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Abstract

Job satisfaction in general has been related to a number of positive organisational outcomes including decreased absenteeism and increased retention (Schubert-Irastorza & Fabry, 2014). More specifically, previous research has shown that academics’ job satisfaction is important for a number of reasons related to academic work, including its positive relationships with teaching quality (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009), research productivity (Albert, Davia, & Legazpe, 2016), as well as student satisfaction (Xiao & Wilkins, 2015) and engagement (Crosling, 2012). Factors previously indicated as impacting on academics’ job satisfaction include interaction with students and colleagues (e.g., Oshagbemi, 1999), and the autonomy associated with the degree of control academics are able to exercise over their work life (e.g., Paul & Phua, 2011).

Transnational Education (TNE) is an important facet of the international education learning and teaching landscape. Ensuring academics are positively engaged in TNE is a challenging but necessary issue for this form of educational provision, if the risks inherent in TNE are to be successfully mitigated.

The objective of this thesis is to better understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved, with Hackman and Oldham’s (1975) Job Characteristics Model (JCM) being used as the theoretical framework. The research objective was addressed in two studies. The first study focused on the satisfaction of academics located at home campuses. The second study examined satisfaction from the perspective of academics at TNE locations. Both studies employed a mixed-methods research approach, with
analysis of quantitative and qualitative data collected using an online questionnaire followed by semi-structured interviews.

In the first study, serious concerns regarding moderation and the processes associated with it, and the lack of direct involvement in the delivery of the unit, were highlighted. A negative relationship was identified between the amount of interaction home campus academics had with TNE academics, and their satisfaction. However, this appeared to be mitigated when the interactions were concerned with academic, rather than administrative matters. Interaction with TNE students was found to be an important factor in satisfaction, even when the interaction was not face-to-face. Other factors found to impact on academics’ satisfaction included the workload associated with TNE, in particular the timing of that work, and the lack of recognition of that work in terms of remuneration or loading.

In the second study, a negative relationship was demonstrated between the amount of modification of supplied content the TNE academic completed and their satisfaction. Neither involvement in creation of assessment, nor the moderation process, was demonstrated to impact on TNE academics’ satisfaction. Causing concern for those TNE academics employed on a casual basis however, were the employment processes of host Private Education Institutions (PEIs), particularly with regard to appointment processes and ongoing job security.

The results described in this thesis have practical implications for all involved in TNE in terms of how the academic work associated with TNE delivery is designed and allocated.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Transnational Education (TNE) is broadly defined as education that occurs where the student is located in a different country to the provider institution (Council of Europe, 2001), or where there is “movement of academic programs and providers between countries” (Knight, 2016 p.36). Previous research, discussed further in Chapter 2, has suggested TNE is important to universities as both a source of income independent of government funding and for the achievement of internationalisation objectives (e.g., Doorbar & Bateman, 2008; Healey & Michael, 2015; Lang, 2011; Mahmud et al., 2010; Whitsed & Green, 2014). Further, TNE is important to economies of both sending (Smith, 2010) and receiving (Wilkins, 2016) countries, as well as providing a range of benefits to students (Adam, 2001) and academics (Smith, 2009a).

Involvement in TNE, however, exposes universities and countries to financial and reputational risk (Hoare, 2012; McBurnie & Pollock, 2000), necessitating a focus on quality assurance (QA) (Lim, 2008). Chapman and Pyvis (2013) suggest that much of the work of QA falls within the responsibilities of the academics involved. This arises because many of the factors that must be addressed in QA for TNE, such as curriculum content, appropriate pedagogy, entry requirements, assessment methods and standards, learning resources, and the ongoing academic evaluation of programmes (McBurnie & Pollock, 2000) are the primary concern of the academy.
Job satisfaction in general has been related to a number of positive organisational outcomes including decreased absenteeism and increased retention (Schubert-Irastorza & Fabry, 2014). More specifically, previous research has shown that academics’ job satisfaction is important for a number of reasons related to academic work, including its positive relationships with teaching quality (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009), research productivity (Albert et al., 2016) and student satisfaction (Xiao & Wilkins, 2015). Factors that have been demonstrated in previous research to be critical in academics' job satisfaction include: interaction with students and colleagues (e.g., Oshagbemi, 1999), and the autonomy associated with the degree of control academics are able to exercise over their work life (Paul & Phua, 2011).

This thesis investigates the issue of job satisfaction among academics who are engaged in TNE, both in the providing university and at the TNE location. Job satisfaction in this context has not previously been explored. In order to do this, it focuses on the factors implicated in academics’ job satisfaction more generally, but in the specific context of TNE.

1.2 Purpose of the Research

The primary objective of the research described in this thesis is to better understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved, in order to better inform universities’ approaches to TNE delivery. Aspects of academic life that have been identified as being associated with satisfaction and are relevant to TNE delivery include interaction with colleagues and students, and the control able to be exercised by the academic over their work (Oshagbemi, 1996).
In this thesis the satisfaction of academics is examined using Hackman and Oldham's (1975) Job Characteristics Model (JCM). The JCM suggests that there are three critical psychological states that need to be achieved in order for the individual to achieve satisfaction and improved job performance: Knowledge of Results; Experienced Responsibility; and Experienced Meaningfulness. In turn, the model suggests that there are five core job dimensions that impact on those psychological states: Skill Variety; Task Identity; Task Significance; Autonomy; and Feedback.

The JCM is an appropriate framework with which to examine academics’ job satisfaction because many of the factors demonstrated in the literature to have a positive impact on academics’ job satisfaction can be related to one or more of the JCM core job dimensions. For example, academics’ capacity to receive feedback from students and colleagues on their performance and the impact academics have on the lives and work of those people are represented in the Feedback and Task Significance dimensions of the JCM respectively. The Autonomy and Task Identity dimensions are expressed in the control academics can exercise over the conduct and delivery of their teaching. The Skill Variety dimension is related to the range of interactions and involvement the academic has with the delivery and management of the units they teach.

In order to achieve the objective of the thesis, the primary research question being investigated is:

- How does the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics’ job satisfaction?
Several more specific secondary questions were defined in order to guide and inform the conduct of the research and are listed below:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ2: How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

1.3 Importance of the Research

TNE has been growing rapidly in provider nations. There has been, for example, a steady increase in the number of students studying for Australian qualifications at overseas campuses, with the number of students increasing from 75,377 in 2009, to 80,458 in 2011 (AEI, 2011), and subsequently to 96,004 in 2015 (Department of Education and Training, 2015). This growth in TNE appears to be mirrored internationally, notwithstanding the relative paucity of information from TNE supplier countries such as the USA (Mellors-Bourne, Fielden, Kemp, Middlehurst, & Woodfield, 2014), with correspondingly high levels of growth also reported in the UK and Greece (Lawton & Jensen, 2015).

The growth in TNE has not come without challenges. It is an activity which is sometimes both complex and risky to the provider institutions (Hoare, 2012), and, as a possible result of this, has become a focus of higher education
regulators, both in sending and receiving jurisdictions, as evidenced by the March 2013 memorandum of cooperation established between the Singapore regulator, CPE\(^1\), and its Australian counterpart, TEQSA\(^2\) (Council for Private Education Singapore, 2013a). Similar agreements have been negotiated between TEQSA and regulators in Hong Kong and the United Kingdom\(^3\).

Various commercial and non-commercial benefits to universities have been identified from involvement in TNE, including internationalisation of the curriculum (Mahmud et al., 2010), an increased international profile (McBurnie & Pollock, 2000) and as a source of on-campus international students (Phillips & Burgess, 2016). From the perspective of national governments in receiving countries, TNE has benefits in terms of retaining talented individuals, and reducing outflows of currency, while in providing countries, governments see TNE as a source of export income (Wilkins, 2016). From the perspective of the individual student, TNE offers opportunities for education that might not otherwise be available for a variety of reasons, including an excess of demand over capacity in local universities (Hoare, 2012).

There are various ways in which TNE can be delivered. These include: simple validation, where a course developed by an institution is validated by a foreign university and subsequently offered by the institution as a course of the validating university (Healey & Michael, 2015); materials licensing agreements; regular teaching visits to the TNE location by academics (Smith, 2009b), and

\(^{1}\) Council for Private Education: \texttt{http://www.cpe.gov.sg}
\(^{2}\) Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency: \texttt{http://www.teqsa.gov.au}
\(^{3}\) \texttt{http://www.teqsa.gov.au/about/international-engagement}
establishment of International Branch Campuses (IBC), staffed by home academics (Dunn & Wallace, 2006; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012).

Each of the different modes of TNE delivery will differ in terms of the participation required by the individual academic at both the home university and the TNE location. In a simple materials licensing agreement for example, home campus academics may find themselves providing unit materials only and having no other involvement in the operation of “their” unit. At the other extreme, academics may find themselves being required to relocate to the TNE location and manage the unit as though they were at their “home campus”. Academics located at the TNE location (local teaching staff) may find their role existing on a similar continuum. The distinctions between the various TNE delivery modes are important from an organisational perspective in that they focus on the nature of the partnership and the roles played by the partners (Naidoo, 2009).

Academic job satisfaction has been investigated in a number of different contexts. It has been shown to have positive impacts on both academics and universities in terms of job performance, motivation and reduced attrition rates (e.g., Noordin & Jusoff, 2009). Bollinger and Wasilik (2009) suggest that teaching quality is also positively influenced by academic job satisfaction. Some of the aspects of academic life that have been shown to result in increased satisfaction include interaction with students, scholarly achievements and the opportunities that academia provides for creativity (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997). Conversely, it has been reported that dissatisfaction in academics is caused by other factors such as increased administrative work (Shanafelt et al., 2009) and a lack of control that
can be exercised in the role (Pugliesi, 1999). However, there has been little research on the faculty perspective of TNE, with Knight and Liu (2017), in an analysis of TNE research published between 2000 and 2017, finding that only 5% of the publications related directly to academics.

There has been little research into academic job satisfaction in the context of TNE and so the research described in this thesis provides insight into this important issue. Further, it should assist universities in determining methods of TNE delivery that should result in increased academic satisfaction leading to improved outcomes for academic staff and students involved in TNE, and ultimately for the diverse range of TNE stakeholders.

1.4 Research Approach

In order to answer the research questions posed in this thesis, two studies were conducted, with the first concentrating on home campus academic staff and the second concentrating on academic staff at TNE locations. Both studies employed a mixed-methods approach (Creswell, 2014) because it allowed for the research questions to be addressed using both quantitative and qualitative data and analyses.

In each study, questionnaires were used to collect a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data, and these were followed by semi-structured interviews, the content and structure of which were informed largely by analysis of the questionnaire data. The first study collected 47 valid responses from information technology academics in Australian universities involved in TNE, followed by
five interviews. The second study collected 55 responses from academics involved in the delivery of TNE units in Singapore, followed by ten interviews.

The collection of quantitative data allowed for the various factors of TNE delivery that are proposed as having an impact on academics’ job satisfaction to be correlated with measurable indicators of academics’ job satisfaction. The collection of qualitative data allowed for the development of a deeper understanding and explanation of the relationships between those factors of TNE delivery and academics’ satisfaction.

1.5 Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is arranged in eight chapters. This chapter has presented a brief overview of TNE and its importance to economies, universities, academics and students, as well the research questions being addressed, and outlined the methodology employed.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature relevant to TNE and academic job satisfaction, highlighting the need for research into the relationship between the ways in which TNE is operationalised and the satisfaction of the academics involved in it.

Chapter 3 presents, discusses and justifies the methods used in the conduct of both studies, including the objectives of the research and the design of both studies. It details the data collection and analysis procedures.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the first study. This study focused on academics at home campuses. It begins by reporting on the descriptive analysis of the
quantitative data collected in the first phase of the study (the online questionnaire). It then reports on the TNE delivery factors proposed to affect academics’ job satisfaction. It concludes with the findings from the analysis of the qualitative data collected in the online questionnaire and the second phase of the study (semi-structured interviews).

Chapter 5 discusses the results presented in Chapter 4. It begins by discussing the aspects of control over unit delivery that were investigated in the first study. It then discusses the results associated with interaction between the home campus academics and their TNE colleagues and with their TNE students, and concludes by examining the other factors associated with TNE that were identified as having an impact on academics’ job satisfaction.

