

사내대학의 통합적 모델 수립에 관한 연구 : 사내대학 역할을 중심으로*

A Study on Building a Holistic Model of the Corporate University : Focused on Its Roles

박 조 현 (Cho Hyun Park)

삼성SDS 교육사업팀 (chohyun.park@samsung.com)

오 정 록 (Jeong Rok Oh) **

우송대학교 국제경영학부 (jroh58@wsu.ac.kr)

ABSTRACT

A corporate university (CU) is an educational institution established by an organization whose primary purpose is not education. Traditionally, a CU is considered a training facility to improve organizational performance. However, the proliferation of the CU has engendered its diverse purposes, roles, and forms. This study attempts to identify three types of the existing CUs: (a) a CU to improve organizational performance; (b) a CU to satisfy employees' learning needs; and (c) a CU to develop a competent national workforce. Also, this study suggests a holistic CU model including the three CU types. In order to transform a CU to a multifunctional CU embracing all three types of CU, organizations should (a) provide communication and collaboration channels, (b) present clear organizational goals, (c) establish organizational policies/systems to encourage learning in CUs, and (d) devise an effective approach to evaluate the impact of CUs. Organization's critical roles in the development of CUs can assist CUs in becoming the core of knowledge management.

Keywords: corporate university, organizational performance, learning needs, national competitiveness, human resource development

I. Introduction

As the number of corporate universities (CUs) has grown rapidly since the 1990s, CUs have received more attention as a research topic

(Abel & Li, 2012; Allen, 2007). CUs have been predominantly seen as a means of alignment of human resources with organizational strategies (Abel & Li, 2012; Dealtry, 2000b; Prince & Beaver, 2001a, 2001b) and knowledge management (Jansink, Kwakman, & Streumer, 2005; Rademakers, 2005) to improve organizational performance and achieve

* 논문접수일: 2015년 5월 14일; 1차 수정: 2015년 6월 6일;

2차 수정: 2015년 6월 12일; 게재 확정: 2015년 6월 14일

** 교신저자

competitive advantage (DeFilippo & Pearl, 2012). However, as CUs have emerged and developed to address each organization's different needs, their purposes as well as forms have become rather diverse (Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007).

Due to their different purposes and forms, CUs can be seen not only from the perspective of human resources to achieve organizational goals but also from various perspectives of lifelong learning (Ryan, 2008), a learning and education society (Blass, 2005), and national human capital (Wiggenhom, 1990). This implies that the focus of CUs has been expanded from organizations to individuals and nations in that CUs influence not only organizations' strategies for their performance but also individual learning needs (Prince & Beaver, 2001b) and human resources for national competitiveness (Buchbinder & Newson, 1990). Although research studies on CUs have been conducted from each perspective, few attempts have been made to investigate CUs from the holistic view. For this reason, it is necessary to revisit the existing CU studies and to propose a holistic CU model that embraces all three aspects of CUs — individual, organization, and nation. It is meaningful to view CUs holistically in that this can provide organizations that want to establish their own CUs or want to improve their CUs with insights into the direction in which they need to proceed. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to propose a holistic CU model from the perspective of the three levels of human resource development (HRD): individual,

organization, and community/society. Based on the CU model, this study suggests implications for the practice and development of CUs in terms of the organization's roles.

2. Review of the Corporate University

Many business organizations in many countries have created their own universities to train their employees in an effective way, to develop organizational learning capabilities, and to keep them competitive, and these universities are called, as a rule, corporate universities (Morin & Renaud, 2004). Every CU has its own unique purpose (Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007), and this has engendered various definitions (Blass, 2005; Prince & Beaver, 2001a, 2001b). Table 1 shows the definitions of CU.

Among these many definitions of CUs, Meister's (1998) definition encompasses a broad aspect of learning and thus was selected as the most comprehensive one for the current study: "Corporate universities are essentially the 'in-house' training and education facilities that have sprung up because of the frustration of business with the quality and content of post-secondary education on the one hand; and the need for life-long learning on the other. They have evolved at many organizations into strategic umbrellas for educating not only employees, but also customers and suppliers." (p. 12) Hence, this study adopts Meister's definition of CUs

as a foundation of the holistic model of CUs proposed in the latter part of the study.

CUs originated from the General Motors Institute in the 1920s, focusing on engineering and management skills (Morin & Renaud, 2004; Nixon & Helms, 2002). In the 1950s, General Electric started its own CU to develop their own management capabilities (Gould, 2005; Prince & Beaver, 2001b). After this, CUs began to proliferate, and in the 1990s, CUs became a widespread practice with various purposes, foci, and forms depending

on many organizations in North America, Europe, and Asia (Dealtry, 2008; Qiao, 2009). Some organizations have adopted the name

corporate university for their HRD or training and development (T&D) functions without any change of their roles (Dealtry, 2000b; Holland & Pyman, 2006; Prince & Beaver, 2001a, 2001b). However, CUs are different from T&D, and the role of CUs is much more comprehensive than that of T&D. CUs embrace a wide range of areas such as knowledge management, organization development, career development, and academic research, as well as T&D, which focuses on tactical knowledge and skills. CUs' focus is more strategic than that of tactical T&D, and CUs are more concerned with contributing to the profit, growth, or efficiency of organizations (Abel & Li, 2012; Allen, 2007).

