

**‘FALLING BEHIND’: A GROUNDED THEORY
OF UNCRITICAL DECISION MAKING**

By

Jonathan Gordon MacLeod Pratt

**A thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

School of Management, Faculty of Business

University of Technology, Sydney

December, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of candidate

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have provided support, encouragement, training and assistance since the beginning of my candidature as a Masters by Thesis student in March 2002. Within the university, I am grateful to my Head of School, Associate Professor Anne Ross-Smith, for her wisdom in encouraging a focused pursuit of this thesis during my employment as an Associate Lecturer and Lecturer in the School of Management. Associate Professor Anne Ross-Smith also marshalled various university resources to facilitate my completion, particularly the acquisition of additional computing resources after two home burglaries in 2006. I am also thankful for her support, with Professor Ian Palmer, towards the awarding of two doctoral completion scholarships within the university, which enabled me to work full time on this research during spring 2005 and 2006. Professor Jenny Edwards also assisted by graciously reviewing a draft of this thesis and providing many valuable suggestions. I would also like to acknowledge the Masters and Doctoral Assessment panels, for providing me with constructive feedback on early research proposals.

The coursework training program for new research students in the Faculty has been second to none. Professor Stewart Clegg and Dr John Crawford provided a comprehensive introduction to the management and methodology literatures, while fostering the development of foundational research skills through various reading and writing tasks. It was during these classes that I had opportunity to explore and test the foundations of this research.

I have also treasured the long term support of my two supervisors, Associate Professor Judy Johnston and Professor Shirley Alexander, who watched patiently over my apprenticeship as a researcher, providing me with opportunities to test ideas, make mistakes, and develop my own research agenda. I am particularly thankful that they allowed me the freedom to pursue research that I found interesting, and for taking the time to engage with my work over the last six years.

Three external examiners assessed this thesis and deserve my thanks. Their suggestions improved the quality of this research immensely. I am therefore grateful for the many comments they provided.

Many academics and university managers at other Australian and overseas universities were also consulted and interviewed as part of this research project. Without their generous contributions of

time, advice and relevant materials, it would not have been possible to carry out much of this empirical research.

There have also been countless other university staff and friends who provided encouragement and light relief during a long and sometimes difficult research journey. Thank you for your friendship during this period.