Chapter 6, in a similar way to Chapter 4, reports on the results of the second study which focused on academics in Singapore who were involved in the delivery of TNE. Chapter 7 discusses the results presented in Chapter 6.

The final chapter, Chapter 8, provides the conclusion to the thesis. It summarises the findings of the research and the progress toward answering the research questions outlined in this chapter. This is followed by a discussion of the contributions the research makes to theory concerning TNE and the satisfaction of academics involved. The practical implications of the study for the practice of TNE delivery are then discussed. The chapter concludes by addressing the limitations of the research, and makes suggestions for future research that arises out of it.
1.6 Definitions of Key Terms

To ensure the terminology used in this thesis is clear, this section includes definitions and descriptions of the key variables and terms that are used throughout the thesis.

**Assessment Creation**: The academic's responsibility for the creation and choice of assessment, the degree of input into the design of those items, and the potential and process for there to be modification of the content of the assessment items.

**Assessment Marking**: The degree of involvement of the academic in the process of grading students’ assessments.

**Content Creation**: The degree of responsibility the academic has for the creation of unit content.

**Content Modification**: The processes involved in the changing of content supplied by home campus academics by TNE teaching staff.

**Course**: collection of units of study (see below) that lead to the award of a degree.

**Face-to-face Delivery**: The degree to which the academic is involved in the physical delivery of the unit content, as would occur, for example, by conducting face-to-face lectures.

**Home campus**: The institution in the sending country that provides the course and component units.
**Learning Objectives:** Learning objectives are central to the unit design to express the desired outcomes for student from successful completion of a unit, and also for assessment of a unit and course’s level of study (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013).

**Moderation:** Moderation is a process used by universities to ensure there is reliability in assessment marking. In TNE, this most often takes the form of review of the marks awarded in the TNE location by home campus academics.

**Private Education Institution (PEI):** is the term used by the Committee for Private Education (CPE) in Singapore to denote private education providers.

**Staff Interaction:** The degree of interaction that occurs between the academics at the home and TNE campus.

**Student Interaction:** The degree to which the academic interacts with the students, be it face-to-face or using some other remote or asynchronous modality.

**TNE teaching staff/academics:** Teaching staff located at the TNE location, who may be either employed by the home university (in the case of an International Branch Campus) or a third-party education provider to teach a unit or units.

**TNE Delivery Mode:** The way in which responsibilities for the delivery of unit components and materials are assigned between the home campus and the TNE location.

**Transnational Education (TNE):** Academic programs that are delivered in a country different to the awarding institution.
**Unit:** The basic component of study in a Course. This is also known as a **Module** in the Singapore context.

**Unit Coordinator:** Academic who has responsibility for the design and conduct of the unit. The Unit Coordinator will normally be located at the Home campus, but, in the case of an International Branch Campus (IBC), may be located at the TNE location.
Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The previous chapter provided a background to the research presented in this thesis and discussed the research questions being addressed. This chapter reviews the literature relevant to those questions and highlights the need for further research into the relationship between the operationalization of TNE and academic job satisfaction.

TNE has been investigated previously in a broad range of contexts, including those associated with the student perspective on the effectiveness of TNE programs (Miliszewska & Sztendur, 2011), quality assurance in TNE (e.g., Lim, 2010; Stella, 2006; Woodhouse, 2006) and management of TNE partnerships and contracts (Henderson, Barnett, & Barrett, 2017). Literature relevant to the role of the academic in TNE has focussed on the TNE teaching team (Leask, 2004), quality assurance in TNE teaching (Mahmud et al., 2010), and preparation for teaching in a TNE context, particularly when the academic is required to travel (Dunn & Wallace, 2006). Similarly, the literature reveals a body of research addressing academic job satisfaction, particularly with respect to the “traditional” teaching/research academic role (e.g., Albert et al., 2016; Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003), and there has also been research into job satisfaction with on-line teaching (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009). The relationship between research and job satisfaction for academics has also been explored (Albert et al., 2016).
The research questions being addressed in this thesis focus on how the manner in which TNE is operationalised impacts on the satisfaction of the academic with TNE, particularly in the context of those factors that have been suggested in the literature as being important in determining academic job satisfaction; interaction with students and colleagues, and control over unit delivery.

This first section of this chapter focuses on TNE. It starts by reviewing how TNE has been defined in the literature and then examines the impacts TNE can have on economies and universities, and some of the risks that are associated with TNE. This is followed by a review of the various ways in which the delivery of TNE has been operationalised. The second section of the chapter focuses on academic job satisfaction and commences with a review of the literature relevant to job satisfaction in general and then to academic job satisfaction in particular, and discusses the importance of academic job satisfaction, particularly in terms of its links with motivation and job performance. It then focuses on those factors of academic work that have been reported to influence academic job satisfaction. The final section of the chapter examines the impacts of TNE on academics, particularly in terms of its impact on their job satisfaction.

2.2 Transnational Education (TNE)

This section examines the literature relevant to several aspects of TNE and begins by reviewing the various definitions of TNE that have been adopted. It then reviews the literature with regard to the impacts of TNE on both sending and receiving countries, as well as on universities. This is followed by a discussion of the risks associated with involvement in TNE, and concludes with a review of the various ways in which TNE has been operationalised.
2.2.1 TNE Background and Definitions

There has been a long history of TNE in various forms; for example, Naidoo (2009) suggests that TNE dates back to the mid-1950s, where US military personnel posted overseas were provided with teaching materials from US institutions. Healey and Michael (2015) report a much longer history, with the University of London being involved in the provision of cross-border correspondence courses since the 1850s. In an Australian university context, McLean (2007) suggests that the early development of TNE in Australian universities was a “serendipitous” outcome as a result of networking by individual academics. Clayton and Ziguras (2011) agree, presenting a comprehensive discussion of the history of TNE in Australia, characterising its early development in the 1980s as being primarily entrepreneurial in nature and driven largely by individual academics. This was followed by a proliferation of TNE activity in the late 1990s, and then by “…a phase of ‘maturation’ in the past decade” (p.329). This maturation phase was marked by rationalisation of TNE courses and partnerships during the second half of the 2000s.

Regardless of its long history, defining TNE has been problematic, with Adam (2001) stating that, “The research revealed widespread confusion concerning the definition of transnational education and its associated terminology” (p.39). The confusion regarding the definition of TNE has persisted with, more recently, Knight (2016) saying that, “To put it bluntly, there is mass confusion within and among countries about what is actually meant by TNE in general and the different modes of TNE in particular” (p. 36).
A wide range of definitions of TNE have been suggested and used in the literature. Many of these are based around the location of the student relative to the providing institution; for example, the Council of Europe (2001) provided the following definition of TNE based on the students studying in a different country:

“All types of higher education study programmes, or sets of courses [units] of study, or educational services (including those of distance education) in which the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding institution is based” (Section 1. Terminology Para. 8).

This definition, however, does not include some forms of TNE where there is collaboration between the sending and receiving institutions (Knight, 2016), such as would occur in “Twinning programs, internationally co-developed or co-founded institutions” (p.38).

Other features of TNE definitions include the inclusion of, or requirement for, a face-to-face component (Department of Education Science and Training, 2005), and the need for there to be a formal agreement between the provider university and the overseas institution or organisation with whom the students are located (Heffernan, Morrison, Basu, & Sweeney, 2010).

Further complicating the understanding of TNE, and of relevance to this thesis, are the multiple variations in the way that TNE delivery is operationalised. Knight (2016) has proposed a framework to articulate these variations, based on several factors. The first is whether the location of responsibility for curriculum development and provision is on the sending or receiving location. The second is with regard to whether the qualification is offered by the sending or the
receiving partner. The third factor examines the responsibility for academic oversight, and the final factor is the sourcing of, and responsibility for, the faculty. The various TNE delivery modes are discussed in more detail in Section 2.2.5. For the purposes of this thesis, however, TNE is defined generally as referring to academic programs that are delivered in a country different to the awarding institution. Where more specific forms, or delivery modes, of TNE are being discussed, or reference is being made to modes of delivery that may not be covered by the above definition, the terms as discussed in Section 2.2.5 will be used.

2.2.2 Impacts of TNE on Hosting and Sending Countries

TNE can have impacts at many levels, including on the economies of countries that participate in TNE, whether they are hosting or sending TNE. Lawton and Jensen (2015) identify the UK, Australia and Germany as the largest suppliers of TNE. They list the UK as being by far the largest supplier, and Mellors-Bourne et al. (2014) agree, though they suggest there are few figures from the USA to allow direct comparison. Wilkins and Balakrishnan (2013) state that the USA, Australian and the UK are largest source countries of international branch campuses in the UAE. However, complicating direct comparisons are the differences in the definitions of TNE used by various countries to record the numbers of TNE students (Knight, 2016).

Countries identified as being major host countries for TNE supplied from the UK and Australia include Malaysia, Singapore, China, Pakistan, Hong Kong and Vietnam, while host countries for German TNE include the US, Canada, China and South Korea (British Council, 2013).
Governments in countries that host TNE find it attractive, particularly as it is a way of encouraging the expansion of higher education without the related drain on the public purse (Wilkins, 2016). A number of other potential benefits can accrue to hosting countries from the growth of TNE, including: fulfilment of increased demand for higher education (Huang, 2007), national capacity building (Vincent-Lancrin, 2007), a reduction in the drain of talented individuals overseas (e.g., Altbach, 2002; Ziguras & Gribble, 2015), and a reduction in the outflow of currency caused by nationals studying abroad (Alam, Alam, Chowdhury, & Steiner, 2013). The Chinese government, for example, has attempted to reduce ‘brain drain’ by encouraging the development of TNE agreements onshore (Mok & Han, 2016). Additionally, there may be benefits to existing local institutions in receiving countries through additional competition and collaboration (Healey & Michael, 2015), and attraction of foreign income through the establishment of regional education hubs (e.g., Alam et al., 2013; Knight & Morshidi, 2011; Waring, 2015), such as has occurred in Singapore, Malaysia and Hong Kong, among others. Countries with an under-provisioned higher education sector may also benefit from the provision to citizens of access to higher education (Hodson & Thomas, 2001).

Governments in TNE exporting countries see TNE as an important source of export earnings, and, as discussed further in Section 2.2.3, participation in TNE can reduce universities’ reliance on government funding (Smith, 2010). However, there is also potential for individual TNE operations to reflect poorly on a sending country’s educational system and to cause damage to the reputation
of that system (Hodson & Thomas, 2001). Risk associated with TNE is discussed at more length in Section 2.2.4.

2.2.3 Impacts of TNE on Universities

A number of reasons for universities’ involvement in TNE have been reported in the literature. Financial reasons appear to dominate, with Hodson and Thomas (2001) suggesting that the reduction in government funding for universities in the UK in the 1990s, alongside the increasing participation rates were factors largely responsible for the need for UK universities to review their sources of income. One response was the creation and growth of TNE. McLean (2007) stated that while universities take the ‘high moral ground’ when becoming involved in TNE, they are more often driven by “the much lesser gods of … commercial gain” (p. 58). Similarly, quality audits conducted by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) identified that often the broader university community is largely unaware of any organisational motivation for involvement in TNE other than financial, primarily in order to become less reliant on government funding (e.g., De Vita & Case, 2003; Dunn & Wallace, 2004; Heffernan et al., 2010; McBurnie & Pollock, 2000; Stella, 2011).

Reasons listed for universities’ involvement in TNE other than economic have included: a desire to develop research collaborations (Mahmud et al., 2010); internationalisation of the curriculum (e.g., Chan, 2011; International Education Association of Australia, 2008); creation of an enhanced international profile for the university; and an expanded student base (e.g., Smith, 2009a). McBurnie and Pollock (2000) suggested a number of other factors, including: increased numbers of alumni; additional opportunities for staff and student mobility;
development of new curricula; and the creation of a resource base in offshore locations that can be used strategically. Crosling (2012) also discussed additional benefits to universities in terms of projecting an “innovative image” (p.197) in responding to issues of global needs and changes, and an increase in diversity of students and academic staff in terms of backgrounds, previous educational experiences, and their expectations.

2.2.4 Risk and Quality Assurance in TNE

As discussed in Sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3, there are benefits that can accrue to countries and universities from participation in TNE. This section discusses some of the risks associated with involvement in TNE and how QA measures aim to mitigate those risks.