[Table 1] The Definitions of Corporate University

Authors	Definitions
Allen (2002)	"A corporate university is an educational entity that is a strategic tool designed to assist its parent organization in achieving its mission by conducting activities that cultivate individual and organizational learning, knowledge, and wisdom"(p. 9).
Dealtry (2000a)	"The corporate university is a management intervention that takes a company or organisation into a new robust and sustained phase of business development that it would not achieve with its current levels of opportunity for thought leadership and styles of learning behaviour"(p. 255).
Grenzer (2006)	Corporate university is defined as "a function strategically aligned toward integrating the development of people within a specific organization. It must focus on personal development, career paths, training opportunities, learning events, human resource programs, and leadership at all levels of the organization"(p. 1).
Meister (1998)	"Corporate universities are essentially the 'in-house'training and education facilities that have sprung up because of the frustration of business with the quality and content of post-secondary education on the one hand; and the need for life-long learning on the other. They have evolved at many organizations into strategic umbrellas for educating not only employees, but also customers and suppliers"(p. 12). The corporate university is defined as "the strategic umbrella for developing and educating employees, customers, and suppliers in order to meet an organization's business strategies"(p. 29).
Paton, Peters, Storey, & Taylor (2005)	The term corporate university is used "to encompass a range of initiatives that carry cognate titles such as academy or institute. As a working guide we include all initiatives, whatever the term in use as a label, which: (1) are wholly owned by a parent work organization; (2) have as their primary focus the provision of learning opportunities for employees of the parent organization (even though it may also offer learning to suppliers and customers); and (3) utilize symbols and language from the educational sector"(p. xi).
Ryan (2008)	Corporate universities are "in-house training units providing educational programs for staff from basic training to high level programs that equate to courses traditionally offered by higher education bodies and universities"(p. 2).

Traditionally, CUs are considered in-house entities for developing and educating employees in order to achieve organizations' business goals or objectives (Meister, 1998). Many scholars suggest the functions of CUs in terms of culture and change (Allen, 2007; Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007; Prince & Beaver, 2001b; Qiao, 2009), knowledge management (Allen, 2007; Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007; Prince & Beaver, 2001a, 2001b; Qiao, 2009), and organizational learning and learning organization (Abel & Li, 2012; Allen, 2007; Prince & Beaver, 2001a). Although the main focus of CUs has been on achieving organizational performance or goals, there are also different points of view on the function of CUs, such as providing employees with the opportunities for lifelong learning (Gould, 2005; Ryan, 2008), contributing to a learning and education society (Blass, 2005), and developing national human capital (Wiggenhom, 1990).

Given their foci, the current CUs play a role not only as entities of in-house training, but also as higher education institutions. For example, some CUs have established partnerships with traditional universities to use external expertise in order to combine practice and theory and to add strength and credibility to the CUs' programs (Abel & Li, 2012; Ryan, 2008), and some CUs are institutionalized as higher education entities having a degree-granting power (Abel & Li, 2012; Ryan, 2009).

Although CUs encompass many functions, the present study starts by explaining the CU'

s main roles from the organizational level of the HRD perspective such as culture and change, knowledge management, organizational learning, and learning organization, which are commonly considered basic roles of CUs. Then, the extended role of the CUs from the individual and community/societal levels of the HRD perspectives will be derived. Based on these roles from the three levels of the HRD perspective, a holistic CU model will be suggested.

2.1 The Role of CUs: From the Perspective of the Organizational Level of HRD

2.1.1 A driver of organizational culture change

The first critical role of CUs is to drive organizational culture and change and to shape and share organizational culture (Allen, 2007; Andresen & Lichtenberger, 2007; Prince & Beaver, 2001b; Qiao, 2009). The curriculum of CUs, aligned with organizational visions and strategies, enables employees to communicate and understand organizational visions, missions, and strategic objectives clearly (Meister, 1998). Through clearly shared visions, missions, and strategies, employees can define the existing organizational culture and understand the purpose and direction for cultural change of organizations (Cummings & Worley, 2008). Organizational culture contains its own value shared by organizational members (Schein, 1990), and a unique mix of values is important for an organization to create a competitive advantage (Porter, 1996).

In addition, CUs play a significant role

in creating learning culture throughout organizations. CUs provide a focus and commitment to learning, so that learning cultures can be established within organizations (Eccles, 2004; Prince & Beaver, 2001b), and employees can be trained and educated to improve core competencies for the competitive advantage of an organization (Meister, 1998). Therefore, CUs as initiators of shaping, sharing, and changing organizational culture are the strategic tools to ultimately meet the organizations' business strategies and competitive advantages.

2.1.2 An agency for knowledge management

CUs perform an important role in creating, sharing, and coordinating knowledge aligned with organizational strategies (Andresen, 2007; Jansink et al., 2005). In today's knowledge-based economy, knowledge is perceived as the primary resource (Drucker, 1992) and as an important driver of continuous innovation and competitive advantage (Rademakers, 2005). However, simply obtaining knowledge itself may not bring an organization competitive advantage; knowledge obtained should be assimilated into a task and embody organizational vision and strategic goals (Drucker, 1992). The curriculum of CUs consists of the skills and knowledge needed in today's rapidly changing workplace to support the overall competitiveness of the companies, and employees can learn how their jobs fit into the overall corporate mission and strategic agenda of the organizations through CUs (Meister, 1998).