I count myself fortunate to also belong to a loving and supportive family. My father has been a faithful source of advice for many years, particularly as I have embarked upon an academic career not dissimilar to his own. My mother has made countless sacrifices over the years for her five boys, some of which we are only now beginning to recognise. My wife Emily has provided incalculable indirect support during this research candidature, as a silent partner in this research endeavour. After long days in the office, I counted it pure delight to return home each day and unwind with my wife and sons Xavier and Silas. Without the support of my immediate and extended family, this thesis would have been neither possible, nor enjoyable.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly to me, I would like to acknowledge my God who has sustained me throughout this challenging period.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------|
| CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP/ORIGINALITY | II |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | III |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | V |
| TABLE OF FIGURES..... | X |
| ABSTRACT | XIII |
| CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH PROBLEM..... | 1 |
| AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION | 1 |
| ADOPTION OF LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS | 4 |
| UNCRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE MERIT OF LEARNING MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS? | 6 |
| CONSEQUENCES OF UNCRITICAL EXAMINATION | 9 |
| SHORTCOMINGS IN EXPLAINING UNCRITICAL EXAMINATION..... | 11 |
| CONTRIBUTION TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION LITERATURE..... | 12 |
| <i>Research Problem</i> | 13 |
| <i>Research Questions</i> | 13 |
| <i>Contribution to the Higher Education Literature</i> | 13 |
| CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY | 16 |
| RESEARCH FRAMEWORK | 16 |
| <i>Justification for a Critical Theory Framework</i> | 16 |
| <i>Justification for Qualitative Research</i> | 21 |
| <i>Justification for Qualitative Case Studies</i> | 22 |
| DATA COLLECTION..... | 24 |
| <i>Selection of Unit of Analysis</i> | 24 |
| <i>Selection and Justification of University Cases</i> | 24 |
| <i>Data Collection Instruments</i> | 33 |
| DATA ANALYSIS..... | 42 |
| <i>Grounded Theory</i> | 43 |
| <i>The Case Study Framework</i> | 50 |
| <i>Coding and NVivo</i> | 53 |
| <i>Researcher Bias</i> | 53 |
| EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF THIS RESEARCH | 57 |
| <i>Recognising the Social Construction of Reality</i> | 57 |
| <i>Evaluating the Quality of this Research</i> | 58 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Analytical Delimitations</i> | 66 |
| <i>Commitment to Ethical Research</i> | 67 |
| CHAPTER THREE: CASE STUDY ONE – ‘SUBURBAN UNIVERSITY’ | 69 |
| NATURE OF CASE EVIDENCE | 69 |
| AN INTRODUCTION TO SUBURBAN UNIVERSITY | 72 |
| <i>Size and Scope</i> | 72 |
| <i>Structure and Key Relationships</i> | 72 |
| <i>Institutional History and Identity</i> | 72 |
| UNSUPPORTED ACADEMIC EXPERIMENTATION | 74 |
| ‘FALLING BEHIND’ | 77 |
| ‘CATCHING UP’ | 80 |
| <i>Restructuring</i> | 81 |
| <i>Initial Evaluation of Online Learning Platforms</i> | 84 |
| <i>‘Fast-Tracking’ Adoption Among the Faculties</i> | 88 |
| SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL SOURCES OF INFLUENCE | 96 |
| <i>Major External Influences</i> | 97 |
| <i>Major Internal Influences</i> | 101 |
| IMPACT OF CHANGES AT SUBURBAN UNIVERSITY | 105 |
| <i>Organisational Resources</i> | 105 |
| <i>Learning and Teaching</i> | 106 |
| <i>Organisational Learning</i> | 108 |
| <i>Legitimacy of Adoption</i> | 109 |
| <i>Pace of Adoption</i> | 110 |
| <i>Stability of Adoption</i> | 111 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDY TWO – ‘METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY’ | 113 |
| NATURE OF CASE EVIDENCE | 113 |
| AN INTRODUCTION TO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY | 116 |
| <i>Size and Scope</i> | 116 |
| <i>Structure and Key Relationships</i> | 116 |
| <i>Institutional History and Identity</i> | 116 |
| CENTRALLY SUPPORTED ACADEMIC EXPERIMENTATION | 117 |
| ‘ONE OF THE BEST UNIVERSITIES IN THE WORLD’ | 119 |
| ‘MAINSTREAM THE DIGITAL REVOLUTION’ OR BE ‘LEFT BEHIND’ | 120 |
| CATCHING UP | 123 |
| <i>Development of Multimedia Fund</i> | 123 |
| <i>Metropolitan Online as Emergent Strategy</i> | 126 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Restructuring</i> | 127 |
| <i>Evaluations of Learning Management Systems</i> | 129 |
| <i>Implementing Change Across the University</i> | 137 |
| SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL SOURCES OF INFLUENCE..... | 143 |
| <i>Major External Influences</i> | 143 |