TNE is both complex and risky, particularly for the provider institutions (Hoare, 2012), but also more generally for the sending country’s higher education system (Hodson & Thomas, 2001). As a result of this, TNE has become a focus of higher education regulators, both in the sending and receiving jurisdictions (e.g., Jackson, 2016; TEQSA, 2013). Coleman (2003) suggests that external QA programs only commenced in the latter part of the 1990s, and prior to that, “offshore and branch campuses were all but unmonitored” (p. 368), which may be a reflection of the serendipitous way in which TNE was initially established (Clayton & Ziguras, 2011). It was at this time that several governments in TNE sending countries began to include TNE operations in university audits (Heffernen & Poole, 2004); in the UK through the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA), and in Australia, through the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). Stella (2011) makes the point that the QA of Australian TNE is an
important aspect of maintaining the reputation of Australian higher education, stating that:

“...TNE is the international face of Australian education, and Australian operations overseas are much more open to international scrutiny than domestic operations. Getting them right is thus particularly important for the reputation and health of the institution and for the Australian higher education sector in general. International opinions of the quality of Australian higher education heavily depend not only on the actual quality of TNE, but also on its perceived quality and the attention Australia directs towards its development. Achieving high regard requires (inter alia) highly visible attention to the external quality assurance regime. In consequence, the quality of TNE is of great importance to AUQA, and those offshore operations which are known to have quality assurance issues are particularly targeted by AUQA”. (p. 61)

In the primarily TNE receiving countries of Malaysia and Singapore, Lim (2010) reports that this focus on QA in the sending countries was mirrored through the establishment of similar agencies responsible for monitoring of private higher education providers, primarily because

“...in practice, geographical distance and contextual constraints limit a university’s ability to monitor and review all aspects of delivery, leaving private higher education providers to define quality and set their own standards in its assurance”. (p.220)

Altbach and Knight (2007) note that similar agencies and processes have been established in other receiving countries such as Hong Kong, South Africa and
Israel. They also make the point that accreditation of such courses by professional bodies has had an important role to play in the ongoing QA of TNE offerings.

This attention to quality assurance in TNE at a national level is further evidenced by the establishment of a memorandum of cooperation between the Singapore regulator, the Council for Private Education (CPE), and its Australian counterpart, the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) in March 2013 (Council for Private Education Singapore, 2013a). Similar agreements have also been negotiated between TEQSA and regulators in a number of countries, including: the UK, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Japan, UAE, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Vietnam (TEQSA, 2017c). Further, several national higher education regulators, including those in Australia, the UK, Malaysia, UAE, Singapore, Hong Kong and the USA, have formed the “Quality Beyond Boundaries Group”, with the aim of collaborating and sharing information in order to improve QA in TNE (TEQSA, 2017b).

Robust, national-level QA of TNE is also important for providers in both sending and receiving countries (Hodson & Thomas, 2001; Stella, 2006) because it is potentially a point of differentiation. For example, receiving countries with strong TNE QA can attract students from neighbouring countries because there is a perception of additional protection for students.

McBurnie and Pollock (2000), in the context of the establishment of branch campuses, identified five major areas of risk associated with TNE: financial,

---

reputational, legal, sovereign and physical/personal. They warn that QA mechanisms are important in mitigating many of these risk factors:

“It is not a foregone conclusion that, when a reputable institution delivers education outside its own national borders, the quality of its programmes will be maintained” (p.341).

Citing QA approaches used by various organisations with an interest in TNE, McBurnie and Pollock (2000) list several factors that must be addressed in QA for TNE, including: curriculum content, appropriate pedagogy, entry requirements, assessment methods and standards, learning resources, staffing, ongoing academic evaluation of programmes, ethical marketing and contractual arrangements. Many of these factors are directly under the control of individual academics. Indeed, Chapman and Pyvis (2013) suggest that much of the work of QA needs to be done by the academics involved in TNE, as, “…It is the academics involved in program implementation who carry the weight of these expectations” (p.80).

One of the primary QA measures employed in TNE that is relevant to academics, is moderation of assessment marking for which the home campus academics involved are usually directly responsible. Moderation has the intention of minimising the variations that may occur between geographically distant locations and offerings of courses, while maintaining equivalent and comparable course outcomes (Mahmud et al., 2010). Dobos (2011) refers to the moderation process as being “one-way” (p.26), in that it is a process controlled by the home campus; the marking of the TNE academic is reviewed by the unit coordinator at
the home campus. There is no flow of information from the TNE campus to the home campus.

In a comprehensive review of TNE assessment moderation processes in Malaysia, Mahmud et al. (2010) found that the moderation process is one that is complex and difficult for several reasons, including that it causes stress for both TNE teaching staff and TNE students. For TNE teaching staff, because they feel their professionalism and competence is being called into question by the moderation process. TNE students find moderation stressful because they fear being marked down by a distant marker who is not aware of their individual circumstances or the amount of effort they have expended on an assignment.

Added to this, the delays in the return of assessment to students is problematic, particularly when feedback is required for subsequent assessment items. They also suggest that delays in return of assessments from the moderation process increases workloads for professional staff on both sides; at the TNE location because of student complaints about delays in the provision of feedback, and at the home campus in chasing up academics to complete the moderation process.

A possible reason for some of the issues relevant to moderation raised above was discussed in a study examining the relative understanding of QA processes relevant to an Australian TNE course being offered in Malaysia (Lim, 2008), which suggested that home campus academics perceive that the workload associated with moderation was not adequately recognised by the university, with the outcome that, “the university academics lacked enthusiasm with regard to the moderation of the activities assigned to them” (p.137).
Further complicating QA in TNE is the suggestion by Coleman (2003) that academic equivalency of TNE offerings and home campus offerings cannot be assumed, primarily because of the differences between unit offerings at different locations. These differences will occur for many reasons including differences in the target market for the TNE location, which will generally be students who are local to the campus. This then opens the possibility of different cohorts of students with different learning styles being taught in the same way. Heffernan et al. (2010), for example, explored the differences in learning styles between Chinese and Australian students taking the same unit offered transnationally and suggested that, ideally, materials developed for Australian students would need to be modified for delivery to Chinese students.

2.2.5 Operationalisation of TNE Delivery

This section examines how the various modes in which TNE is delivered have been defined and described, and how these differences may impact on the role academics play in TNE.

The ways in which TNE units are delivered vary widely (McBurnie & Ziguras, 2007). Doorbar and Bateman (2008) suggest that these differences arise because there is “no one size fits all” (p.17), and that factors such as the mission of the university, the receiving country, financial reasons and the “perceived acceptability of models in relation to quality” (p.17), all impact on how TNE is delivered.

As discussed in Section 2.2.1, one of the factors making research in TNE difficult is the wide variation in definitions of the delivery modes and agreements
between the provider institution and the in-country partner (Knight, 2016). There have been many different nomenclatures used to describe these agreements. The International Education Association of Australia (IEAA), for example, suggested four distinct TNE delivery modes (Table 2-1), those being Full Delivery, Articulation, Franchising and Branch Campus (International Education Association of Australia, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEAA “Delivery Mode”</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full delivery</td>
<td>Occurs where the provider maintains complete ownership and control of the award program and teaches all units offered either with home campus staff or a combination of home and approved locally engaged teaching staffs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Occurs where inter-institutional arrangements are negotiated to enable two or sometimes more providers to offer a joint study program that includes provision for study credits and credit transfers. Often termed ‘twinning programs’, this model recognises agreed units of prior study as being equivalent for the purposes of enabling students to gain advanced standing in another institution’s award program. These may or may not result in a joint or double degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franchising</td>
<td>Occurs where one tertiary institution authorises another institution to offer, either as a whole or in part, the approved study program. Under this model, the provider gives over the syllabus and lesson plans to be delivered by the local associate. In many cases, the franchisee will only provide part of the program, for example, year one or years one and two of a three-year degree, which is recognised as a partial credit towards the qualification offered in the home country. In these circumstances, the franchisee or the associate will award an interim qualification that is more readily accepted/approved by the recipient country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch campus</td>
<td>Occurs where a tertiary institution in one country establishes a campus in another country in order to offer award and non-award programs and qualifications. The approach has seen some popularity and success, as more information becomes available concerning establishment, operations, resources, funding and sustainability mechanisms. The earlier notes on franchising also apply to this model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the IEAA modes, the British Council (2013) listed several other modes of TNE delivery, those being: twinning programmes, double/dual degree programmes, joint degree programmes, validation, and “other” types of arrangements whereby students are located in a country other than the providing institution.
Doorbar and Bateman (2008), in a review of the growth of TNE in the UK, list validation and franchising arrangements as common methods of TNE delivery. Validation in TNE refers to the situation in which a course developed by a foreign institution is ‘validated’ by the university. The validated course is then offered by the foreign institution as a course of the validating university. Students will receive their degree from the ‘home’ university (Healey & Michael, 2015).

The Council of Europe Code of Good Practice in the Provision of Transnational Education (2001) also refers to joint degrees where part of a course is provided by another partner institution, as well as to branch campuses where the provider institution creates a physical presence in the other country. A further type of TNE arrangement is ‘twinning and programme articulations’, which involve the creation of arrangements between providers in different countries to create a joint study programme where credit for study can be transferred between the programmes (Naidoo, 2009).

In a report for the Australian Office of Learning and Teaching, Mazzolini, Yeo, Ling and Hall (2012) suggest that the most useful way to study different TNE delivery modes if the primary interest is the role of the academic in TNE, is to concentrate on the “locus of curriculum control” (p.22). This deals with the contractual determination of responsibility for learning and teaching focussed elements of the relationship, such as:

- Curriculum selection and design
- Choice of learning and teaching activities
- Choice of assessment methods and items, and
- Grading of student performance.
The report defines four degrees of curriculum control based on how the responsibilities associated with curriculum control are allocated between the home and TNE campus: home campus control, limited transnational campus control, distributed control and full transnational campus control.

Characteristics of each of these are shown in Table 2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Curriculum Control</th>
<th>Home campus</th>
<th>Limited transnational campus control</th>
<th>Distributed control</th>
<th>Transnational campus control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Curriculum design and assessment are determined by the home campus only. May be fly-in-fly-out delivery.</td>
<td>Opportunities for contextualisation of learning activities &amp;/or assessment items. Assessment or sample moderated by home campus.</td>
<td>Transnational Campus decisions constrained only by attaining the same learning outcomes. May include sample assessment moderation.</td>
<td>Units of study or programs offered only at transnational campus but with the qualification awarded by the home campus institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decisions made concerning the locus of curriculum control will impact on the degree and nature of academics' participation in TNE. For example, where the locus of curriculum control is home campus or limited transnational campus control, then there would be an expectation of more involvement of home campus academics in the design, and possibly delivery, of curricula at the TNE location. From the perspective of academics at the TNE location, there would be more involvement when the locus of curriculum control shifted to being distributed or transnational campus control. The fact that Mazzolini et al.'s (2012) model explicitly articulates where responsibilities for control over various aspects of curriculum lie, makes it an appropriate model to use for this research when discussing the control over curriculum decisions academics have in the context of TNE delivery.
The “normal” or “traditional” model of university teaching involves some degree of face-to-face interaction with on-campus students and colleagues (Schulz, 2013). It is characterised by immediate feedback between students and academics, as well as interaction between staff in the same courses or disciplines; these being seen as key factors in academic job satisfaction (e.g., Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006) as discussed further in Section 2.4. However, variations in TNE contractual and operational arrangements will impact on how the individual academic will interact with TNE students and teaching colleagues.

For example, when there is some degree of “fly-in-fly-out” teaching as might be found when the focus of curriculum control is characterised as “home campus”, there will be an element of physical interaction between the home campus academic and the students. If the unit was to be delivered without any presence of the home academic, as might be found when the locus of curriculum control is focused on the TNE location, interaction between the home campus academic and the students may be non-existent, or limited to contact via email, discussion fora, or virtual classrooms.

Similarly, the relationship between the home and TNE location academics is impacted by the method of delivery. In a more traditional, on-campus setting, the Unit Coordinator will have closer contact with the rest of the teaching team, be they tutors, lecturers or demonstrators, than would be expected in a fly-in-fly-out model. Further, where there is no face-to-face contact, communications will tend to be more formal and require management of the additional communication overhead (Mahmud et al., 2010). In the case reported by Pyvis (2011), weekly communication between academics at both locations was
desirable and programme coordinators monitored its success. Consequently, relationships between staff at the home and TNE location were very important to the quality of the programme.