CUs can employ in-company experts, who have much experience and insight in their fields, as faculty members (Gould, 2005; Qiao, 2009). Employees can learn tacit knowledge such as skills and know-how as well as explicit knowledge from experienced and insightful internal experts. Tacit knowledge acquired through CUs can act as a vital source of knowledge innovation and competitive advantage for organizations. Also, CUs play an important role in the coordination of knowledge in that explicit and tacit knowledge interacts dynamically in CUs (Rademakers, 2005). Through the interaction process, new knowledge aligned with organizational strategies can be created, transferred, and applied in an organization (Alavi & Leidner, 2001). Therefore, CUs can be regarded as institutions for knowledge creating, sharing, and coordinating (Blass, 2005; Jansink et al., 2005), as leaders of the knowledge innovation (Rademakers, 2005), and as important entities for the competitive advantage of organizations (Dealtry, 2000b; Meister, 1998).

2.1.3 An entity for organizational learning

The third important role of CUs is to promote organizational learning (Abel & Li, 2012; Prince & Beaver, 2001a). As organizations as well as the environments around them have changed, the nature of work in organizations and the views of workforces and learning in organizations have also changed, and as a result, employees are required to learn continuously (Watkins & Marsick, 1993a). Meister (1998)

claims that CUs emerged to meet the needs for employees' continuous learning to possess new workplace competencies due to the emergence of the knowledge economy, the changes in organizations, the environment of workplaces, and the shortened shelf life of knowledge, and to sustain competitive advantages.

An important aspect of organizational learning is transformation of individual knowledge into collective knowledge that bears organizational norms, values, and culture. Prince and Beaver (2001a, 2001b) suggest four key processes of an ideal type world-class CU: learning process, knowledge systems and process, networks and partnerships, and people process. They emphasize that learning actively occurs through these processes. Considering that organizational learning is viewed as a learning process within an organization (Confessore & Kops, 1998), CUs are regarded as important entities to enhance organizational learning within organizations.

2.1.4 A creator of a learning organization

The three aspects of the CU's roles explained earlier — organizational culture change, knowledge management, and organizational learning — are intertwined with each other; each aspect affects other aspects, and these reciprocal effects can ultimately act as a foundation of a learning organization. Therefore, the present study suggests that the CU also plays a crucial role as a creator of a learning organization.

Culture is a behavioral, cognitive, and emotional learning process learned by group

experiences (Schein, 1990), and it directly affects the quality of learning in the workplace (Cook & Yanow, 2011). Also, the relationship between knowledge management and organizational learning is inseparable in that knowledge management enables employees to create, share, and implement knowledge within an organization (Civi, 2000), and organizational learning is to acquire and develop useful knowledge for organizations, and to increase the organizational capacity (Edmondson & Moingeon, 1996). Confessore and Kops (1998) also emphasize that the core of organizational learning is the corporate knowledge that is shaped, shared, understood, and utilized collectively throughout organizations. Moreover, knowledge management, through which employees become enriched with knowledge, fosters the organizational culture of learning in an organization (Janz & Prasarnphanich, 2003), upon which the learning organization can be created (Earl, 1994). The learning organization, a learning environment in which organizational learning thrives (Confessore & Kops, 1998), is an organization that is capable of creating, sharing, managing, and utilizing its own knowledge and insight (Garvin, 1993). For this reason, three aspects of CUs' roles — culture, knowledge management, and organizational learning — are closely related with each other and lead an organization to change into a learning organization.

2.2 The Extended Role of the CUs: Individual and Community/Societal Level of HRD

As explained above, when a CU thoroughly performs its roles in terms of culture, knowledge management, and organizational learning, ultimately the organization can be transformed into a learning organization. Watkins and Marsick (1993a, 1993b) clarify the critical characteristics of a learning organization. They insist that learning occurs at four independent levels – individual, team, organization, and society – and that learning at each level is increasingly collective and interdependent. They also suggest the action imperatives for each level as follows: “create continuous learning opportunities, promote inquiry and dialogue, encourage collaboration and team learning, establish systems to capture and share learning, empower people toward a collective vision, and connect the organization to its environment” (p. 11). The first two imperatives are for the individual level, the third one is for the team level, the fourth and fifth are for the organizational level, and the last action imperative is for a society level. They stress that when learning occurs at all levels with all action imperatives, the learning organization transforms toward continuous learning and change.

Meanwhile, according to Garavan, McGuire, and David (2004), HRD should be understood as multidisciplinary, multiperspectival, and multilevel. However, historically, the individual and community-societal levels remain

comparatively under-researched (Garavan et al., 2004) because an organizational level of analysis has dominated the HRD field (Cummings & Worley, 2008). Garavan et al. (2004) propose a comprehensive HRD framework for a systemic HRD perspective. According to the framework, HRD should be viewed not only at the organizational level but also at individual and community-societal levels to better understand HRD. From the perspective of the individual level HRD, individuals participate independently and voluntarily in their learning activities; from the viewpoint of the organizational level HRD, external rewards or requirements may motivate learning activities in an organization; and from the standpoint of the community-societal level HRD, individuals are affected by social structure, interdependence, collaboration, and citizenship, and learning is motivated by motives such as securing a job, mobility within the labor market, personal development, and so forth (Garavan et al., 2004).