| <i>Major Internal Influences</i> | 147 |
| IMPACT OF CHANGES AT METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY..... | 151 |
| <i>Organisational Resources</i> | 151 |
| <i>Learning and Teaching</i> | 152 |
| <i>Organisational Learning</i> | 155 |
| <i>Legitimacy of Adoption</i> | 156 |
| <i>Pace of Adoption</i> | 157 |
| <i>Stability of Adoption</i> | 158 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDY THREE – ‘REGIONAL UNIVERSITY’ | 160 |
| NATURE OF CASE EVIDENCE..... | 160 |
| AN INTRODUCTION TO REGIONAL UNIVERSITY..... | 163 |
| <i>Size and Scope</i> | 163 |
| <i>Structure and Key Relationships</i> | 163 |
| <i>Institutional History and Identity</i> | 163 |
| CENTRALLY SUPPORTED ACADEMIC EXPERIMENTATION..... | 165 |
| ‘MULTI-LOCATION TEACHING’..... | 166 |
| <i>The Australian Distance Education Consortium</i> | 166 |
| <i>The Countryville Campuses</i> | 169 |
| <i>The Teaching and Educational Technologies Unit</i> | 175 |
| <i>Institutional Commitment to ‘Flexible Delivery’</i> | 176 |
| <i>Multiple Evaluations of Learning Management Systems</i> | 177 |
| <i>Influence from Other Universities</i> | 183 |
| <i>Encouraging Adoption Among Staff</i> | 185 |
| SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL SOURCES OF INFLUENCE..... | 190 |
| <i>Major External Influences</i> | 190 |
| <i>Major Internal Influences</i> | 192 |
| IMPACT OF CHANGES AT REGIONAL UNIVERSITY..... | 196 |
| <i>Organisational Resources</i> | 196 |
| <i>Teaching and Learning</i> | 198 |
| <i>Organisational Learning</i> | 199 |
| <i>Legitimacy of Adoption</i> | 200 |
| <i>Pace of Adoption</i> | 201 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Stability of Adoption</i> | 202 |
| CHAPTER SIX: OBSERVING AND EXPLAINING UNCRITICAL EVALUATION..... | 204 |
| INTRODUCTION | 204 |
| COMPARATIVE UNIVERSITY CHANGE CONTEXTS | 205 |
| RESEARCH Q1: PARTIES INVOLVED..... | 208 |
| <i>Suburban University</i> | 211 |
| <i>Metropolitan University</i> | 212 |
| <i>Regional University</i> | 213 |
| <i>Cross-Case Analysis</i> | 213 |
| RESEARCH Q2: PROCESSES OF EVALUATION AND ADOPTION..... | 217 |
| <i>Evaluation Processes</i> | 217 |
| <i>Adoption Processes</i> | 222 |
| RESEARCH Q3: IMPACT ON VARIOUS UNIVERSITY OUTCOMES | 226 |
| <i>Organisational Resources</i> | 226 |
| <i>Learning and Teaching</i> | 229 |
| <i>Organisational Learning</i> | 231 |
| <i>Legitimacy of Adoption</i> | 232 |
| <i>Pace of Adoption</i> | 232 |
| <i>Stability of Adoption</i> | 234 |
| RESEARCH Q4: INFLUENCE OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS..... | 235 |
| <i>Internal Factors</i> | 236 |
| <i>External Factors</i> | 246 |
| <i>Influence on Parties, Processes and Outcomes</i> | 255 |
| <i>Relationships Between Internal and External Factors</i> | 261 |
| RESPONSE TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM: A GROUNDED THEORY..... | 270 |
| GROUNDED THEORY AND INSTITUTIONAL THEORY..... | 277 |
| CONCLUSION | 283 |
| CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS | 285 |
| SUMMARY | 285 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION LITERATURE | 287 |
| <i>Major Contributions</i> | 287 |
| <i>Minor Contributions</i> | 287 |
| CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTIONAL THEORY LITERATURE..... | 287 |
| <i>Minor Contribution</i> | 288 |
| IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY | 288 |
| IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT | 290 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 291 |
| APPENDICES | 293 |
| APPENDIX ONE: VALIDATION OF GROUNDED THEORY THROUGH FIELD INTERVIEWS..... | 294 |
| <i>Nature of Field Respondent Evidence</i> | 294 |
| <i>Uncritical Evaluation and 'Falling Behind'</i> | 296 |
| <i>Uncritical Evaluation and Ignorance</i> | 299 |
| <i>Implications for Grounded Theory</i> | 308 |
| APPENDIX TWO: A REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL THEORY | 310 |
| <i>Institutional Theory in Organisation Studies</i> | 310 |
| <i>Institutional Theory and this Study</i> | 319 |
| <i>Old and New Institutional Theory</i> | 328 |
| <i>Difficulties Explaining the Process of Institutionalisation</i> | 333 |
| <i>Opportunities to Contribute to Institutional Theory</i> | 359 |
| APPENDIX THREE: CODING AND THE ASSISTANCE OF QUALITATIVE SOFTWARE..... | 362 |
| <i>Coding of Texts</i> | 362 |
| <i>Coding and the Use of Qualitative Software</i> | 366 |
| <i>NVivo Qualitative Software</i> | 367 |
| APPENDIX FOUR: CASE STUDY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS | 369 |
| APPENDIX FIVE: FIELD LEVEL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS | 370 |
| APPENDIX SIX: REFEREED PUBLICATIONS PRODUCED DURING THIS THESIS | 371 |
| <i>Refereed Journal Articles</i> | 371 |
| <i>Refereed Conference Papers</i> | 371 |
| REFERENCES..... | 372 |