Crosling (2012) suggests that student engagement is an important aspect of TNE if student outcomes are to be maintained. The case is made that an understanding of the local setting is important if the curriculum is going to be designed in such a way so as to be engaging for both the TNE students and the staff teaching in the TNE location. In order to include this understanding of the local setting there would need to be either input from academic staff at the TNE location or ongoing on-the-ground presence of home campus academics. This will impact on the requirements for the involvement of academics at both the home campus and the TNE location.

2.3 Job Satisfaction

This section begins by reviewing the literature with regard to job satisfaction in general, and then more specifically, the job satisfaction of academics, focusing on why academic job satisfaction is important for universities. It then reviews the factors that have been shown to influence academic job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been a focus of much research because of its relationship to job performance (e.g., Bentley, Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2013a; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001) and other key organisational outcomes, such as reduced staff turnover (e.g., Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), and absenteeism (e.g., Scott & Taylor, 1985). In a meta-study of nearly 500 previous studies
(though not necessarily focused on academics), Faragher, Cass and Cooper (2005) also found a positive relationship between job satisfaction and health.

The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance in general has been investigated thoroughly in a number of contexts. One meta-analysis of this relationship (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985) found that though there may be a causal relationship, it is not strong. Judge et. al. (2001) suggested that there is a causal relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, but that the relationship has many factors that moderate or mediate its impact, such as the nature of the work, job complexity, self-esteem and career stage.

While the theoretical literature on job satisfaction is extensive, the next section will examine two of its more important theories. These theories have been selected for closer examination since they arguably have higher explanatory power in the context of this thesis. These are Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1967) and the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) of Hackman and Oldham (1976).

2.3.1 Job Satisfaction Theories

Locke (1969, p.316) defined job satisfaction as being the “...perceived relationship between what one wants from one's job and what one perceives it as offering or entailing”. In order to better understand the role of job satisfaction in the context of this thesis, it is important to understand the factors reported to have an impact on job satisfaction.

In exploring the factors that impact on job satisfaction, Herzberg first described the two-factor theory in the 1950s and further refined it over time (e.g.,
Herzberg et al., 1967). The theory suggests that the presence of factors intrinsic to the job (content factors) such as achievement, recognition, challenge of the work itself, responsibility and prospect of advancement are causes of job satisfaction. It also suggests that the absence of these factors will lead to less satisfaction, but not necessarily to dissatisfaction. Extrinsic or context factors (hygiene), such as supervision, work conditions, job security and salary are factors that have an impact on the levels of job dissatisfaction.

The two-factor theory has been the focus of review and debate over an extended period. Ewen (1964) suggested that the two-factor theory model lacked the capacity for generalizability beyond the context in which it was originally studied for a number of reasons, including that the original work investigated only a narrow range of occupations, and it did not include any measure of overall job satisfaction. Later, in a meta-analysis of studies of two-factor theory, Ewen, Smith and Hulin (1966) noted there were a number of different and contradictory outcomes depending on the context in which the study was conducted. House and Wigdor (1967), in a review of earlier criticisms, suggested that the main criticism in the literature was that the theory was bound in methodology, in that studies replicating Herzberg’s original studies using the critical incident framework “in which the interviewee recounts extremely satisfying and dissatisfying job events” (p.371), tended to have results that were consistent, but that this approach introduced a bias that was not necessarily replicated when using other methodologies. Other criticisms (e.g., Elton, 1996) include the binary nature of content and hygiene factors, with the suggestion being that increased levels of content factors can only result in increased
satisfaction and their reduction cannot result in demotivation, thus ignoring the possibility that some factors will apply across the spectrum.

The JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) is a method for modelling the characteristics of a job that result in higher job satisfaction, as well as motivation, high quality work performance, lower absenteeism and attrition. The model suggests that in order to achieve these positive outcomes in a particular job, three critical psychological states need to be achieved: Knowledge of Results; Experienced Responsibility; and Experienced Meaningfulness. In turn, the model suggests that there are five core job dimensions that impact on the critical psychological states, those being: Skill Variety; Task Identity; Task Significance; Autonomy; and Feedback. These dimensions are explained in Table 2-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Job Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Impacts on which critical psychological state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>The degree to which the job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, which involve the use of a number of different skills and talents</td>
<td>Experienced meaningfulness of the work (the degree to which the individual experiences the job as one which is generally meaningful, valuable and worthwhile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>The degree to which the job requires completion of a “whole” and identifiable piece of work … doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome</td>
<td>Experienced responsibility for the outcome of the work (the degree to which the individual feels personally accountable and responsible for the results of the work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>The degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>The degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out</td>
<td>Knowledge of the results of work (the degree to which the individual knows and understands, on a continuous basis, how effectively he or she is performing the job)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job result in the individual obtaining direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine an overall motivating potential of a given job, the JCM calculates an overall score based on the scores associated with each of the core job dimensions using the following formula:
Motivating Potential Score (MPS) = ((Skill Variety + Task Identity + Task Significance)/3) * Autonomy * Feedback

A higher overall score means that the job has a higher potential to motivate the individual (MPS or Motivating Potential Score). The formula means that MPS scores will be most affected by the scores for the autonomy and feedback dimensions, meaning that jobs low in autonomy or feedback will inevitably have a lower overall MPS.

The model includes a moderating factor to account for individual differences between people, “individual growth need strength” (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). It suggests that individuals with a “high need for personal growth and development” (p. 258) will have more positive outcomes in a job that has a high degree of inherent motivation. Subsequent revisions of the model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) added context satisfaction as another moderating factor. This refers to factors relevant to the work environment such as pay, job security, relationships with colleagues and supervision. However, Tiegs, Tetrick and Fried (1992) found little or no support for the moderating effects of growth needs strength (GNS) or context satisfaction.

The validity of the JCM has been reviewed many times. Fried and Ferris (1987), for example, in a review and meta-analysis of the JCM, suggested that the model was “reasonably valid” (p. 287). However, they went on to suggest that specific outcomes may be associated with individual job characteristics, rather than all characteristics needing to be present to result in positive outcomes, for example,
reduction in absenteeism through development of, “...skill variety, autonomy, and job feedback” (p. 314).

In the context of this thesis, it is the relationship between the aspects of the job that are related to involvement in TNE activities, and the performance of the academic in that context, that is of most interest.

2.3.2 Academic Job Satisfaction

Hagedorn (2000) suggested that the media had popularized the stereotypical view of academics as having shorter than normal working hours and more job security than most, while earning higher salaries without the sort of scrutiny that would be evident in a “normal” workplace. Pearson and Seiler (1983) also reported on the public perception of academic positions as being low in stress, and de Lourdes Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) stated that there was little concern regarding the satisfaction of academics because of the public perception of “the inordinately comfortable working conditions enjoyed by professors” (p. 542).

However, the wide range of tasks that academics are required to undertake lead Oshagbemi (1999) to suggest that academic job satisfaction is something worth studying for its own sake. Tasks such as teaching, research and administration are central to academics’ work, as is the higher degree of control over their working conditions that academics enjoy when compared with other workers. The job satisfaction of academics has also been related to a number of different positive outcomes, including: performance, research productivity, teaching quality, student satisfaction, and attrition, as discussed below.
Performance and job satisfaction have been shown to be related across a broad range of studies (Judge et al., 2001). They found that this relationship was strongest when the job exhibited complexity and autonomy, both characteristics of academic work (Oshagbemi, 1999). More specifically, Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) suggest that job satisfaction for academics is an important aspect of teaching quality, particularly in online or distance units. Similarly, a positive relationship between research productivity and job satisfaction has also been demonstrated (Albert et al., 2016).

The importance of the impact academics involved in TNE have on students has been explored. Xiao and Wilkins (2015) for example, make the case that student satisfaction has become more of a focus for universities because of the higher fees students are paying and that it is seen as an indicator of overall quality. Their study found that the commitment of lecturers to both the students’ academic achievement and the social integration of students, are correlated with overall student satisfaction and the success of TNE programs.

Similarly, Miliszewska and Sztendur (2011) found that students perceived attributes of both home campus and TNE academics as being critical to the effectiveness of TNE programs. For both home campus and TNE academics, the attributes ranked highly were understanding of the program requirements, students' characteristics and needs, as well as the use of effective communication skills.

Attrition rates in academia are important because of the associated costs, and so retention of existing academics is important (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005). Zhou and Volkwein (2004) suggest that the costs associated with
academic staff attrition include the obvious expenses associated with the replacement recruiting process, but also those less obvious costs associated with the inevitable disruption to the ongoing functioning of the academic unit such as coverage of teaching and supervision duties. Their model suggests that academic job satisfaction is a major factor influencing the “intention to leave”. Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) add that from the perspective of the institution, often “faculty who leave are those the institution would prefer to retain” (p. 518). Rosser (2004) adds that academic staff attrition can also have negative impacts on the individual, both financial, in terms of lost on-going benefits, and disillusionment when it is realized that the “grass isn’t greener.”

A number of factors that have a positive impact on academic job satisfaction have been identified, many of which are associated in some way with the academic’s interactions with students and colleagues, potential for intellectual stimulation and a sense of control over their workplace. These are discussed in the next section.

2.3.3 Factors Associated with Academic Job Satisfaction

There are a number of findings as to the factors that contribute to academic job satisfaction. For example, Oshagbemi (1999) lists teaching, research and colleagues’ behaviour as causes of academic job satisfaction. Bellamy et al (2003) agree, stating that academics find more motivation in “intellectual challenge, interaction with students, autonomy and flexibility, than they do from salary (and) workload” (p.16). Pearson and Seiler (1983) state that content factors are more important in a university setting than extrinsic factors, such as working conditions or salary, because of the degree of control over those factors that
academics can exercise. They state those content factors include, “…the process of teaching, guiding, and moulding minds, along with the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge” (p.37).

Paul and Phua (2011), who surveyed academics in a Singapore public university, noted that teaching is the second most important factor in academic job satisfaction, behind relationships with students (See Table 2-4). Factors that were found to be dissatisfying were those associated with mainly administrative tasks including: non-academic work, having to deal with red-tape and heavy workloads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Most Satisfying</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Most Dissatisfying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-related</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Non-academic/admin work</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching itself</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Heavy workload</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>07%</td>
<td>Red-tape &amp; other practices</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Remuneration</td>
<td>05%</td>
<td>Lack of personal growth</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>07%</td>
<td>Dealing with problem students</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary/increments</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lacy and Sheehan (1997) found that job satisfaction for academics arises from activities that increase a sense of “community-acknowledgement” and participation in decision-making. Martin (2011), following a review of relevant literature, suggested that “happiness” for academics comes from several sources based around performing tasks that use their advanced skills to the limit of their ability (e.g., research), creation and maintenance of relationships with colleagues and students, and helping others (e.g., students) to learn through teaching, service and research. More specifically with regard to research, Albert (2016), in a study of Spanish academics, found that it is important in terms of job
satisfaction for academics because research provides prestige, opportunities for promotion and improved access to resources in the future.

Other factors that have been identified in the literature as influencing academics’ job satisfaction are the flexibility they have in their job (Houston et al., 2006) and the control they have over their work (Bellamy et al., 2003). McIntyre (1984, p. 236) defines “Locus of control” as a “self-appraisal of the degree to which an individual views him/herself as having a causal role in determining specific events”, and states that a decreased locus of control has an impact on an individual’s capacity to cope with stressors and decreased “feelings of personal accomplishment”. Paul and Phua (2011) agreed, finding that the control and autonomy that academics are able to exert over their working environment were important factors in satisfaction. In the context of teaching, they suggest that the primary way in which academics exert control is in unit design, management and delivery. Similarly, Schulze (2006) in an examination of job satisfaction of academics in South Africa, found that having the authority to choose course content and teaching methods were aspects of teaching that resulted in increased satisfaction.

Factors reported as causing dissatisfaction in academia have included administration and non-academic work (e.g., Paul & Phua, 2011), quality of senior leadership, increased public scrutiny and need for entrepreneurism (Winefield et al., 2003), remuneration (Leslie, 2002; Ssesanga & Garrett, 2005), and prospects for promotion (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997).

Winefield et al., (2003) suggested that academics are becoming more stressed and that this stress has resulted from a decrease in the amount of autonomy and
control the academic is now able to exercise in the role as universities undergo major organisational change.