Both Watkins and Marsick’s (1993a, 1993b) and Garavan et al.’s (2004) perspectives could be applied to CUs. Learning within a CU as a creator of the learning organization should happen at the levels of individual, team, and organization, as well as community/society. Then, learning within the CU could be ultimately transformed toward continuous learning. In other words, learning that takes place in a CU is related not only to organizational strategies in terms of performance, but also to individual learning needs and to societal – and by

extension, national — goals in terms of both performance and learning that signify learning at the society level. In this context, the CU’s role can be extended from the organizational level of the HRD standpoint focusing on organizational performance and goals to the individual and community-societal levels of HRD focusing on individual learning needs and human capital for societal/national competitiveness.

3. The Holistic Model of the CU

3.1 The CU Models from Three Perspectives

Based on the CUs’ roles discussed earlier, there seem to be three models of CUs from the three perspectives of HRD to improve performance for the benefit of the organization, to satisfy individual learning needs for the benefit of the individual learner, and to improve learning as a social investment for the benefit of the society/nation. Figure 1 represents a holistic CU model composed of the three CU models from the three HRD perspectives: (1) CU 1, a strategic CU model; (2) CU 2, a partnership CU model; and (3) CU 3, a comprehensive CU model. Each CU model can be located in a specific area according to its relationships with the HRD perspectives as seen in Figure 1.

In this figure, CU 1 is located in the area of the organizational level of HRD and refers to a traditional CU that originated from a strategic HRD center. Many companies in the world,

such as General Electric and Disney University, started their CUs as the type of CU 1. CU 2 is located in the overlapping area of the individual and organizational levels of HRD and refers to a CU in partnership with a traditional university. For example, many CUs such as General Motors and Motorola University have strong partnerships with higher education institutions (Abel & Li, 2012). Lastly, CU 3 is located in the overlapping area of individual, organizational, and community-societal levels of HRD and refers to a comprehensive CU that is regarded as a higher education institute supported by societal/national policies and systems. In other words, CU 3 integrates (a) individual, organizational, and community-societal levels of HRD and (b) organizational business goals, individual learning needs, and societal/national competitiveness. A current perfect example of this CU 3 might be Samsung Institute of Technology (SSIT) in South Korea because SSIT can grant official degrees to their employees.



[Figure 1] A holistic model of the corporate university (CU)

3.2 The CU Model from the Perspective of the Organizational Level of HRD

From the perspective of the organizational level of HRD, a CU can be understood as an in-house training entity under the strategic umbrella of the CU in an organization, as implied in Meister's (1998) CU definition, which is adopted as a foundation of the holistic CU model in the current study. CUs from the organizational level of the HRD perspective are based on organizational strategies for the competitiveness in the business market (Andresen, 2007; Holland & Pyman, 2006) and mainly focus on the development of employees' and organizational competencies for organizational performance (Meister, 1998; Morin & Renaud, 2004). This type of CU is represented as CU 1 in Figure 1. CU 1 is considered the most common type of CU all over the world.

CU 1 provides strategic learning rather than tactical training, which had been regarded as a main role of HRD in the past. CU 1 has a curriculum for strategic learning and an evaluation process aligned with organizational goals and is supported by the organization through various kinds of operations or logistics such as facilities and infrastructures (Barley, 2007). In addition to CUs' strategic HRD role in cultural change, knowledge management, organizational learning, and learning organization, CU 1 may play many other different roles such as succession planning, career planning, mentoring, or coaching (Allen, 2007). Therefore, CU 1 fulfills a role of the

organizational level of HRD in developing an expert workforce and in growing an organization in the rapidly changing business market (Gould, 2005).

3.3 The CU Model from the Perspective of the Individual Level of HRD

From the perspective of the individual level of HRD, a CU can be understood as an education institution for autonomous learning in the workplace in that Meister's (1998) definition expresses a CU as an education facility, whose quality and content are equivalent to post-secondary education. This type of CU reflects individual learners' needs for continuing education in the workplace to be competent in the labor market (Garavan et al., 2004) whereas CUs from the organizational level of the HRD perspective are aligned with organizational strategies to create a competitive advantage in the business market. CUs from the individual level of the HRD perspective are focusing on the learning and education of individual workers while CUs from the organizational level of the HRD perspectives are mainly focusing on the organizational performance and competencies by developing human resources (Meister, 1998). CU 2 in Figure 1 represents a CU from the individual level of the HRD perspective.

Because CU 2 has frequently evolved with the partnership with traditional universities, the present study calls it a partnership CU model. CU 2 pursues collaboration with established traditional universities to balance

theory and practice in the CU curriculum (Ryan, 2007), to increase credibility of the CU programs, to provide customized programs to satisfy employees' learning needs, and to offer specialized courses in certain fields (Nixon & Helms, 2002).

In some cases, CU 2 offers transferable higher education credits toward degrees or grants degrees to participants who completed specific courses of CUs (Landau, 2000). Through the partnership with traditional universities, CU 2 can grant degrees in an effective way because developing degree programs requires complicated processes and might be hindered by some obstacles such as accreditation (Allen, 2007). Although CU 2 offers degrees through the partnership with traditional universities, these degrees are not offered by CUs but by traditional universities. In other words, offering degrees is not a function of CU 2 but a role of traditional universities. The role of CU 2 is managing the partnership with a traditional university rather than granting degrees. Therefore, CU 2 is not viewed as a competitor of traditional universities because the primary purpose of CU 2 is to satisfy the learning needs that traditional universities cannot meet (Allen, 2007; Dealtry, 2001a, 2001b).

