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Abstract
Societal expectations of higher education (HE) have changed significantly in the past quarter century without equivalent increases in funding. These changes leave a shortfall between the outcomes HE is expected to provide, the experiences it aspires to offer, and those it can deliver. This shortfall has contributed to HE’s McDonaldization (Ritzer, 1996). Although flexible delivery and technology-enhanced learning are common strategies to narrow this shortfall, I argue that they can actually increase its breadth. I apply Simons’ model of levers of organizational design to show how HE can effect cultural changes to help transform this shortfall into an entrepreneurial gap, thus offering HE a possible future beyond the golden arches.

“Can you tell me what we’re waiting for, Señor?”– Bob Dylan

Expectations of Higher Education and the Shortfall of Resources

In this era of knowledge economies and societies, many governments now recognize that “universities are critical to the national innovation system” (Australian Research Council, 2008, p. 2) and hence to prosperity within a highly competitive globalised market for intellectual capital and intellectual property (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2004; World Bank Group, 2002). Meanwhile, following widespread shifts toward neo-liberalism and “technological and economic reductionism” (Bullen, Robb, & Kenway, 2004, p. 7), many governments have shifted roles from providing and funding elitist-HE towards regulating mass-HE (Gee & Lankshear, 1995; Moreau & Leathwood, 2006). Expectations of HE have therefore undergone significant changes (Boarini, Martins, Strauss, de la Maisonneuve, & Nicoletti, 2008). Characteristic of these changed expectations are increases in academic capitalism, accountability, massification, and McDonaldization (see Figure 1).
Figure 1: Changes to Expectations of Higher Education in this Generation

Academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) describes a shift in the aspirations of research. Humboldt’s vision of universities searching for truth and knowledge (Nybom, 2007) has been replaced by universities searching for the production and commercial exploitation of intellectual property (World Bank Group, 2002), to enrich academics, subsidize universities (Bok, 2003), and fund economies (Australian Research Council, 2008). Quantitative assessment of research reduces HE’s freedom to self-define goals, policy or quality assurance for research (see Henderson, Shurville, & Fernstrom, 2009).

A new culture of accountability of both the quality of learning and teaching (Kis, 2005) and its fitness for the labour market (Boarini et al., 2008) has mainstreamed androgogic and student-centred learning styles (see Browne & Shurville, 2007). While this shift may be overdue, its culture of regulatory compliance leaves HE with less room to self-define policy, practice, and quality assurance of learning and teaching.

Massification and McDonaldization of HE refer to the unprecedented growth in student numbers and the oversight of their preparation for the workforce (Baker, 2007; Ritzer, 1996; Scott, 1998a; Trow 2006). Some critiques of massification and McDonaldization have been profound:

Ritzer’s thesis is that western societies are being characterized by a desire for rationality, efficiency, predictability and control. McDonaldization is the process by which...fast food restaurant principles are applied to a wide range of production activities and service provision. Ritzer argues that HEIs are no different from other service industries and consumers require the same standardization, reliability and predictability in terms of [HE] provision as they do when purchasing a burger meal. (Lomas, 2002, p. 73)
In sum these changes mean that the purposes and regulation of the ivory towers can be hard to distinguish from those of the golden arches.

Unfortunately, as Figure 1 also shows, policy makers have challenged HE to meet these expectations without commensurate increases in funding (Herbst, 2007; Johnes & Johnes, 2008). This challenge creates a shortfall between available resources, societal expectations and HE’s own aspirations. Society requires HE to narrow this shortfall via innovation and entrepreneurialism (see Figure 2). However, in terms of double loop learning, regulation offers HE the leeway to change its action strategies to increase efficiency rather than to shift its high-level control variables to enhance effectiveness (Argyris, 1992).

Figure 2: Actual and Ideal Levels of Funding against Expectations of HE

Flexible Delivery and Technology-Enhanced Learning in Compliance and Cost Conscious Cultures

This shortfall has created compliance and cost conscious cultures where institutions are forced to undergo radical transformations in efficiency to either achieve or transcend societal expectations (Evaline, 2004). Arguably, despite this shortfall, much of HE has set its sights beyond the golden arches to pursue a post-Fordist (Nunan, 1996) model of flexible, mass-personalisation where “the winners design customized products and services on time, on demand faster and more perfectly than their global competition” (Gee & Lankshear, 1995, p. 6; see also Shurville, O’Grady, & Mayall, 2008).