The next section investigates the core focus of the research described in this thesis, academic job satisfaction in the context of academics’ involvement in TNE.

2.4 Academic Job Satisfaction and TNE

While previous research into academic staff involvement in TNE has demonstrated both positive and negative impacts on academics at both home and TNE locations, there has been little research specifically addressing the job satisfaction of academics involved in TNE at both home and TNE locations.

Some of the positive benefits for academics from involvement in TNE reported in the literature include the potential for gaining experience of new and interesting challenges, as well as opportunities for the enhancement of learning and teaching practices because of this additional international experience (Smith, 2009a). Involvement of provider academics in TNE, for example, can be a valuable professional development opportunity for them in terms of development of broader perspectives and growth of understanding of differing “learning models”. This, in turn, can result in improved outcomes for students in all modes (Smith, 2009a).

Gopal (2011) states that the development of intercultural competencies is pre-requisite if home campus academics are to teach at TNE locations, and that these competencies can be developed through pre-departure and on-going professional development. Development of these competencies, she suggests, is
“...not only imperative to educational systems around the world but to producing globally-minded citizens, preparing them to work in international contexts and creating a more democratic society” (p. 379).

Similarly, Leask (2004) suggests that engagement between home campus academics and teaching staff at the TNE location has benefits for all involved, particularly in terms of the potential for both groups becoming “intercultural learners” (p.1), arguing that this does not come automatically as a result of having a broad international student cohort on the home campus. Nor will it develop as an outcome from TNE unless the relationships in the teaching team are developed with an understanding of the impact of culture on approaches to curriculum development and delivery from both sides of the relationship.

McLean (2007) agrees, suggesting that the capacity of the home and local academic staff to work together is the ideal, but is “not easily accomplished” (p. 62) due to the perceived differences in power in the relationship and the relative lack of opportunity to develop collegial relations.

Mahmud et al. (2010) clearly identify the need for close collaboration between home and local staff for many reasons, including easing the moderation process and encouraging internationalisation of the curriculum. They suggest that best practice in this realm is developed through close collaboration and clearly defined roles, though, “these most often depend on the commitment and additional effort of individuals and are thus fragile due to staff turnover and burnout” (p.7).

While the relationship between academics at the home campus and TNE location is important in the development of academics on both sides of the relationship
(e.g., Leask, 2004), Smith (2009b) reported that in the case of a branch campus in the UAE, the relationship was not beneficial to those academics at the UAE campus. The relationship was characterised as being quite negative, particularly because of the “uncaring and condescending attitude” (p. 475) of the academics at the home campus towards those at the UAE campus. Further tensions in these relationships can arise because, depending on the type of TNE delivery model in play, the academics at the TNE location may have no input into the design of the curriculum, or not have the opportunity to contextualise the content (Edwards, Crosling, & Lim, 2014) for their situation. Exacerbating this could be the imposition of a hierarchy in that the academics at the TNE location feel as though they are in a lesser role, possibly employed in teaching only roles and employed under lesser conditions than colleagues at the home campus (Edwards et al., 2014). In situations where the TNE academics are not involved with curriculum design, there may be additional workload required for them in order to interpret and deliver the Australian-designed curriculum (Lim et al., 2016).

In the context of home campus academics who travel to teach in TNE locations, Debowski (2003) lists a number of issues that have a negative impact, including: workload, reduction in research capacity, impact on work-life balance, weekend and night work, impact on “normal” work, and disconnection from the university community from missing meetings and interaction with colleagues.

Much of the research relevant to academics located at TNE locations has been conducted in the context of those employed at branch campuses. Dobos (2011) for example, found a number of factors that caused concerns for academics at a Malaysian branch campus of an Australian university, but suggested the most
important issue for the academics at the branch campus was professional treatment by colleagues at the home campus. These findings were similar to those of Smith (2009b), who in the context of a branch campus in the UAE, reported there being “strained” relationships between the branch and home campus.

Wilkins, Butt and Annabi (2017) examined the organisational commitment of academics at several branch campuses in Malaysia and the UAE and found it was lower than for academics at the home campuses, suggesting that a possible reason for this is lack of involvement in curriculum development and teaching materials.

### 2.5 Overview

This chapter has reviewed literature relevant to this thesis. The first section of the chapter reviewed TNE in general, its development and the ways in which it has been defined. The importance of TNE for hosting and sending countries was discussed, as was its significance for universities as an opportunity to generate discretionary income independent of government sources. Issues of risk and QA in TNE were examined, in particular, the role academics play through their responsibility for oversight of TNE academic programs.

Universities have chosen to deliver TNE in various ways and classification of these delivery modes is problematic, particularly when viewed in the context of the participation of the academic. A model that classifies TNE on the basis of the “locus of curriculum control” (Mazzolini et al., 2012) was discussed as being
appropriate when discussing academics’ control over curriculum decisions in TNE.

Job satisfaction and the factors that impact on the job satisfaction were also defined and discussed. Job satisfaction was reported in the literature to have positive outcomes for academics, in terms of their performance, their propensity to remain with their university and their health. It was noted that the main causes of satisfaction for academics involve their involvement in teaching, the interaction they have with colleagues and students, and the autonomy and control they are able to exercise over their working environment.

Each of the factors that can influence academic job satisfaction will vary depending on the manner in which the academic's university delivers TNE. Interaction with students and TNE teaching colleagues for example, which are valuable sources of feedback, will be influenced by the inclusion or otherwise of a face-to-face component. Similarly, the control over the TNE offering may impact on task significance associated with the job. This literature review has demonstrated there has been little research into how involvement in TNE impacts on academic job satisfaction.

In order to better understand the job satisfaction of academics involved in TNE, the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) is used in this thesis as the theoretical framework.
Chapter 3 Research Method

3.1 Introduction

The objective of the research described in this thesis is to better understand the relationship between the ways in which TNE is operationalised and the satisfaction of the academics involved. This research objective is addressed in two studies. The first study investigates the research questions from the perspective of home-campus academics, the second study from the perspective of academics teaching at the TNE location. Both studies employ a mixed-methods research approach (MMR), in that they collect, integrate and analyse both quantitative and qualitative data in a systematic manner. This chapter discusses the methodological choices made in the design of the research and its implementation.

The chapter begins with a review of the objectives of the research, followed by a discussion of MMR, why it is appropriate and was chosen for this research. It then discusses the research design. This is followed by a description of the first phase of both studies, including the identification of participants and the design and administration of the questionnaires. The second phase of both studies involved semi-structured interviews, so the next section discusses the participant selection processes and the conduct of the interviews. Following this is an explanation of the data analysis procedures for both studies. The chapter concludes with an overview.
3.2 Research Objective

The primary objective of the research described in this thesis is to better understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved, particularly in terms of the aspects of academic life that have been identified as causing satisfaction (for example, interaction with colleagues and students (Martin, 2011)) and the control able to be exercised over the way they organize their work (Bellamy et al., 2003)).

Previous research (e.g., Judge et al., 2001) identified a significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, particularly in those jobs characterised by a high level of complexity and autonomy. Bentley et al. (2013a) state that,

“…a motivated academic workforce, satisfied with their reconstructed academic jobs, is most likely to produce the greatest benefit to research, innovation and society” (p.240).

The importance of TNE to the economies of sending and receiving countries was discussed in Section 2.2, as was its importance to universities and individual students. Given this, the satisfaction of those academics involved in TNE is an important factor in its success.

This understanding of how TNE impacts on academic job satisfaction, in turn, has the purpose of being able to inform universities’ approaches to TNE in order to design TNE in such a way so as to increase academics’ satisfaction and decrease their dissatisfaction. In this project, academics’ satisfaction was explored in terms of the core job dimensions as described in Hackman and
Oldham's (1975) Job Characteristics Model (JCM), as discussed in Section 2.3.1. In order to achieve the objective of the thesis, the primary research question being investigated is:

- How does the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics’ job satisfaction?

Several more specific secondary questions were defined in order to guide and inform the conduct of the research project:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ2: How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

The next section discusses the choice of research approach to answer these questions.

3.3 Mixed Methods Research (MMR)

3.3.1 MMR Definition

The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in a single study has been referred to by a number of different terms including: “multiple operationalism”, “between-method triangulation”, “integrated”, “hybrid”, 
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“combined”, as well as the most commonly used term, “mixed methods research” (MMR) (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).

MMR was chosen for this research because the nature of the research questions (see Section 3.2) is such that the use of either qualitative or quantitative methods alone was unlikely to be able to provide as thorough an understanding of the relationships between the various factors under consideration as the use of a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). These relationships could be examined using quantitative methods alone to, for example, determine the strength of the relationship between academics’ interactions with TNE students and the satisfaction they gain from it. However, the addition of qualitative methods and data was intended to develop a better understanding of the relationship and how it impacts on the participants. Indeed, the blending and integration of the methods allowed for a more thorough engagement with the complexity of the issues raised in the research, and supported achievement of the objective of being able to better inform universities’ approaches to TNE.

MMR is generally defined as a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods in the same study (e.g., Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Creswell & Plano Clark (2007) add that MMR is a research methodology that,
“...involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research process” (p.5).

This definition suggests they see MMR as being more than simply the collection of both qualitative and quantitative data; rather that MMR requires the integration of both qualitative and quantitative data and approaches throughout the study.

The integration of quantitative and qualitative methods and data has been reported as having positive outcomes in a number of different contexts. Currell and Towler (2003) state that organizational research, in particular, benefits from the combination of quantitative and qualitative research in that both, when used in isolation, fail to draw on the strengths of the other; qualitative methods cannot provide theory testing through statistical inference, and quantitative methods cannot provide “theory development through the use of detailed observation of organizational phenomena” (p.514). Hanson, Creswell, Plano Clark, Petska and Creswell (2005) suggest that the capacity for convergence of the numeric trends from the quantitative data with the more specific details from the qualitative data allows for a better understanding of the research problem. Venkatesh, Bala and Sykes (2010), for example, report that a “puzzling finding” (p.591) from a quantitative study into the impact of the implementation of an information system on employees' job satisfaction was able to be understood more deeply as a result of a subsequent qualitative study.

MMR has been used in a wide variety of research projects in a broad selection of discipline areas. For example, Alzaidi (2008) adopted a MMR approach to
investigate the job satisfaction of secondary school head teachers in Saudi Arabia. Venkatesh et al. (2010) used MMR to explore the effects on employees of information technology adoption and implementation in a service organisation. Meta-analyses of the adoption of MMR in several disciplines have been conducted. For example, Azorin and Cameron (2010) reviewed the use of MMR in business and management research and suggested that in that context, MMR was used mainly in theory development. Stentz, Plano Clark and Matkin (2012) suggested that while there was not a large number of MMR projects in leadership research literature, those that had been published demonstrated that MMR allowed the research to approach complex questions in this area in “new and meaningful ways” (p. 1181). Collins, Onwuegbuzie and Sutton (2006) investigated the use of MMR in special education and, while they found there had been a limited adoption, suggested it was appropriate. Further, they discussed and provided a rationale for the use of MMR in the special education discipline. Madey (1982) reported on the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods in education program evaluation, using several cases to demonstrate its usefulness in that context. MMR has also been applied in healthcare research; Creswell and Zhang (2009) described the use MMR in trauma research, and O’Cathain, Murphy and Nicholl (2007) investigated its use in health services research in the UK, and made the suggestion that MMR is used to overcome the inadequacy of quantitative methods to deal with the complexities inherent in health care research.

A number of reasons why MMR has been adopted in such a wide variety of contexts have been posited. At their core, however, is that the integration of
quantitative and qualitative methods and data allows the researcher to make use of the complementary strengths of both (e.g., Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005), and to offset their overlapping weaknesses (e.g., Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Driscoll, Appiah-Yeboah, Salib, & Rupert, 2007). Quantitative research methods, for example, bring strengths to the research in terms of their capacity to supply some degree of generalizability and generation of predictive models (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Conversely, quantitative research does not always adequately capture the participants’ voices (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007) because of the distance between the researcher and the individual which arises from the use of “more remote, inferential empirical methods and materials” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 9). Qualitative research can help to more fully describe and understand the phenomena of interest, particularly when the relationships between factors are not necessarily well understood, and provide a richer understanding of the real world in which the research is situated (e.g., Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Hanson et al., 2005; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). However, the worldviews and interpretations of the qualitative researcher can increase the potential for biases and reduce the potential for generalizability of findings from a study (e.g., Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Saldana, 2015).