3.4 The CU Models from the Perspective of the Community-Societal Level of HRD

From the perspective of the community-societal level of HRD, a CU can be understood as a type of lifelong learning institution in

workplaces in that Meister's (1998) definition of CUs emphasizes that CUs emerged to meet the need for life-long learning. The CUs from the community-societal level of the HRD perspective provide employees with the lifelong learning opportunities throughout their work lives in organizations and ultimately contribute to meet national goals to develop the national workforce by offering lifelong learning opportunities in the workplace (Fulmer & Gibbs, 1998). This type of CU is often considered a post-secondary degree-offering establishment instituted by an organization although the organization's main object is not education or granting degrees (Hawthorne, Libby, & Nash, 1983). This type of CU is expressed as CU 3 in Figure 1 and is called a comprehensive CU model in this study. As a comprehensive model, CU 3 is regarded as a sustainable model that satisfies individual learning needs and organizational goals, as well as national competitiveness. Unlike traditional universities in which people learn for a limited duration, employees as adult learners can fulfill lifelong learning in CU 3 (Gould, 2005). Hence, employees can continuously and collaboratively learn and enhance their capabilities as competent individual workers in the labor market, human resources for organizational performance, and a national workforce for national competitiveness through the CU 3's programs.

CU 3 can be explained in regard to the aspect of the social learning process over one's entire life span. CU 3 can be viewed as a kind of learning society in which an individual

as a member of a society can change his/her behavior by learning and, in turn, can affect other members' behaviors and learning (Jarvis, 2001). According to Schuller and Field (1998), in a learning society, social capital as well as human capital can be developed. Human capital can be increased through education offering knowledge, skills, attitudes, and motivations required for both individual productivity and social development (Psacharopoulos & Woodhall, 1985). Whereas human capital focuses on the individual's competencies, social capital gives attention to the social network and relationships among members. Social capital can be explained by three forms: obligations, expectations, and trustworthiness; information channels; and norms and effective sanctions (Coleman, 1988). A CU is the place where people with the sharing norm and a common goal to achieve organizational or national mission and vision exchange and create knowledge collectively under the obligation to contribute to organizational or national development as well as individual growth as a member of the organization or nation. This is one of the distinctive characteristics of CUs that differentiate from traditional universities. Therefore, within CUs, both social and human capitals can be enhanced; individuals can fulfill their needs of lifelong learning based on social capital in the workplace. From this perspective, CU 3 nurtures individuals who may be considered the competent workforce to contribute to the organizational as well as

societal/national development.

Like CU2, CU 3 also often builds partnerships with traditional universities to ensure employees' lifelong learning in the workplace as well as to grant degrees (Blass, 2005). However, CU 3 is distinct from CU 2 in the following ways: (a) CU 3 is supported by societal/national policies and systems such as administrative controls and financial benefits, and (b) CU 3 can grant official degrees because CU 3 is accredited as a higher education institution by the national system. Whereas CU 2 manages a partnership with a traditional university to grant degrees to participants who complete CU programs (Allen, 2007), CU 3 has the power to offer its own degree to individuals who finish its programs (Blass, 2005). Therefore, the CU can play a role not only as an in-house entity for organizational and individual learning within the workplace but also as an official higher education institution supported by the national legislation. For example, Samsung Institute of Technology (SSIT) in South Korea can grant not only bachelors' degrees but also masters' and doctoral degrees.

4. Implications for the Development of CUs

This study asserts that CUs are critical for improving the competencies of an organization and its employees, and by extension, for developing national human capital by realizing lifelong learning in the workplace. Although

this study focuses on the CU's roles in bringing positive results to individuals, organizations, and nations, the real benefits from instituting a CU may vary depending on situations in or around an organization (Dealtry, 2001a). When an organization builds a CU with a clear purpose, the CU may add value to the organization (Gould, 2005). Therefore, it is important that CUs reflect organizational and employees' needs (George-Leary & Cohen, 2007).

Among the three CU models suggested in the current study, CU 1, 2, and 3, each organization may choose the most appropriate CU type that fits the purpose to have its own CU. However, regardless of the CU type that an organization selects as the ideal one, one thing that is clear is that all CUs should function as entities that contribute to the development of employees' competencies, organizational competitiveness, or national capabilities beyond T&D or CUs in name only (Abel & Li, 2012; Allen, 2007). For example, Samsung Institute of Technology (SSIT) in South Korea has been making every effort to meet all these three goals by making partnerships with traditional universities and granting official degrees to their employees. The case of SSIT implies that the government should play a critical role in the development of CUs in terms of the community-societal environment including national systems and policies.

For the metamorphosis of a training department into a CU, organizational supports are critical. This study, therefore, derives the organization's roles as implications for

the prosperity of CUs adding value to an organization. These implications may be helpful in transforming a nominal CU to a multifunctional CU embracing all three levels of HRD: individual, organizational, and community-societal.

4.1 The Organization's Roles in the Development of CUs

For the successful CUs, the organization should first establish communication channels to facilitate employees' collaborative learning. In that humans as social beings learn through interactions among members in the society, communication and collaboration in the learning process are critical (Clarke, 2005). Like the case of the learning environment in higher education institutions (Kang & You, 2008), communication and collaboration among employees can enhance their knowledge sharing and creating activities in the workplace (Nonaka, von Krogh, & Voelpel, 2006). Creating and sharing knowledge, in turn, will contribute to building the organization's culture of learning (Iles, 1994), which will help the organization transform into the learning organization (Watkins & Marsick, 1993b). Within the learning organization, learning will thrive at the individual, team or organizational, and society levels, and this will move continuous learning forward in the workplace (Watkins & Marsick, 1993a). Schuller and Field (1998) assert that shared learning through communication is a critical factor for a learning society. Therefore, organizational support for communication and

collaboration will enhance mutual learning among employees and help a CU evolve into a learning society in which employees' lifelong learning takes place.

