Why Learning Organizations Often Struggle to Learn About Themselves

15.09.2026 14:45:57 | Management Insights, Lukas Michel | 0 Comments | Learning Industry

Why mastery requires inward and outward learning.

Educational institutions are built around knowledge.

They generate it.
They teach it.
They certify it.
They debate it.
They preserve it.
They renew it.

And yet, many institutions devoted to learning still struggle to learn about their own organization.

That is one of the most useful insights in the education chapter of *Patterns of Mastery*. The manuscript describes higher education as a sector with strong professional capability, high engagement, and excellent performance, but also with persistent bureaucracy, decentralized “kingdoms,” and management concentrated in department leaders who may be strong experts without equivalent management preparation.

That is the central tension.

Educational organizations are full of knowledge.

But they do not automatically turn that knowledge inward.

Why education often performs better than its design would suggest

The manuscript is clear that the education cluster is not weak.

Quite the opposite.

The typical educational organization operates at the performers maturity level and is described as highly successful in meeting objectives and goals. The sector shows high trust, high choice, high awareness, and high focus of attention, with correspondingly high speed and superior performance. In that sense, educational institutions already have many of the ingredients other sectors are still trying to build.

That matters because the leadership challenge in education is not basic repair.

It is hidden limitation inside visible strength.

The students are there.
The faculty are capable.
The mission is serious.
The work is meaningful.

But the organization can still be held back by the way it is led and coordinated.

The education pattern: hybrid purpose, hybrid design

The education chapter describes a particularly distinctive business model.

Educational institutions typically combine education, which has more exploitation traits, with research, which operates more in exploration mode. This creates a hybrid business model. Administrators and faculty try to understand student and employer needs while also supporting the open-ended logic of research.

This is a defining structural reality of higher education.

Teaching needs reliability.
Research needs openness.
Administration needs coordination.
Academic work needs autonomy.

All four are legitimate.

The challenge is not choosing one over the other.

The challenge is designing an organization that can support all of

them without fragmentation.

Why professional assemblies create both excellence and friction

The manuscript says educational institutions tend to function as professional assemblies. They are built around highly trained decentralized professionals, customized work, and standardization of skills rather than standardization of tasks. At the same time, decentralized structures — schools, departments, disciplines, chairs — create “kingdoms” that require coordination and often compete for budget, status, and recognition.

This is one of the clearest organizational tensions in education.

The same structure that protects expertise can also fragment the institution.

Academic quality depends on decentralized competence.

But institutional coherence becomes harder when each unit carries its own identity, priorities, and power base.

That is why education can feel highly professional and politically divided at the same time.

Why engagement is not the problem

The education chapter contains one of the strongest positive people profiles in the manuscript.

People in higher education organizations tend to be highly engaged, with strong trust, choice, awareness, and focus of attention. The manuscript notes that boredom is largely offset by almost endless opportunities for researchers and teachers. This is a genuine strength and one reason the sector performs so well.

That is important.

Because many organizational problems in education are not caused by disengaged people.

They are caused by underdesigned coordination around highly

engaged people.

Faculty and researchers usually care.
Academic administrators often care.
Professional staff often care.
Students certainly feel the consequences when alignment is weak.

The issue is not lack of engagement.

It is whether the operating system supports that engagement well enough.

The hidden barrier: bureaucracy still dominates

The manuscript is particularly sharp here.

It says educational organizations succeed on only three of the six criteria of competitive advantage. It explicitly identifies persistent bureaucracy and a traditional operating system that resists change and agility as dominant root causes of the capability barriers. It also notes that people-centric management practices have become essential precisely because bureaucracy still dominates the industry.

This is the key contradiction.

Higher education often speaks the language of inquiry, creativity, and intellectual freedom.

But internally, the organization may still rely on structures and routines that slow decision-making, resist agility, and make coordination harder than it should be.

So the institution becomes strong in expertise but weaker in organized movement.

Why academic leadership is a special challenge

The manuscript explains this with unusual precision.

It states that management in educational institutions is concentrated in department leaders who may be subject-matter experts with limited practical management experience or training. At the same time, education does better than healthcare in reconciling expert and managerial roles because academic institutions often combine management and faculty into positions such as deans or chairs. Their subject-matter expertise is essential to success.