MMR studies also exhibit a number of other features. A quantitative first phase, for example, might be used to determine the questions to be asked in subsequent phases (Creswell & Zhang, 2009); this is referred to as development (e.g., Greene et al., 1989; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). An MMR study can also provide the capacity to extend the breadth and range of a research project, referred to by Green et al. (1989), as expansion. Expansion creates the potential
for the researcher to use a broader range of tools and approaches than would normally be available to them were they conducting a single method study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The discovery of contradictory findings between the methods could lead to a possible reframing of the research questions, in a process referred to as *initiation* (Greene et al., 1989).

The clarification, elaboration, enhancement or illustration of results from one method with the findings from the other is also a feature of MMR. This has been referred to as *complementarity* (e.g., Azorín & Cameron, 2010; Greene et al., 1989; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005) and, for example, could come from the use of semi-structured interviews to clarify and explore the results of a quantitative survey. MMR can also exhibit *triangulation*, where the same phenomenon can be studied using different methods allowing for corroboration and convergence of findings (Greene et al., 1989).

### 3.3.2 Evaluation of MMR Studies

There has been much debate about assessing and evaluating the quality of MMR studies, which has included disagreement as to whether or not *validity* (credibility of the research) is even the correct term to use, with the term *legitimation* being more inclusive of both quantitative and qualitative methods (e.g., Hanson et al., 2005; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006). There have also been several evaluative frameworks created (e.g., O’Cathain, 2010; Onwuegbuzie & Johnson, 2006; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2008), but the issue of quality assurance in MMR is still complex and controversial (Ivankova, 2014) because both the quantitative and qualitative components “bring to the fore their own unique crises” (Collins et al., 2006, p.303). This is
further complicated when outputs of one method are used as a starting point for
the other, meaning deficiencies in quality of the first may adversely impact the
whole study (Ivankova, 2014), as they would be in two-phased design such as
has been adopted in this research.

More generally, discussion of validity (or legitimation) of MMR studies has
focused on the need for it to be considered at all stages of the study. Collins,
Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2012) focus on legitimation as being a
determination of whether adequate meaning has been able to be extracted from
the collected data, whether the findings of the project are dependable and
transferable based on whether there has been some form of legitimation at
every stage of the project, and whether or not those findings can be considered
to be rigorously applied and useful to a range of stakeholders.

Ivankova (2014) suggests that where the study makes use of an explanatory
sequential design (i.e., the quantitative data is collected and analysed prior to
the collection of the qualitative data, in a similar but not identical way to the
conduct of this research), the use of three quality assurance strategies is
advised:

- Adoption of a systematic process for selecting participants for qualitative
  follow-up,
- Elaboration of any unexpected quantitative results, and
- Observing the interaction between qualitative and quantitative results.

Taking these strategies into account, in the context of this project, selection of
participants for the second phase of each of the studies used a purposeful
sampling strategy with maximum variation (Suri, 2011), based on the
institutions at which the participants were employed, the institutional approaches to the delivery of TNE and the role of the participant in the delivery of TNE. These processes are detailed for each of the studies in Section 3.7. The qualitative data and analyses are used throughout to elaborate on the quantitative results, particularly where the quantitative results were not as expected (see for example, Section 4.5.1.2).

The next section discusses the design of the research, providing an overview of the research design.

### 3.4 Research Design

This research was designed so that the research questions could be examined from the perspectives of both home campus and TNE academics. In order to do this, two studies were conducted. The first focused on home campus academics, and the second on local teaching staff at a TNE location. Both studies adopted a MMR approach in that they collected, integrated and analysed quantitative and qualitative data.

There are a number of different ways in which MMR can be conducted, each differing in terms of the order in which the quantitative and qualitative data are collected (implementation), the weighting that is placed on each (priority), and the stages at which the datasets are integrated (integration). Each of the choices made for this research are discussed below.

#### 3.4.1 Implementation

Each of the studies employed a similar design in that they were both conducted in two phases as discussed below.
The first phase, an online questionnaire, collected both quantitative and qualitative data concurrently. The design of the online questionnaires for each of the studies is detailed in Section 3.6. Analysis of the data collected in the online questionnaire in each of the studies informed the design and conduct of the second phase which used semi-structured interviews and is discussed in Section 3.7.

Leech and Onwuegbuzie (2009) classify this type of design as being “fully mixed, concurrent, equal status”, in that the quantitative and qualitative phases of the study are “mixed concurrently at one or more stages or across components” (p.270), and that the quantitative and qualitative data and analyses assume approximately equal weighting.

3.4.2 Priority

Priority, or status, refers to how much weight is given to each of the quantitative and qualitative data (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Morgan (1998) states that decisions on priority will depend on which method is the one that has the best strengths in terms of achieving the project’s goals. In this research, the quantitative and qualitative data were given the same weighting for several reasons:

- The nature of the research questions was such that answers to each of the four secondary research questions required some degree of explanation of the factors impacting on academic job satisfaction, as well as attempting to create a predictive model.
- The relatively small population and likelihood of small samples could have limited the degree of generalizability that could be derived from the quantitative data collection and analysis alone.
The outcomes of the research project are intended to be used as guidance for universities as to how to enhance the degree of job satisfaction associated with academics’ participation in TNE, therefore these outcomes need to be situated in the academics’ context.

3.4.3 Integration

A feature of MMR is that it is more than making use of both quantitative and qualitative methods and analysis in a single project; the integration of both is important in achieving the aims of the project (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). In each of the studies, integration of the quantitative and qualitative data occurs at two points; firstly, analysis of both the quantitative and qualitative data from the online questionnaire was used to direct and inform the semi-structured interview questions for the second phase. Secondly, integration occurred in the reporting where analysis of the quantitative data was used to highlight and explain the qualitative analysis and vice versa.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

This section discusses the two data collection methods that were employed in both studies; an online questionnaire with both closed and open-ended questions, and a series of semi-structured interviews.

3.5.1 Questionnaires

Questionnaires involve the administration of an instrument to the participants, and were chosen as a data collection method for this research for a number of reasons, including the fact they are relatively inexpensive, have a quick turnaround, and can provide a high degree of anonymity for the participant (Johnson & Turner, 2003). In both studies, the questionnaires were self-
administered, meaning the participant had no direct interaction with the researcher during their completion of the questionnaire. Participants were invited to leave their email address if they were willing to be interviewed, or if they wished to be informed of the outcomes of the project, but were free to not record an email address if they chose not to. Email addresses that were collected were held separately from the questionnaire responses.

In both studies, the questionnaires were mixed (referred to as a Type 2 data collection by Johnson and Turner (2003)) in that they included both open- and closed-ended questions. The closed-ended questions were designed to determine participants’ views on various aspects of their involvement in TNE, as well as their demographic background. Peterson (2000) suggests there are several advantages to this type of question, but they stem firstly from the reduction in effort on the part of the participant to answer, given that they are not required to frame an answer, and as such it is less likely participants will refuse to answer. Secondly, from the perspective of the researcher, closed-ended questions require less effort to administer and analyse.

Closed-ended questions can also exhibit several effects that may limit their usefulness. In the context of this research, the concern was that the participant would feel forced to provide a simplistic answer to what they see as a complex issue, or would experience frustration because the “correct” answer was not provided as an alternative (Neuman, 1994). Therefore, the questionnaires also included a number of open-ended questions. These questions were designed to allow the respondent to provide answers in their own words, to provide clarification if the closed-ended questions did not provide a suitable alternative
and to reveal additional insight that might not have been collected by the closed-ended questions (Peterson, 2000). The open-ended questions from both studies revealed interesting insights that were important in framing the interviews. The design and conduct of each of the first phase of both studies is discussed in Section 3.6.

3.5.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

In a semi-structured interview, the interviewer will begin with a set of standard questions, but has the latitude to explore the respondent’s responses further than would be possible in a structured interview or closed-ended questionnaire. The semi-structured interview is more like a “conversation” in that it, depending on the nature of standard questions, “can take many different directions” (Fylan, 2005, p.66). This flexibility means that the interviewer has the capacity to explore contradictions within the participants’ answers in order to come to a deeper understanding of the answer to the research question. This style of interview allows for the interviewer to clarify and elaborate on the answers provided (May, 2011) and also to probe further than would be possible in a structured interview or closed-ended questionnaire (Barriball & While, 1994). Ambrose et al. (2005), in a study examining faculty satisfaction, suggested that the use of semi-structured interviews to collect detailed narratives from university faculty allowed them to examine the context within which the academics were situated from the participants’ own perspective. It also allowed for the more detailed exploration of “unanticipated phenomena and influences” which were possible to discover in this less structured type of interview (p.807).
In the context of this research, semi-structured interviews were used to clarify and elaborate on the data collected from the questionnaires and to explore the impacts involvement in TNE had on job satisfaction. The processes involved in the semi-structured interviews for both studies are discussed in more detail in Section 3.7.

### 3.6 Phase One: Questionnaires

This section details the design and conduct of the first phase of each of the studies. While the two studies were conducted separately, the design and conduct of Study Two was informed by findings from Study One as discussed in Section 3.6.2.2.

#### 3.6.1 Study One

Study One concentrated on academics involved in TNE on the supplier, or home campus side. This section will discuss firstly the identification and recruitment of the participants for Study One. It then describes the design and development of the online questionnaire and the constructs being examined.

##### 3.6.1.1 Identification and Recruitment of Participants

It was decided in the design of the first study to restrict the participants to academics delivering TNE units in Information Technology (IT) and related disciplines for several reasons. Firstly, it is the home discipline of the researcher; as such the researcher is familiar with the learning content and pedagogical approaches commonly used in the discipline. This familiarity allowed the researcher a deeper appreciation of the participants’ perspectives than may otherwise have been the case, without the potentially confounding
impact of discipline or domain-specific artefacts. Secondly, there was an expectation that both IT academics and students would have a higher degree of familiarity and comfort with the use of educational and communication technologies. As the focus of the project is academic satisfaction as a function of the interactions between academics and students, as well as the control able to be exercised over the conduct of a unit, the use of this cohort was seen to reduce the potentially confounding degree of dissatisfaction that may have arisen as a result of unfamiliarity or unease with the technology. Thirdly, there was also an expectation that basing the study in a single discipline area would reduce the breadth of pedagogical approaches and terminology used to describe the various teaching activities used in the TNE offerings, as this could also have had the potential to confuse the interpretation of the results of the project. Fourthly, IT and related-field courses are well represented in TNE.

Approval of the University Human Research Ethics Committee was sought and granted (see Appendix A) prior to proceeding. Recruitment of participants occurred in several ways. Initially Australian universities that offer IT and related-field programs transnationally were identified from sources such as AusLIST\(^6\), in-country registers of TNE operations (e.g., CPE\(^7\) in Singapore), and university websites. These sources did not always agree, and in some cases, were even contradictory; therefore, where possible, current online university handbooks were consulted in order to determine which courses were, in fact, currently being offered. Fourteen Australian universities were identified as offering IT and related courses transnationally. Associate Deans, Learning and

---


\(^{7}\) CPE [http://www.cpe.gov.sg](http://www.cpe.gov.sg)
Teaching (or equivalent) in the relevant academic organisational units at these universities were identified using the ARNEIA\(^8\) listing and contacted via email (See Appendix B). They were invited to participate and also to pass the invitation on to colleagues who were involved in TNE. Approximately five weeks later, the web sites of the Universities were also searched to identify other academics who were, or who may have been, involved in TNE. These academics were then contacted by email (See Appendix C), and a reminder was sent to all of the email addresses approximately three weeks after that.

In all, 202 academics were directly contacted requesting participation in the study. There were 47 responses with 6 responses being discarded because they were substantially incomplete, leaving 41 valid responses. The response rate is difficult to calculate as there is no information as to how many responses came from academics contacted by Associate Deans. This sample size is at the lower end of the requirements for the intended quantitative analyses (multiple regression analysis (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006)) making the qualitative data collection and analysis important in order to understand and further explore the issues suggested by the quantitative component of the study.

### 3.6.1.2 Questionnaire Design and Development

The questionnaire was developed specifically for the study, drawing upon previous research into academic job satisfaction with online teaching (Bolliger & Wasilik, 2009), with the individual components being discussed in more detail below. It was pre-tested by several academics from different universities to ensure that the language and terminology used was appropriate and clearly

---

explained; for example, terms relating to units/courses and teaching staff at both the home and TNE locations were clarified. Comments and feedback on the structure and nature of information being sought were solicited, and the feedback received was incorporated in subsequent versions of the questionnaire. It was intended to take no longer than 30 minutes to complete.