Second, the organization should clearly present a well-defined business strategy, vision, and mission. This is very important for organizational growth in that the provision of a specific way that the organization should move forward helps employees identify their existing and needed competencies (Prokesch, 1997). A CU can reflect the clear organization's business strategy, vision, and mission in its curriculum to align its learning activities with organizational goals and to enhance employees' as well as organizational competitiveness (Meister, 1998). Moreover, employees with a clear sense of purpose are able to know what they have to learn, and in turn, knowing their own educational needs is linked to motivation for their learning. A CU's sound curriculum reflecting the organization's business strategy, vision, and mission can act as a catalyst for motivating employees to attend CUs actively. Within CUs, individuals can plan and develop their own careers in organizations, and CUs can serve as a career ladder for employees (Allen, 2007; Gould, 2005).

Third, the organization should establish policies and systems for the prosperity of its CU. For instance, an organization may create systems by which individuals who actively participated in learning processes are rewarded for their learning activities (Watkins & Marsick, 1993a). An organization could also develop a

policy on admitting the credits earned from the CUs and link it to national policies. By doing so, credits acquired through a CU can be accredited by the nation, and the CU can be transformed into a higher education institute in which workers as adult learners can fulfill their continuous learning needs in their workplace. In addition, organizations should regard people who completed the curriculum of a CU as core-competent employees and support them to develop themselves continuously in the organization. Also, an organization can give promotion opportunities to people who have earned credits from CUs. These policies will affect employees' motivation for learning in the workplace and elevate their interest and participation in the CUs. The policies or systems that enable learning activities to take place in collaboration with field departments and that assure the opportunities for individuals to apply what they have learned in a CU to the workplace could also be helpful for the success of CUs (Clarke, 2005; Watkins & Marsick, 1993a).

Fourth, the organization should consider a means of evaluating the impact of learning activities in its CU on organizational performance (Abel & Li, 2012). In that a CU is established by an organization — regardless of whether it is for-profit or not-for-profit — whose main object is not education (Hawthorne et al., 1983), there might be an ultimate purpose of CUs beyond a purely educational one. Especially when an organization that owns a CU is for-profit, the CU's economic impact on the organizational financial profit

should be seriously considered. Like the case of the performance measurement system in higher education institutions (Lee & Lee, 2009), the cost of the investment in a CU should contribute to increasing organizational performance. By calculating return on investment (ROI), the CU's contribution to organizational financial profit should be recognized. Then, the CU can be recognized as an important entity increasing organizational performance by the CEO or executives and can receive more organizational support (Phillips & Phillips, 2005). Based on the organizational support, the CU will thrive in the organization, perform its roles faithfully, and ultimately contribute to satisfy members' learning needs, to enhance organizational performance, and to strengthen national competitiveness.

4.2 Limitations and Implications for Future Study

This study examined CUs' roles from the perspective of the three HRD levels. Based on this, the current study suggested a holistic CU model that includes all of the three perspectives of HRD. Although this study has significance in that the CU is considered from the three perspectives at the same time, the individual and community-societal HRD perspectives were not treated in as much detail as was the organizational HRD perspective. Hence, the future study will investigate CUs from the viewpoints of individual and community-societal levels of HRD in more detail and will specify the

holistic model proposed in this study.

In addition, this paper introduced only organizational roles as implications to promote a CU. Even though organizations have the primary ownership and responsibility of CUs, to move CU3 forward national supports in terms of systems and policies are necessary. Therefore, the future study will also suggest implications from the perspective of nations to foster a CU as an important means to nurture competent individual workers in the labor market and national workforce for the nation's competitiveness.

5. Conclusions

The current CUs play important roles for organizational performance, and by extension, for individual learning needs and national competitiveness. Based on the roles of CUs from these three perspectives, three CU models were reviewed, and a holistic CU model embracing all three models was proposed. The present study suggested that an organization's support is important for a CU to step up to a multifunctional institution that encompasses the roles from the three levels of the HRD perspectives. An organization should make an effort (a) to expand the opportunities of communication and collaboration among organizational members, (b) to declare organizational goals clearly to its members, (c) to establish organizational policies and systems for

the prosperity of its CU, and (d) to consider an effective way to evaluate the impact of learning activities in a CU on organizational performance.

Although traditional CU studies have focused on the organizational HRD aspect of CUs, CUs' characteristics as institutions for individual learners and the national workforce should also receive more attention. In the case of the transition from CU 1 to CU 2, a new approach from the perspective of not only the organizational level of HRD but also the individual level of HRD is needed to explain the partnership with traditional universities and the emphasis of individuals' learning needs. Furthermore, in the case of transitions from CU 1 and/or 2 to CU 3, examination of CUs from the community-societal level of HRD perspective is also necessary because national policies and systems are required to allow CUs to grant official degrees. When an organization creates its own CU, it is necessary that the organization take into account various factors that may strongly affect the success of the CU such as organizational strategy, culture, systems, individuals' needs, national policies, surrounding environments, and so forth. In conclusion, organization's critical roles in the development of CUs can assist CUs in becoming the core of knowledge management within the organization.