TABLE OF FIGURES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 1: Basic Beliefs of Alternative Paradigms..... | 17 |
| Figure 2: Selected University Responses to Participate in Doctoral Research | 28 |
| Figure 3: Diversity Among Selected University Cases..... | 31 |
| Figure 4: University Case Study Respondent Profile | 35 |
| Figure 5: University Case Study Interview Details..... | 36 |
| Figure 6: University Case Studies Document Profile | 39 |
| Figure 7: Field Level Respondent Profile | 40 |
| Figure 8: Field Level Interview Details | 41 |
| Figure 9: Suburban University ‘Actor’ Profiles..... | 70 |
| Figure 10: Suburban University Document Profiles..... | 71 |
| Figure 11: Perceptions of Academics who Experimented with Learning Management Systems..... | 75 |
| Figure 12: Strategies Employed to Encourage Adoption at Suburban University..... | 89 |
| Figure 13: Staff Resistance at Suburban University | 93 |
| Figure 14: Management’s Response to Staff Resistance at Suburban University | 95 |
| Figure 15: Summary of Key Changes at Suburban University: 1990-2005 | 96 |
| Figure 16: Major External Influences at Suburban University | 98 |
| Figure 17: Major Internal Influences at Suburban University | 102 |
| Figure 18: Internal and External Forces of Change at Suburban University | 104 |
| Figure 19: Metropolitan University ‘Actor’ Profiles | 114 |
| Figure 20: Metropolitan University Document Profiles | 115 |
| Figure 21: Strategies Employed to Encourage Adoption at Metropolitan University | 138 |
| Figure 22: Staff Resistance at Metropolitan University..... | 141 |
| Figure 23: Management’s Response to Staff Resistance at Metropolitan University..... | 142 |
| Figure 24: Summary of Key Changes at Metropolitan University: 1990-2005..... | 143 |
| Figure 25: Major External Influences at Metropolitan University..... | 145 |
| Figure 26: Major Internal Influences at Metropolitan University..... | 147 |
| Figure 27: Internal and External Forces of Change at Metropolitan University..... | 149 |
| Figure 28: Regional University ‘Actor’ Profiles..... | 161 |
| Figure 29: Regional University Document Profiles..... | 162 |
| Figure 30: Strategies Employed to Encourage Adoption at Regional University..... | 186 |
| Figure 31: Staff Resistance at Regional University | 188 |
| Figure 32: Management’s Response to Staff Resistance at Regional University | 189 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 33: Summary of Key Changes at Regional University: 1990-2005 | 189 |
| Figure 34: Major External Influences at Regional University | 191 |
| Figure 35: Major Internal Influences at Regional University | 193 |
| Figure 36: Internal and External Forces of Change at Regional University | 195 |
| Figure 37: Comparative Chronologies of Key University Changes | 206 |
| Figure 38: Comparative Parties Involved in University-Wide LMS Evaluation Activities..... | 209 |
| Figure 39: Comparative Parties Involved in University-Wide LMS Adoption Activities..... | 210 |
| Figure 40: Comparative Relationships between Parties Involved in Evaluation and Adoption | 214 |
| Figure 41: Comparative LMS Evaluation Details..... | 218 |
| Figure 42: Comparative Adoption Strategies..... | 223 |
| Figure 43: Comparative Responses to Staff Resistance..... | 224 |
| Figure 44: Comparative Impacts on Various University Outcomes | 227 |
| Figure 45: Internal Contextual Factors | 237 |
| Figure 46: Institutional Educational Expertise..... | 242 |
| Figure 47: Internal Factors Associated with Uncritical Examination at Suburban University | 246 |
| Figure 48: Comparative Perceived External Environments..... | 247 |
| Figure 49: External Factors Associated with Uncritical Examination at Suburban University | 255 |
| Figure 50: Internal and External Factors and Institutional Change at Suburban University | 256 |
| Figure 51: Internal and External Factors and Institutional Change at Metropolitan University | 257 |
| Figure 52: Internal and External Factors and Institutional Change at Regional University | 259 |
| Figure 53: Distribution of the Online Learning Literature over Time | 263 |
| Figure 54: Count of Australian Universities Cited in 15 Publicly Funded Empirical Studies..... | 265 |
| Figure 55: Ranked Australian University Citations in Publicly Funded Research since 1991 | 266 |
| Figure 56: 'Falling Behind' in the Australian Higher Education Literature | 273 |
| Figure 57: 'Falling Behind': A Grounded Theory of Uncritical Decision Making | 275 |
| Figure 58: Comparative Mechanisms of Institutionalisation | 279 |
| Figure 59: Comparative Use of Various Mechanisms of Institutionalisation..... | 281 |
| Figure 60: Field Respondent Backgrounds..... | 295 |
| Figure 61: Lines of Theory in Organisational Analysis..... | 313 |
| Figure 62: Institutional and Technical Environments..... | 317 |
| Figure 63: The Old and New Institutionalisms | 331 |
| Figure 64: Perspectives on Institutional Change..... | 337 |
| Figure 65: Mapping of the Institutional Change Literature | 339 |
| Figure 66: Greenwood & Hinings' (1996) Institutional Model of Organisational Change..... | 344 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Figure 67: Barley & Tolbert's (1997) Sequential Model of Institutionalisation | 345 |
| Figure 68: Seo and Creed's (2002) Institutional Change Model | 346 |
| Figure 69: Dorado's (2005) Model of Institutional Change | 347 |
| Figure 70: George, Chattopadhyay, Sitkin & Barden's (2006) Cognitive Underpinnings of Institutional Persistence and Change..... | 349 |
| Figure 71: Greenwood, Suddaby and Hining's (2002) Model of Institutional Change..... | 351 |
| Figure 72: Lawrence, Winn & Jennings' (2001) Mechanisms of Institutionalisation | 352 |
| Figure 73: Opportunities for Contributions to Institutional Theory..... | 360 |