The questionnaire was hosted online by SurveyMonkey\textsuperscript{9}. Respondents had to acknowledge their consent to participate in the study prior to proceeding with the questionnaire using a form of words approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the researcher's university and could withdraw this consent by closing the web browser at any stage. The final version of the full questionnaire is provided in Appendix D, and comprised four sections which are discussed below.

The first section of the questionnaire used in Study One collected background and demographic information regarding the individual academic and their history of involvement in TNE, more specifically:

- how long (in years) the respondent had been involved in TNE,
- how many TNE unit/course offerings the respondent had been responsible for in the last year,
- the countries in which the respondent had had TNE responsibilities, and
- the respondent’s age.

The second section of the questionnaire aimed to determine the role of the individual academic in the provision of TNE in order to identify the degree of control they had over unit content and operations (as discussed in Section \textsuperscript{9} See www.surveymonkey.com
3.6.1.3) and the degree of interaction they had with TNE teaching colleagues and students (as discussed in Section 3.6.1.4). The third section of the questionnaire asked a series of questions designed to determine the respondents’ levels of satisfaction with TNE teaching (see Section 3.6.1.5). The final section of the questionnaire asked several more open questions to investigate the respondents’ attitudes toward several aspects of TNE. The following sections describe the constructs associated with control over unit delivery, interaction with staff and students, and then satisfaction.

3.6.1.3 Control over Unit Delivery

As discussed in Section 2.3.3, previous research has demonstrated that the control an academic has over their work is seen as an important factor in their job satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Oshagbemi, 1999; Paul & Phua, 2011). In terms of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), the Autonomy dimension reflects the aspects of the job that provide the worker with the freedom to determine how their job is carried out.

Mazzonlini et al. (2012) state that differences in allocation of responsibilities between the home and TNE location for learning and teaching activities can be articulated in terms of the “locus of curriculum control” (p.21), which consists of the following elements:

- Selection of curriculum content
- Determination of learning and teaching activities
- Development of related learning resources
- Choice of assessment instruments
- Drafting of assessment items
From these locus of curriculum control elements, the following four learning and teaching activities were selected as being representative of the key aspects of TNE unit delivery, and, in turn, the control the academic could exercise over their TNE teaching: Content Creation, Content Modification, Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking. Each of these is discussed below.

Content Creation is defined for this project as the degree of responsibility the academic has for the creation of unit content. As the focus of Study One is the home campus academic, the question is being asked from that perspective. Content Creation was measured using a single item that was created specifically for this study (see Table 3-1). The questionnaire also included an open-ended possible response of “Other” in order to capture any other content that may have been created for the unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What content (apart from assessment) did you create for the transnational offering?</td>
<td>Learning objectives, Topic objectives, Topic lecture slides, Tutorial/laboratory exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Modification was defined for this project as processes involved in the changing of content supplied by the home campus academic by the TNE teaching staff. The focus of Study One is the home campus academic, therefore the question is being asked from that perspective. Because it was unclear as to what the possible answers to this question would be, and in order to capture the full range of possible approaches, an open question was asked, “If the content
supplied by you is modified by the teaching staff at the transnational locations, how does the modification happen?"

Assessment Creation was defined for this research as the academic’s responsibility for the creation and choice of assessment, the degree of input into the design of those items, and the potential and process for there to be modification of the content of the assessment items. In Study One, the question was being asked from the perspective of the home campus academics.

Assessment Creation was measured using a single item that was developed specifically for this research. The question, response options and scoring are shown in Table 3-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What degree of responsibility do you have for the creation of the assessment items in the unit/course?</td>
<td>I have no involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I approve assessment items created by the teaching staff at the transnational location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I create all of the assessment items</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An open-ended question was also asked about the nature of the local TNE teaching staffs’ involvement in the creation of the assessment items; it was, "Where the local staff have any involvement in the creation of Assessment items, what is the nature of that involvement?"

Assessment Marking refers to the involvement of the academic in the process of grading students’ assessments, and ranged from no involvement through to the respondent being responsible for marking all of the assessment items. The question used to measure Assessment Marking as well as the response options and scoring method are shown in Table 3-3. Respondents, who in Study One
were home campus academics, were given the opportunity to provide other
detail if they wished to do so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3 Assessment Marking Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes your involvement in the marking of the assessment items?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have any involvement with the marking of the assessment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mark some items and moderate the marking of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use and then moderate the marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mark all of the assessment items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1.4 Interaction

As discussed in Section 2.3.3, the nature and degree of interaction that home
campus academics have with the TNE students and also the TNE academics is
examined in this thesis in order to explore its role as a determinant of the home
campus academics’ satisfaction with TNE. There are three aspects of interaction
that were examined in Study One with respect to the respondent’s most recent
TNE teaching experience: Face-to-face Delivery, Student Interaction, and Staff
Interaction. These are defined and discussed below.

Face-to-Face Delivery is defined as the degree to which the academic is involved
in the physical delivery of the unit content, as would occur, for example, by
conducting face-to-face lectures. In terms of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham,
1976), Face-to-Face Delivery relates to the Task Identity dimension, in that it
indicates the completion of the job, which is this case refers to the academic
having designed and then been responsible for the face-to-face delivery of the
unit to the students. Face-to-face delivery of the unit also provides an opportunity, through interaction with students in a classroom environment, for immediate feedback; this then relates to the Feedback dimension of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). The question asked in the questionnaire to measure this aspect of interaction with respect to the respondent's most recent TNE teaching experience is listed in Table 3-4, along with the response options and the scoring method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What involvement do you have with the physical delivery (i.e. face-to-face contact with the students) of the unit content?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorial/laboratory sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lectures AND Tutorial/laboratory sessions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were given the option of specifying any other face-to-face activities involved in the physical delivery of the unit in which they may have been involved.

The second aspect of interaction is Student Interaction, which is defined as the degree to which the academic interacts with the students, be it face-to-face or using some other remote or asynchronous modality. Student interaction has been reported in the literature as being one of the causes of academic job satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Paul & Phua, 2011). In terms of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), interaction with students potentially relates to the Task Significance and Feedback dimensions. This is because having knowledge of the students’ circumstances and stories, and the subsequent impact of a
successful education experience, can enhance the feelings of the significance of
the job. Similarly, being able to gain immediate feedback from students on the
quality or otherwise of the academics’ work is a potential source of job
satisfaction. The question asked in the Study One questionnaire to measure this
aspect of interaction with respect to the respondent’s most recent TNE teaching
experience is listed in Table 3-5, along with the response options and the
scoring method used to calculate the Student Interaction variable.

Table 3-5 Student Interaction Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typically, how often would you have some interaction with individual</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transnational students during a typical teaching period?</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An open-ended question was also asked about interaction with students in
order to determine what the communication was about, and how it was
classified, “What is the nature of the interaction you have with transnational
students?”

The third aspect of interaction considered is Staff Interaction which is defined in
this project as the interaction between the academics at the home campus and
TNE locations. As with Student Interaction, this variable relates to the Task
Significance and Feedback dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).
Further, and as discussed in Section 2.3.3, interactions with colleagues are an
important aspect of academic job satisfaction (e.g., Martin, 2011; Oshagbemi,
1999). The question asked in the Study One questionnaire to measure this
aspect of interaction with respect to the home campus academic’s most recent TNE teaching experience is listed in Table 3-6, along with the response options and scoring used to calculate the Staff Interaction variable.

**Table 3-6 Staff Interaction Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typically, how often would you have some interaction with individual teaching staff at the transnational location during a typical teaching period?</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Student Interaction, a further, open-ended question was asked; “What is the nature of the interaction you have with the transnational teaching staff?”, in order to understand the content and mechanisms of the interactions.

### 3.6.1.5 Satisfaction

Academics’ job satisfaction was determined in this project through the use of multiple item measures. As discussed in Chapter 2, job satisfaction has been measured in many contexts, using many different approaches (e.g., van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek, & Frings-Dresen, 2003). There has been debate as to the use of single versus multiple-item instruments in determining job satisfaction, with some (e.g., Scarpello & Campbell, 1983; Wanous, Rechers, & Hudy, 1997) suggesting that a single, global, summed satisfaction item is a more inclusive measure of job satisfaction, and others, such as Nagy (2002), suggesting that a single-item satisfaction measure is easier to administer and complete, less expensive and more flexible than multiple-item scales.
However, Oshagbemi (1999) found that single-item satisfaction measures resulted in an overestimation of job satisfaction and an underestimation of job dissatisfaction (as well as indifference) when compared with multiple-item instruments. Further, he suggested that the use of multiple-item satisfaction measures could be appropriate when attempting to measure satisfaction with specific and important areas of an individual employment grouping (in that case, university teachers). Multiple-item measures can also identify specific areas that are causing satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) and that can be the focus of remedial action. Oshagbemi (1999) also suggested that direct questions about satisfaction can tend to elicit a defensive reaction from employees.

Examples of previous approaches to measuring academic job satisfaction include Oshagbemi (1996), who used eight measures when researching academic job satisfaction in the UK, with these being satisfaction with: teaching, research, administration and management, present pay, promotions, supervision/ supervisor behaviour, co-workers’ behaviour and physical conditions/working facilities. Farrell and Rusbult (1981) used two direct queries: “are you satisfied with the job?”, and, “do you like the job?” They then asked a further four indirect questions, including: “would you recommend the job to a friend?”, “how close is this to your ideal job?”, “has the job met your expectations?”, and, “what possible regrets do you have about the job?” A single question, “How would you rate your overall satisfaction with your current job?” was used by Shin and Jung (2014).

As this thesis is examining a particular aspect of academic work (i.e., TNE) rather than academic work in general, it was decided to develop a multiple-item
instrument that asked about respondents' satisfaction with a number of areas of their work life associated specifically with TNE. These aspects included satisfaction with their interactions with students and teaching colleagues, the perceived level of support from the university, the level of support required to be provided to TNE students and staff, and the reward gained from participation in TNE. The items used to measure satisfaction were based on those used by Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) in their study of academic satisfaction with online teaching. Modifications were made to account for the difference in focus between online and TNE teaching. Satisfaction was determined with regard to firstly, the respondent’s most recent TNE teaching experience, and secondly with regard to TNE more generally. The items regarding the most recent experience were focused more on the day-to-day delivery and operation of TNE, as opposed to their more general satisfaction with TNE that was sought in the second section.

To measure satisfaction with their latest TNE offering, participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements regarding their most recent experience of TNE (see Table 3-7). The items were all measured on 5-point Likert scales labelled from 1 ‘Strongly Disagree’ to 5 ‘Strongly Agree’. 
Table 3-7 Items to Measure Satisfaction with Most Recent Experience of TNE

I am satisfied...

- with the support in designing and running my transnational units/courses provided to me by the University.
- that my transnational students are receiving an equivalent experience of my unit/course to my local students.
- with the degree of control I have over the conduct of my unit/course transnationally.
- with the degree to which my transnational students communicate with me regarding their unit/course matters.
- with the degree of enthusiasm my transnational students demonstrate toward their studies when compared with my local students.
- with the level of feedback I am able to provide to my transnational students on their performance in the unit/course.
- with the degree to which the transnational teaching staff communicate with me regarding unit/course matters.
- with the degree of enthusiasm the local teaching staff demonstrate toward the unit/course.
- that the transnational staff are adequately qualified to teach my unit/course.
- with the level of support I need to provide to the transnational teaching staff.

A composite variable, Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering, was calculated as the mean of scores of the responses for each respondent.

To measure satisfaction with TNE in general, participants were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with a number of statements regarding their most recent experience of TNE (see Table 3-8). The items were all measured on 5-point Likert scales labelled from 1 ‘Strongly Disagree’ to 5 ‘Strongly Agree’, and a composite variable, Satisfaction with TNE in General, was calculated as the mean of scores of the responses for each respondent.
Table 3-8 Items to Measure Satisfaction with TNE in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in my transnational units/courses as being &quot;my&quot; students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next transnational unit/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the “reward” I receive for teaching my transnational units/courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching transnational units/courses has provided me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more satisfied with transnational teaching than other forms of teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1.6 General Questions about Respondents’ Attitudes to TNE

The final section of the questionnaire asked several more general questions in order to provide additional details to assist with the development of a deeper understanding of home campus academics’ attitudes toward TNE. These questions are listed in Table 3-9.