References

- [1] Abel, A. L. and Li, J. (2012), Exploring the corporate university phenomenon: Development and implementation of a comprehensive survey, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 23(1), 103-128.
- [2] Alavi, M. and Leidner, D. E. (2001), Review: Knowledge management and knowledge management systems: Conceptual foundations and research issues, *MIS Quarterly*, 25(1), 107-136.
- [3] Allen, M. (2002), What is a corporate university, and why should an organization have one? In M. Allen (Ed.), *The corporate university handbook: Designing, managing, and growing a successful program* (pp. 1-12), New York, NY: AMACOM.
- [4] Allen, M. (2007), What is a next-generation corporate university? In M. Allen (Ed.), *The next generation of corporate universities: Innovative approaches for developing people and expanding organizational capabilities* (pp. 3-16), San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- [5] Andresen, M. (2007), Diversity learning, knowledge diversity and inclusion: Theory and practice as exemplified by corporate universities, *Equal Opportunities International*, 26(8), 743-760.
- [6] Andresen, M. and Lichtenberger, B. (2007), The corporate university landscape in Germany, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 19(2), 109-123.
- [7] Barley, K. (2007), Learning as a competitive business variable, In M. Allen (Ed.), *The next generation of corporate universities:*

- Innovative approaches for developing people and expanding organizational capabilities* (pp. 39-60), San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- [8] Blass, E. (2005), The rise and rise of the corporate university, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(1), 58-74.
- [9] Buchbinder, H. and Newson, J. (1985), Corporate-university linkages and the scientific-technical revolution, *Interchange*, 16(3), 37-53.
- [10] Buchbinder, H. and Newson, J. (1990), Corporate-university linkages in Canada: Transforming a public institution, *Higher Education*, 20(4), 355-379.
- [11] Civi, E. (2000), Knowledge management as a competitive asset: A review, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 18(4), 166-174.
- [12] Clarke, N. (2005), Workplace learning environment and its relationship with learning outcomes in healthcare organizations, *Human Resource Development International*, 8(2), 185-205.
- [13] Coleman, J. S. (1988), Social capital in the creation of human capital, *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S95-S120.
- [14] Confessore, S. J. and Kops, W. J. (1998), Self-directed learning and the learning organization: Examining the connection between the individual and the learning environment, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(4), 365-375.
- [15] Cook, N. and Yanow, D. (2011), Culture and organizational learning, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(4), 362-379.
- [16] Cummings, T. G. and Worley, C. G. (2008), *Organization development & change* (9th ed.), Mason, OH: South-Western.
- [17] Dealtry, R. (2000a), Case research into the evolution of a corporate university development process, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(8), 342-357.
- [18] Dealtry, R. (2000b), Strategic directions in the management of the corporate university paradigm, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 12(4), 171-175.
- [19] Dealtry, R. (2001a), Frequently asked questions with reference to the corporate university, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 13(6), 254-259.
- [20] Dealtry, R. (2001b), Managing the transition to the corporate university: A synthesis of client research, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 13(5), 215-222.
- [21] Dealtry, R. (2008), Interim reflections on the corporate university and SME academy business development innovation and its diffusion, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 20(1), 71-78.
- [22] DeFilippo, D. and Pearl, S. (2012), Learning's External Brand, *Chief Learning Officer*, 11(4), 40-43.
- [23] Drucker, P. F. (1992), The new society of organizations, *Harvard Business Review*, 70(5), 95-104.
- [24] Earl, M. J. (1994), Knowledge as strategy: Reflections on Skandia International and Shorko Films, In C. Ciborra and T. Jelassi (Eds.), *Strategic information systems: A European perspective* (pp. 53-69), Chichester, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- [25] Eccles, G. (2004), Marketing the corporate university or enterprise academy, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 16(7), 410-418.
- [26] Edmondson, A. and Moingeon, B. (1996),

- When to learn how and when to learn why: Appropriate organizational learning processes as a source of competitive advantage, In B. Moingeon and A. Edmondson (Eds.), *Organizational learning and competitive advantage* (pp. 17-37), London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- [27] Fulmer, R. M. and Gibbs, P. A. (1998), Lifelong learning at the corporate university, *Career Development International*, 3(5), 177-184.
- [28] Garavan, T. N., McGuire, D., and David, O. (2004), Exploring human resource development: A levels of analysis approach, *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(4), 417-441.
- [29] Garvin, D. A. (1993), Building a learning organization, *Harvard Business Review*, 71(4), 78-91.
- [30] George-Leary, A. and Cohen, E. (2007), Building a holistic development framework, In M. Allen (Ed.), *The next generation of corporate universities: Innovative approaches for developing people and expanding organizational capabilities* (pp. 19-37), San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- [31] Gould, K. E. (2005), The corporate university: A model for sustaining an expert workforce in the human services, *Behavior Modification*, 29(3), 508-520.
- [32] Grenzer, J. W. (2006), *Developing and implementing a corporate university*, Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- [33] Hawthorne, E. M., Libby, P. A., and Nash, N. S. (1983), The emergence of corporate colleges, *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 31(4), 2-9.
- [34] Holland, P. and Pyman, A. (2006), Corporate universities: A catalyst for strategic human resource development? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(1), 19-31.
- [35] Iles, P. (1994), Developing learning environments: Challenges for theory, research and practice, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 18(3), 3-9.
- [36] Jansink, F., Kwakman, K., and Streumer, J. (2005), The knowledge-productive corporate university, *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(1), 40-57.
- [37] Janz, B. D. and Prasarnphanich, P. (2003), Understanding the antecedents of effective knowledge management: The importance of a knowledge-centered culture, *Decision Sciences*, 34(2), 351-384.
- [38] Jarvis, P. (2001), *Universities and corporate universities: The higher learning industry in global society*, London, United Kingdom: Kogan Page.
- [39] Kang, M. H. and You, J. W. (2008), A framework for open, flexible and distributed learning environment for higher education, *Knowledge Management Research*, 9(4), 17-33.
- 강명희, 유지원 (2008), 개방, 공유, 참여의 대학 교육환경 구축 사례, *지식경영연구*, 제 9권 제 4호, 17-33.
- [40] Landau, M. D. (2000), Corporate universities crack open their doors, *Journal of Business Strategy*, 21(3), 18-23.
- [41] Lee, Y. C. and Lee, S. S. (2009), *Diagnosis of performance measurement system of knowledge management: A case of university*, *Knowledge Management Research*, 10(1), 71-100.

