#### Copyright

"The Centralised Development of Elearning" by Raymond John O'Brien is licensed under <u>CC BY-SA 4.0</u>. This is a free cultural works licence that allows sharing and adaptation under the following terms.

Attribution – appropriate credit must be given. Provide a link to the license,

and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner,

but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same licence as the original.

No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the licence permits.



# The Centralised Development of Elearning Resources

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the

Masters of Education (Elearning)

at Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand.

Raymond John O'Brien

2016

#### Abstract

This thesis explores the centralisation of elearning resource development in New Zealand Institutes of Technology and Polytechnics (ITPs). There was a significant gap in existing research relating to the organisation of elearning resource development. The tertiary education sector has been subject to significant and rapid change with associated challenges. Centralisation has been mooted as contributing to a solution for these challenges. The lack of research around centralised development of resources makes it difficult to support such a claim. To address this, the thesis explored three areas: the extent to which centralised development of elearning has been adopted, the perceived advantages and disadvantages of a centralised model, and the attitudes teaching staff hold towards a centralised model.

The study applied a mixed method convergent parallel research design. This drew on data from interviews with elearning managers and from a survey of teaching staff.

Findings established that three categories of centralisation exist in New Zealand ITPs; decentralised, centralised and highly centralised. The typical composition and functions of the centralised teams were defined for each category. The findings supported the perceived advantages and disadvantages identified in existing research, but also identified additional advantages. These included better project management, more clarity around roles and responsibilities, that elearning resources produced by a centralised unit was more student focussed and specific cost saving information. Levels of understanding around the financial advantages of a centralised model were inconsistent. The attitudes teaching staff held towards a centralised model were seen as to some extent ambivalent. Attitudes were more positive where the staff already operated within a centralised model.

iii

#### Centralisation of elearning Resource Development

The thesis makes a significant contribution where there was a gap in existing research. This new knowledge is directly relevant to current decisions around cost of development, composition of central teams, expectations when adopting a centralised model, and planning to centralise or decentralise. These findings are both timely and significant as recent mergers, qualification reviews and the expectation to innovate and adopt new models of delivery increase the need for more efficient solutions to creating elearning resources.

#### Acknowledgements

Conducting this research and writing this thesis has resulted in plenty of highs and lows over the past two years. It has been a privilege to have been helped by so many great people along that way.

First, I must thank my family. Without my wife setting the example and forging ahead with her studies, I am not sure I would have even got past the obstacles that the ethics approval process presented to me. To my amazing kids, I hope I have role modelled the need to keep learning throughout your life and apologise for being the "grumpy Dad" on too many occasions. I'm sure you will get your own back over the next few years.

Secondly my managers over the last few years. Chris Warburton whose fault it is that I even considered elearning as a specialism and Becca Black whose perpetual positivity and allowance for flexibility has enabled me to get through some of the lowest points.

Thirdly, I thank all the participants in the study—elearning managers and teaching staff alike, for their honest contributions. Their input into this study will hopefully contribute to New Zealand tertiary education being ready for the challenging time ahead.

There are many people who have influenced my study perhaps without realising it. Dr Lesley Gill unknowingly stopped me from withdrawing from the programme with just a few words of wisdom. Dr Dilani Gethera's gentle encouragement kept a smile on my face and Doris Lancaster has kept me in line when the rebel in me tried to take over. Great people to be surrounded by.

٧

#### Centralisation of elearning Resource Development

I am also so incredibly grateful for my supervisors who have advised, supported and guided me throughout the entire research process. Dr Amy Wilson, provided the pragmatic grounding. Dr Maggie Hartnett provided the big picture questioning that kept me focussed on the why of this project. Dr Peter Rawlins was able to bring much clarity to my own thinking.

While the experience of writing a thesis has left me with many questions around traditional tertiary methods, and whether they are effective in impacting on capabilities beyond research skills, I am incredibly grateful that I have been in the privileged position to experience it.

