheremet Inessa, 2019, *A New View of the Nature of Reality and the Teaching Higher-Level Cognitive Strategies*, Philosophy and Cosmology, Vol. 22, pp. 92–100, https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/22/7.

Bowman William, 2016, *Friedrich Nietzsche: Herald of a New Era*, Hazar Press.

Derrida Jacques, 2005, *Politics of Friendship*, Verso.

Eco Umberto, 1989, *The Open Work*, Harvard University Press.

Jones Gill, Fleming Scott, Laugharne Janet, 2018, *The challenge of enterprise/innovation: a case study of a modern university*, Journal of Further and Higher Education, https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2018.1517865.

Kerr Clark, 1963, *The Uses of the University*, 5th edition, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

McLaren Colin A., 1975, *The management of modern university records*, Journal of Educational Administration and History, Vol. 7, Issue 1, pp. 51–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/0022062750070106.

MacRury Iain, 2007, *Institutional creativity and pathologies of potential space: The modern university*, Psychodynamic Practice. Individuals, Groups and Organisations, Vol. 13, Issue 2, pp. 119–140, https://doi.org/10.1080/14753630701273058.

Moodie Gavin, 2017, *Wisdom's workshop: the rise of the modern university by James Axtell*, History of Education, Vol. 46, Issue 6, pp. 868–870, https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2017.1346148.

Możgin Wiktor, 2019, *The Condition of a Modern University – Is There a Problem*?, Future Human Image, Vol. 11, pp. 56–65, https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/11/6.

Pavlova Olena, 2018, *Politically-Technological Potential of Cultural Practices in Ukrainian Perspective*, Ukrainian Policymaker, Vol. 2, pp. 20–26, https://doi.org/10.29202/up/2/3.

Savenkova Liudmyla, Svyrydenko Denys, 2018, *Academic Mobility and Academic Migration Issues: the Case of Ukrainian Higher Education*, Interdisciplinary Studies of Complex Systems, No. 13, pp. 57–65, https://doi.org/10.31392/iscs.2018.13.057.

Shore Cris, Taitz Mira, 2012, *Who 'owns' the university? Institutional autonomy and academic freedom in an age of knowledge capitalism*, Globalisation, Societies and Education, Vol. 10, Issue 2, pp. 201–219, https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2012.677707.

Selleck Richard J.W., 1999, *The modern university and its discontents*, The European Legacy. Toward New Paradigms, Vol. 4, Issue 6: Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians, pp. 100–104, https://doi.org/10.1080/10848779908580015.

Tull Ashley, 2007, *Higher Ground: Ethics and Leadership in the Modern University*, Journal of College and Character, Vol. 8, Issue 2, https://doi.org/10.2202/1940-1639.1170.

Vokey Daniel, 2011, *Debating moral education: rethinking the role of the modern university*, Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 40, Issue 1, pp. 134–136, https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2011.541997.

Wach Krzysztof, Wojciechowski Liwiusz, 2016, *Entrepreneurial Intentions of Students in Poland in the View of Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behaviour*, Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review, Vol. 4 (1), pp. 83–94, https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2016.040106.

Whyte William, 2016, *Wisdom's Workshop: the rise of the modern university*, Social History, Vol. 41, Issue 3, pp. 351–352, https://doi.org/10.1080/03071022.2016.1175108.

Zhang Yingqiang, Fang Hualiang, 2018, From Living Space to Cultural Space: How a Modern University Academy System is Possible, Chinese Education & Society, Vol. 51, Issue 1: Liberal *Arts (General) Education in Chinese Universities*, pp. 57–67, https://doi.org/10.1080/10611932.2017.1411695.