Flexible delivery (FD) is key to meeting societal expectations (see Seddon & Angus, 2000). Canonically, FD provides “students with flexible access to learning experiences in terms of at least one of the following: time, place, pace, learning style, content, assessment and pathways” (Chen, 2003, p. 25). Flexible delivery facilitates mass-HE which is integrated with work — which is itself increasingly flexible (Hall & Atkinson, 2006) — and shifts costs and responsibility from society to the individual (Gee & Lankshear, 1995; Moreau & Leathwood, 2006). So in economic terms, FD enables students to attend HE and earn wages to pay their fees.
Flexible delivery also provides a framework for androgogic learning and teaching approaches that prepares learners for lifelong learning (Browne & Shurville, 2007) and is a means to implement the teaching-research nexus (Boyer Commission, 1999). It can also facilitate education for those with disabilities (Getzel, 2008). As Nunan observed, “while part of the framework for flexible delivery may be borrowed from economics, there are progressive interpretations of flexible learning which are structured around competing social and humanist values which have educational expression through concepts such as constructivism, open education, student-centred learning, life-long learning, deep learning, and accessible learning structures” (1996). So FD is an educational philosophy with which to move beyond McDonaldization and implement Nunan’s ethical post-Fordist visions.

Flexible, post-Fordist delivery calls for a Copernican transition within HE because it reverses the loci of control and convenience from academics and institutions to learners. Unfortunately, this reversal often places substantial demands upon academics, professional staff and, ironically, the learners themselves (Chen, 2003). So although FD provides a way to increase access to HE, a path to improved learning and teaching, and a philosophy for post-Fordist HE, it can also tend to widen this shortfall between resources, expectation and visions (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: The Enlarged Shortfall brought by Post-Fordist Flexible Delivery of Mass-HE

Some believe that the shortfall can be reduced by systems for TEL that offer educational and institutional flexibility (Balacheff, Ludvigsen, deJong, Lazonder, & Barnes, 2009; Conole & Oliver, 2006; Laurillard, Oliver, Watson, & Hoppe, 2009; Shurville et al., 2008). In Australia, for example, the application of ICT/TEL to academic and business process has recently been shown to produce cost improvements in the order of 3.3% across all Australian universities — with a range of 1.8% to 13.0% (Worthington & Lee, 2008). Moreover, some argue that TEL can mediate new educational experiences:

Our perspective. . . is not focused on efficiency in terms of using technology to accelerate learning processes by faster delivery and distribution of learning materials. It is rather oriented towards the role of technology to enable new types of learning experiences and to enrich existing learning scenarios (Laurillard et al., 2009, p. 289).
However, the price of TEL can — oft-times erroneously — be seen to be a driver for cost conscious senior managers when the reality is more complex:

. . .unlike conventional forms of course delivery which require physical plant of limited capacity, many Internet-based e-learning courses have theoretically unlimited capacities. If the substantial initial costs of course creation can be invested then there is the potential for significant return on investment. . .an attractive proposition to the senior managers of universities beset by the pressures discussed earlier (Williams, 2006, p. 515).

So, FD mediated by TEL has been widely and perhaps naively perceived as a means for HE to enable reductions of the cost of provision of McDondaldsized education (Roberts, 1993) and, more tenuously, to enable flexible, post-Fordist mass-HE (Laurillard, 2007), when it can actually be more expensive and labour intensive to implement than traditional approaches (Guri-Rosenblit, 2005) (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: The Enlarged Shortfall brought by Costs and Transformational Requirements of ICT/TEL for FD

Setting Institutional ‘Levers’ for Double Loop Learning

Simons invented a model to (a) help organizations to design effective roles in terms of resource allocation, entrepreneurialism and double-loop learning; and (b) set appropriate cultural expectations for collaboration and cooperation (2005). It contains four levers which can be set independently from low to high (see Figure 5).
Figure 5: Simons’ Model of the Levers of Organizational Design

Lever 1 sets the *span of resources*, which sets the range of resources for which an individual is given decision rights and held accountable for performance.