This is a very particular leadership problem.

Academic institutions often solve legitimacy by appointing respected experts into leadership.

That has real advantages.

But it also creates a structural risk:

the institution may assume that academic excellence is enough to produce management excellence.

It is not.

Deans, chairs, and heads of school may understand the discipline deeply and still need stronger organizational, coordination, and managerial capabilities to lead the whole institution well.

Why the real issue is coordination, not commitment

The manuscript places most educational institutions in the delegation life-cycle stage. In this phase, decentralized academic and administrative structures create a crisis of control. To move forward, institutions need an operating system that strengthens dynamic capabilities and coordination among departments. The text argues that higher education needs to move beyond traditional employee engagement and design a Leadership Toolbox that fits the operating system more precisely.

That is the decisive point.

The next challenge in education is not to convince people to care more.

It is to coordinate capable people better.

That means the institution has to become more intelligent about how knowledge flows, how priorities align, how departments collaborate, and how systems support rather than burden academic work.

Why diversity and inclusion matter strategically here

The education chapter includes an expert reflection that fits this sector especially well.

It describes diversity and inclusion not as moral language alone, but as an organizational-learning resource. Variety of backgrounds, capabilities, experience, and values becomes a competitive benefit when people can contribute without being forced to conform to prevailing norms. Leadership that supports transparency, collaboration, cooperation, and exchange strengthens this.

This matters because higher education depends on intellectual diversity.

An institution cannot claim to be a place of learning while building systems that narrow how people contribute.

So diversity and inclusion are not secondary themes here.

They are part of how educational organizations become more capable of learning and coordinating.

What leaders should look for in educational institutions

Leaders in education should ask harder questions than whether faculty are committed and students are being taught.

Those questions matter.

But the deeper questions are these:

Where is bureaucracy still resisting change and agility?

Where are schools, departments, or disciplines functioning as kingdoms rather than coordinated parts of a larger institution?
Where are highly engaged people still constrained by traditional systems?
Where are academic leaders carrying formal authority without enough management preparation?
Where is the institution strong in expertise but weaker in dynamic coordination?
Where do long-established norms still prevent the organization from learning about itself?

These are the real development questions in education.

The development path: people-potential plus dynamic operations

The manuscript's direction is very clear.

Educational institutions need to implement people-first practices that align systems and leadership with culture, and they need dynamic operations for coordination capabilities. The text states that moving from good to mastery requires going beyond traditional engagement and developing people-centric and dynamic capabilities that facilitate knowledge sharing throughout the organization.

That does not mean weakening academic autonomy.

It means strengthening the institution's ability to coordinate around it.

In practice, that means:

better alignment between leadership, systems, and culture,
better coordination among departments,
stronger knowledge sharing across boundaries,
more precise management capability in academic leadership roles,
and enough courage to challenge long-established norms.

That is how an educational institution becomes better at learning about itself.

The first step: create your own Organization Twin

The most practical first step is not another committee.

It is to create your own Organization Twin.

Through a Structured Reflection — a standardized online questionnaire that takes about 15 minutes — you create a first evidence-based representation of how your institution currently works.

This produces two practical views:

The Capability Profile, which makes visible the broader organizational pattern: strategy, business model, organizational form, management context, growth stage, operating capabilities, and competitive barriers.

The Leadership Scorecard, which reveals how systems, leadership, culture, and success interact, and whether the institution supports understanding, thinking, delivery, engagement, and meaningful boundaries.

Together, they help leaders see whether their educational organization is truly coordinating its knowledge well — or quietly limited by bureaucracy, fragmented structures, and inherited norms.

Not as a judgment.
Not as a ranking.
Not as criticism of individuals.

But as preparation for a Guided Clarity Session.

Educational mastery begins when institutions learn inwardly as well as outwardly

Educational institutions are meant to advance knowledge.

The question is whether they can apply that same seriousness to

understanding their own management, leadership, and coordination patterns.

That is why learning organizations so often struggle to learn about themselves.

And that is also why the next step toward mastery in education is not more mission language.

It is better organizational design.

- Version zum Drucken
- Per E-Mail versenden
- Newsletter abonnieren

- Twittern

No comments yet.