- 이영찬, 이승석 (2009), 대학 지식경영 성과측정시스템의 진단 사례연구, 지식경영연구, 제 10권 제 1호, 71-100.
- [42] Meister, J. C. (1998), *Corporate universities: Lessons in building a world-class workforce*, New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- [43] Morin, L. and Renaud, S. (2004), Participation in corporate university training: Its effect on individual job performance, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 21(4), 295-306.
- [44] Nixon, J. C. and Helms, M. M. (2002), Corporate universities vs higher education institutions, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(4), 144-150.
- [45] Nonaka, I., Von Krogh, G., and Voelpel, S. (2006), Organizational knowledge creation theory: Evolutionary paths and future advances, *Organization Studies*, 27(8), 1179-1208.
- [46] Paton, R., Peters, G., Storey, J., and Taylor, S. (2005), Preface, In R. Paton, G. Peters, J. Storey, and S. Taylor (Eds.), *Handbook of corporate university development: Managing strategic learning initiatives in public and private domains* (pp. xi-xii), Burlington, VT: Gower Publishing.
- [47] Phillips, P. P. and Phillips, J. J. (2005), *Return on investment (ROI) basics*, Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training & Development.
- [48] Porter, M. E. (1996), What is strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74(6), 61-78.
- [49] Prince, C. and Beaver, G. (2001a), Facilitating organizational change: The role and development of the corporate university, *Strategic Change*, 10(4), 189-199.
- [50] Prince, C. and Beaver, G. (2001b), The rise and rise of the corporate university: The emerging corporate learning agenda, *The International Journal of Management Education*, 1(2), 17-26.
- [51] Prokesch, S. E. (1997), Unleashing the power of learning: An interview with British Petroleum's John Browne, *Harvard Business Review*, 75(5), 146-168.
- [52] Psacharopoulos, G. and Woodhall, M. (1985), *Education for development: An analysis of investment choices*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- [53] Qiao, J. X. (2009), Corporate universities in China: Processes, issues and challenges, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(2), 166-174.
- [54] Rademakers, M. (2005), Corporate universities: Driving force of knowledge innovation, *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 17(1/2), 130-136.
- [55] Ryan, L. (2007), Developing a qualitative understanding of university-corporate education partnerships, *Management Decision*, 45(2), 153-160.
- [56] Ryan, L. (2008), Lifelong learning through corporate universities in partnerships with traditional universities, In C. Wankel and R. DeFillippi (Eds.), *University and corporate innovations in lifelong learning* (pp. 1-14), Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- [57] Ryan, L. (2009), Exploring the growing phenomenon of university-corporate education partnerships, *Management Decision*, 47(8), 1313-1322.
- [58] Schein, E. H. (1990), Organizational culture, *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 109-119.
- [59] Schuller, T. and Field, J. (1998), Social capital,

human capital and the learning society, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 17(4), 226-235.

- [60] Watkins, K. E. and Marsick, V. J. (1993a), A framework for the learning organization, In K. E. Watkins and V. J. Marsick (Eds.), *Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systemic change* (pp. 3-22), San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- [61] Watkins, K. E. and Marsick, V. J. (1993b), Sculpting the learning organization: Consulting using action technologies, *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 58, 81-90.
- [62] Wiggens, W. (1990), Motorola U: When training becomes an education, *Harvard Business Review*, 68(4), 71-83.

● 저 자 소 개 ●



박 조 현 (Cho Hyun Park)

미국 Pennsylvania State University에서 Workforce Education and Development 전공으로 박사학위를 취득하고, 현재 삼성SDS 교육사업팀 HRD 수석컨설턴트로 재직 중이다. 주요 연구관심분야는 인적자원개발, 조직개발, 학습조직, 지식경영, 스마트러닝 등이다. Human Resource Development Quarterly, Human Resource Development International, Learning and Performance Quarterly 등의 학술지에 논문을 발표하였다.



오 정 록 (Jeong Rok Oh)

미국 University of Minnesota에서 Work and Human Resource Education 전공으로 박사학위를 취득하고, 현재 우송대학교 국제경영학부 조교수로 재직 중이다. 주요 연구관심분야는 인적자원개발, 지식경영, 학습조직, 경력개발 등이다. Human Resource Development International, Learning and Performance Quarterly, The Journal of Knowledge Economy and Knowledge Management 등의 학술지에 논문을 발표하였다.