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how selected Australian universities evaluated and adopted various learning management systems in their teaching and learning programs, given claims of uncritical evaluation, problems and cautions in the Australian (1998: 13; Brabazon, 2002; Yetton, Forster, Hewson, Hughes, Johnston, Nightingale, Page-Hanify, Vitale and Wills, 1997) and North American (Berg, 2002; Noble, 1998b) higher education literatures. Ironically, universities charge large amounts of money teaching their students to develop competence in critical analysis, yet some studies have claimed that they were deficient in critically analysing their own decisions (Brabazon, 2002; Yetton et al., 1997). This important question has received little attention in the higher education literature, despite the high visibility and costs of these decisions. Although limited theoretical explanations have been proposed by various researchers, such as Yetton et al. (1997) and Brabazon (2002), these matters have not been the subject of published empirical research to date.

A grounded theory methodological framework, validated by the insights of institutional theory, was employed throughout to promote broader sociological explanations than other studies constrained by functionalist theoretical frameworks (Yetton et al., 1997). Qualitative case studies utilising semi-structured interviews and document analysis were conducted at three Australian universities. The findings of this analysis were written up in three case study narratives and an analytic cross-case analysis. Semi-structured interviews and document analysis at the field level were undertaken as an additional source of data to verify emergent grounded theory.

A grounded theory of uncritical decision making (Figure 57) was ultimately developed in response to this study's research problem. The core category around which this model was developed ('falling behind') appeared in all three cases, in interviews with experts from the Australian higher education sector, and was also found in both the Australian and overseas higher education literatures. This grounded theory also represents a minor contribution to the institutional theory literature as a new institutional change process model which links the activities of key individuals with broader field developments, and integrates the constructive and reproductive assumptions of old and new institutional theory.