## Table of Contents

Copyright	i
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	х
List of Tables	xi
List of Appendices	xii
Chapter One: The Centralised Development of Elearning Resources	1
Introduction	1
Rationale for study	2
Purpose	2
Research boundaries	2
Structure of the thesis	3
Chapter Two: Literature Review	4
What is elearning?	4
What is elearning resource development?	7
What is centralised development?	8
Reported advantages and disadvantages of centralised elearning development	14
Attitudes to centralised development of elearning resources	17

Centralisation of elearning Resource Development

Conclusion	19
Chapter Three: Methodology	20
Adoption of a Pragmatic Paradigm	20
Rationale for Selecting a Mixed Method Design	22
Rationale for Selecting a Convergent Parallel Design	23
Description of Data Collection Methods	27
Ethical Issues in Data Collection	27
Qualitative Data Collection: Managers' Interviews	34
Qualitative Data Analysis	37
Quantitative Data Collection: Educators' Survey	39
Quantitative Data Analysis	44
Summary: Methodology	45
Chapter Four: Findings	47
Research Question 1: To what extent has the centralisation of development of	
elearning resources been adopted?	47
Research Question 2: What advantages and disadvantages do staff see in the	
centralised development of elearning resources?	65
Research Question 3: What attitudes do teaching staff hold towards centralised	d
development of elearning resources?	79
Summary of findings	96
Chapter Five: Discussion	98

Introduction	98
Research Question 1: To what extent has the centralisation of development o elearning resources been adopted?	f 98
Research Question 2: What advantages and disadvantages do staff see in the centralised development of elearning resources.	101
Research Question 3: What attitudes do teaching staff hold towards centralise development of elearning resources?	ed 104
Summary	105
Chapter Six: Conclusions	106
Introduction	106
Contribution to Research	107
Implications of Research	108
Limitations	112
Opportunities for further research	112
Final thoughts	114
References	116
Appendices	137

# List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Summary of convergent mixed method design.	26
Figure 4.1: Combination of factors used to describe a centralised model	48
Figure 4.2: Number of elearning managers that identified each factor	49
Figure 4.3: Extent of adoption of centralised model	50
Figure 4.4: Functional centralisation	55
Figure 4.5: Range of roles adopted in centralised teams	60
Figure 4.6: Territorial centralisation	61
Figure 4.7: Usefulness of a centralised model	66
Figure 4.8: Words used to describe teachers' attitudes	86

## List of Tables

Table 4.1 Survey data relevant to extent of centralisation	51
Table 4.2 Survey data relevant to extent of centralisation	53
Table 4 3 Team size in each category of centralisation	58
Table 4.4 Survey questions relating to perceived usefulness	65
Table 4.5 Survey data relevant to advantage for financial control	68
Table 4.6 Spearman's rank order correlation of demographic factors and perceived	
usefulness data.	73
Table 4.7 Survey data relating to perceived ease of use	75
Table 4.8 Survey data relevant to attitude	80
Table 4.9 Spearman's rank order analysis of demographic data and data relating to attitu	ıdes
to centralisation.	81
Table 4.10 Spearman's rank order analysis of data relating to attitudes towards	
centralisation and extent of centralisation of the organisation in which the teacher work	ed.
	83
Table 4.11 Elearning managers' descriptions of teacher's attitudes	86
Table 4.12 Survey data relevant to behavioural intentions	88
Table 4.13 Spearman's rank order analysis of data relating to behavioural intentions towa	ards
centralisation and demographic information.	89
Table 4.14 Spearman's rank order analysis of data relating to behavioural intentions towa	ards
centralisation and extent of centralisation.	90
Table 4.15 Behavioural intent of elearning managers	93
Table 5.1 Description of typical centralised teams	99

# List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Glossary	138
Appendix 2: Letters to Chief Executives of New Zealand Polytechnic Institutions	139
Appendix 3: Interview consent form	142
Appendix 4: Information sheet for interview participants	143
Appendix 5: Interview schedule	145
Appendix 6: Confidentiality Agreement	147
Appendix 7: Transcript release form	148
Appendix 8: Draft email invitation from eLearning Manager to participate in survey	149
Appendix 9: Information sheet for survey participants	150
Appendix 10: Survey Questions	151
Appendix 11: Statistical Appendix- Internal reliability	161