Lever 2 sets the *span of accountability* (which I refer to as the *span of freedom of accountability*), which sets the range of trade-offs affecting the measures used to evaluate a manager’s achievements. With a wide span, individuals can, for example, refine their goals — in harmony with organizational strategy and policies — to increase the effectiveness of the targets they are changing and thus make their work more effective and efficient. Having a high setting is like having the freedom to change the control variable in double-loop learning (Argyris, 1992).

Lever 3 sets the *span of influence*, which sets the width of the net that an individual needs to cast in collecting data, probing for new information, and attempting to influence the work of others.

Lever 4 sets the *span of support*, which sets the amount of informal help/goodwill anyone can expect to receive across the organizational units.

The positions for levers 3 and 4 are set by example from the organization’s leaders and by rewarding behaviors that match the desired settings.

Simons argues that reining in the *span of resources* while simultaneously loosening the *span of accountability* creates his *entrepreneurial gap*. This entrepreneurial gap encourages individuals to solve problems in resource-light ways by practicing innovation and double-loop learning. This disparate pair of settings for *resources* and *freedom of accountability* can be enabled by simultaneously setting the spans of *influence* and *support* to high values. These simultaneous high settings mean that individuals and
departments across the organization are expected to contribute knowledge and goodwill to innovative practice and join innovative initiatives (see Figure 6). The cultural outcome of collegiality means that individuals and units who are narrowing the entrepreneurial gap do not have to fear undermining or other pathological behaviours.

Due to its cultural history as a collegiate environment (Becher & Trowler, 2001), HE is in a good position to set higher spans of influence and support than might be achieved in industry. My thesis is that if institutions can implement high settings for these levers, then some of the shortfall might be transformed into an entrepreneurial gap, with opportunities for innovation and entrepreneurship. This brings us to how stakeholders in FD and TEL can set them.

Adjusting the span of resources: this setting is largely externally imposed by public funding. However, academics and educational technologists can apply expert power to ensure that chosen human and technical resources are fit for their purpose. Maximizing this constraint can entail engaging with change initiatives and winning over Information Technology Services (ITSS) to support innovative solutions. The most important considerations are a combination of educational and institutional flexibility in educational software (Shurville et al., 2008) and participation in development and deployment of services (Shurville & Williams, 2005). Senior educational technologists are starting to acquire new influence within ITSS and senior management so that they can affect human resources, purchasing, support strategies and technological choices (Shurville, Browne, & Whitaker, 2009).

Adjusting the span of freedom of accountability: the setting for this lever is largely externally imposed by regulation of HE. Academics and senior educational technologists can lobby externally for changes to policies for managing learning and teaching and
research. Managers and senior managers can contribute by applying the settings for the lever of influence and support to be discussed below to enable academics and educational technologists to work with colleagues from local, national and international communities of practice to lobby for evidenced change.

Adjusting the spans of influence and support: academics and educational technologists can help to widen these settings by establishing and attending meetings of special interest groups across the campus and beyond. They can also establish and take part in local, national and international mentoring schemes and contribute learning designs to social networking sites, such as the LAMS repository (Shurville et al., 2008). Senior academics and senior educational technologists carry sufficient expert and legitimate power to influence local policy on such initiatives. It is a matter of choosing to prioritize being an agent for this particular change. As the lever of support is set by modeling and rewarding appropriate behaviors, it is essential that academics continue with the tradition of collegiate practice and that educational technologists, who have acquired new found strategic importance (Shurville et al., 2009), establish a code of conduct that prioritizes similar collegiality and transparent allegiance to theory.

Conclusion

Choosing to engage more deeply with a collegiate model of institutional culture in the face of mounting workloads is not easy. Nor is it a ‘nice to have.’ If you accept the arguments made above, then fundamental changes have taken place concerning who sets the positions for two of the levers that govern our experience of HE and, more importantly, the experience of up to 50% of our fellow citizens. It is important that academic and professional stakeholders in FD and TEL choose to wrest and retain control of the remaining levers and give them an occasional affirmative nudge. To do so, they need to model behaviors and engage in initiatives that might transform the shortfall between resources, expectations and vision into an entrepreneurial gap. In turn this transformation might help HE to offer everyone a life beyond the golden arches.
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