Table 3-9 General Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of transnational teaching do you find satisfying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What aspects of transnational teaching do you find dissatisfying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you see in transnational teaching as being of benefit to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impact does transnational teaching have on your “normal” work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you receive additional financial payment for your transnational teaching? If so, do you think this payment adequately compensates you for your time and effort?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two questions asked the respondents to contemplate and articulate the aspects of TNE that caused them either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The third question asked the respondent to specify any aspect of TNE they had found beneficial, and the final two questions were exploring the impacts and rewards attributed to TNE.
### 3.6.2 Study Two

The focus of Study Two was on academics teaching curricula sourced from Australian universities in Singapore. Singapore was chosen for Study Two for several reasons. Firstly, Singapore has the highest number of TNE students studying Australian university courses, surpassing enrolments in China, Malaysia, Vietnam and Hong Kong between 2010 and 2014 (Department of Education and Training, 2015). Secondly, Singapore is the geographically closest TNE importing country to Australia, providing easier access for the researcher to TNE academics in their own environment. Finally, the researcher's university has a strong TNE presence in Singapore meaning that there were existing networks that could be used to facilitate the research.

This section will discuss the processes associated with the identification and recruitment of participants for the study. This is followed by a description of the design and development of the online questionnaire and the constructs being examined.

#### 3.6.2.1 Identification and Recruitment of Participants

The selection of participants in this study was broader than in the first study in that recruitment was not restricted to IT academics as in the first study, because it was anticipated that recruitment would be problematic for several reasons. Firstly, the private education market in Singapore is very competitive (Lee, 2015). As this study would be identified with a particular Australian university and local Private Education Institution (PEI) in the market because of the researcher's affiliation, it was anticipated that assistance from other PEIs might not be easily forthcoming. Secondly, privacy laws in Singapore preclude
organisations from providing employees’ contact details to third parties\textsuperscript{10}. This meant that there was a reliance on the PEIs to pass emails on to potential study recruits, meaning the target sample might be difficult to reach.

It is not possible to accurately gauge the response rate for this part of the study. Australian universities with some degree of infrastructure (for example, a campus or permanent office) in Singapore, such as Curtin University, James Cook University, Murdoch University and University of Newcastle, had some academic contact details for local TNE academics on their websites, and a total of 246 email addresses were collected in this way. Contact was also made with Principals/Deans and those in similar roles at each of the Australian universities listed above. Emails with details of the study were sent to both groups with recipients being asked to forward them on to academics teaching into the university’s courses (see Appendix E).

A total of 54 responses were received with 7 being discarded because they were largely incomplete, leaving a total of 47 valid responses.

\textbf{3.6.2.2 Questionnaire Design and Development}

The questionnaire used for Study Two (see Appendix F), while essentially similar to that used in Study One, differed in several ways. Firstly, the questions were asked from the perspective of the participant as an academic in Singapore teaching curriculum sourced from foreign universities. The second point of difference was the addition of several questions regarding interaction between the TNE teacher and home campus academics. This was because Study One suggested there was a negative relationship between the amount of contact the

\textsuperscript{10} Primarily, the Personal Privacy Data Protection Act (PDPA), \url{https://www.pdpc.gov.sg/legislation-and-guidelines/overview}
home campus academics had with the TNE academics and their satisfaction. In order to explore this relationship further, and specifically from the perspective of the TNE academic, several additional questions were asked about the mode and content of the communications with the home campus colleagues. Thirdly, interaction with students was explored in the context of “out-of-class” contact because all of the local teaching staff would be expected to be involved in the physical delivery of the content, and so contact additional to that was of interest. Finally, several questions from the shortened form of Hackman and Oldham’s (1974) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) were added to gain additional insight into the use of that instrument in this context.

The questionnaire was pre-tested by several academics employed in TNE in Singapore, as well as the Dean of one Australian university’s Singapore campus. Comments and feedback on the structure of the questionnaire and the terminology used when referring to units and the teaching staff at both the TNE and home locations were sought. There were several iterations of this, and the feedback that was received was incorporated into subsequent versions of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was intended to take no longer than 30 minutes to complete.

The questionnaire was hosted online by Survey Monkey. Respondents had to acknowledge their consent to participate in the study prior to proceeding with the questionnaire using a form of words approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC 2015/1055) of the researcher’s university and could withdraw this consent by closing the web browser at any stage.

---

11 See www.surveymonkey.com
The first section of the questionnaire used in Study Two collected background and demographic information regarding the individual academic and their history of involvement in TNE, more specifically:

- the respondent’s age,
- the discipline in which they teach,
- how long the respondent had been involved in TNE,
- the number of units\textsuperscript{12} they had taught in the last year,
- the countries from which the units they had taught were sourced,
- the number of hours per week the respondent would normally be teaching.

The second section of the questionnaire aimed to determine the role the individual TNE academic had in the provision of TNE in order to identify the degree of control they have over unit content and operations (as discussed in Section 3.6.2.3), including the creation, modification and delivery of unit content. This was followed with several questions regarding assessment, in particular the TNE academic’s role in the creation and marking of the assessment items. The next section of the questionnaire explored the TNE academic’s interaction with students and home campus teaching colleagues (as discussed in Section 3.6.2.4).

The third section of the questionnaire asked a series of questions designed to determine the TNE academic’s levels of satisfaction with TNE teaching (as discussed in Section 3.6.2.5), firstly with regard to their most recent TNE teaching.

\textsuperscript{12} The questionnaire used the term ‘module’ to refer to unit as this term is more widely used in the Singapore context. For continuity, the term ‘unit’ will continue to be used here.
teaching experience, then their satisfaction with TNE in general. This was followed by a series of questions from the JDS as discussed in Section 3.6.2.6.

The final section of the questionnaire asked several more open questions to investigate the TNE academic’s attitudes toward several aspects of TNE.

3.6.2.3 Control over Unit Delivery

As discussed in Section 2.3.3, control over the conduct and delivery of units by TNE teaching staff was investigated because of the impact it has been reported as having on academics’ job satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Oshagbemi, 1999; Paul & Phua, 2011), particularly in terms of the JCM Autonomy dimension (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), which reflects the aspects of the job that provide the worker with the freedom to determine how their job is carried out.

On the basis of findings from the first study (see Section 4.5.2), it was anticipated that TNE academics would have a lesser degree of control over the conduct of units than their home campus colleagues, and that this might impact negatively on their satisfaction. In many cases in the first study, it appeared as though home campus academics allowed little or no modification of the content of the units to be undertaken without their expressed consent. Similarly, in most cases, assessment was designed by the home campus academics and, at the very least, the marking of the students’ work was moderated by the home campus academics. In order to understand the impact home campus control had on the TNE academics, the respondents were asked several questions about their control over the curriculum and their role in assessment design and marking to determine if this had an impact on their satisfaction.
The control TNE academics could exercise over unit delivery was measured, as it was in the first study (Section 3.6.1.3), by asking a series of questions relating to Mazzolini and Yeo’s (2012) locus of curriculum control. In particular, they were asked about their capacity to influence or modify unit content and assessment items, as well as their role in the marking of assessments. From the locus of curriculum control elements, the following learning and teaching activities were identified as being representative of the key aspects of TNE unit delivery over which TNE academics could exercise some control: Content Creation, Content Modification, Assessment Creation, and Assessment Marking. Each of these is discussed below.

Content Creation is defined for this research, as being the degree of responsibility the academic had for the creation of unit content in their most recent TNE offering. If the respondents had multiple unit offerings in the last teaching period, they were asked to consider the questions in the context of the unit they saw as being most typical. The Content Creation variable was calculated as a count of the various content components created for the unit offering (Table 3-10). If the respondent selected “None”, the score for this item would be 0. This item also included an open response of “Other” in order to capture any other content that may have been created for the unit.
Table 3-10 Content Creation Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What content (apart from assessment) did you have to create for the module? (Please select all that apply) | Learning Objectives  
Topic Objectives  
Topic Lecture Slides  
Tutorial/laboratory Exercises  
None |

Content Modification was defined for this project as being the processes involved in the changing of content supplied by the home campus academic by the TNE teaching staff. Types of content modification that had been reported as being employed in Study One were used to initially populate the list of possible responses (see Table 3-11). The list was subsequently modified on the basis of feedback in the piloting process. Respondents were firstly asked if they modified the unit content supplied by the foreign university. If they answered yes, then they were asked a further question about the items that were modified and the modification process. The score for the Content Modification variable was calculated as a count of the options selected by the respondent as representing the content they had modified in their most recent TNE offering. An option was also provided for the respondent to provide further information if their modification was not covered by the options.
If respondents indicated they did modify the content, then they were asked about the content modification process. Three options that had been identified from the first study and confirmed during the piloting process were supplied as options, along with “other” and a request for further information. The score for the Content Modification variable was determined in the order of the autonomy associated with each option and is indicated in Table 3-12.

**Table 3-12 Content Modification Process Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the process for modification of the module content?</td>
<td>I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and the coordinator makes the changes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and make the changes myself</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I make the changes without reference to the module coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Creation is defined in this research as being the academic’s responsibility for the creation and choice of assessment, the degree of input into the design of those items, and the potential and process for there to be modification of the content of the assessment items. In Study Two, Assessment Creation is operationalised in terms of the TNE academic’s role in the creation of assessment items in their most recent offering of a TNE unit, including, but
not limited to: assignments, laboratory exercises, tutorial participation and examinations. If respondents had multiple unit offerings in their most recent teaching period, then they were asked to answer the questions with regard to what they would see as being a typical unit offering. The response options were created based on responses from Study One and feedback during the piloting process. The question, response options and scores allocated to each of the options is shown in Table 3-13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What degree of responsibility do you have for the creation of the Assessment items in the module?</td>
<td>I create all of the assessment items for the module</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I create the assessment items for the module in cooperation with the teaching staff at the foreign university</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment items created by me are approved by the teaching staff at the foreign university</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have no involvement in the creation of Assessment items used in the module.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study One suggested there was some modification of assessment items made at TNE locations and that these modifications happened for a number of reasons. If the respondents indicated they had been involved in modification of the assessment items, they were asked to indicate what modifications they had undertaken. Three possible responses were provided (Table 3-14) along with an open-ended question asking for other comments.
Assessment Marking is defined in this research as being the involvement of the academic in the process of grading students’ assessments. In Study Two, and in a similar way to Study One, Assessment Marking could range from having no responsibility for marking through to marking all of the assessment items. In Study Two however, the TNE academics will generally be using supplied marking guides and having their marking moderated (Mahmud et al., 2010), and so in Study Two, the response options for measuring Assessment Marking were modified to take that into account. To ensure consistency, a brief definition of moderation was included with the question. The scoring for this variable was such that a higher score recognised a higher level of responsibility and autonomy in the marking process (see Table 3-15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where you have involvement in the creation of assessment items, what is the nature of that involvement?</td>
<td>Modifications of those items for cultural reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modification to allow for differences in the teaching environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input into exam/assignment questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-15 Assessment Marking Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes your involvement in the marking of the assessment items?</td>
<td>I mark all of the assessment items using my own marking guide</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I mark the assessment items using a marking guide provided for me by the staff at the foreign university</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I mark the assessment items using a marking guide provided for me by the staff at the foreign university and the marking is then moderated by the foreign university staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some items are marked by the home campus staff, I mark the others and that marking is then moderated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not have any involvement with the marking of the assessment items.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ‘other’ option was provided for respondents to provide other or further details regarding their involvement in the marking.

3.6.2.4 Interaction

As with Study One, interaction in Study Two was examined in terms of the respondents’ involvement with the physical delivery of the unit and their interactions with students and home campus academic staff. For analysis, three variables were created as discussed below, these being Face-to-Face Delivery, Student Interaction and Staff Interaction.

In contrast to the home campus academics, the TNE academics will generally have many opportunities for synchronous interaction and development of relationships with students. Several questions were added to this section of the questionnaire, in addition to those asked in Study One. These questions were seeking more detail about the nature and type of interaction the academics had with the students. They are discussed below.
Face-to-Face Delivery is defined in this research as being the degree to which the academic is involved in the classroom delivery of unit content. As discussed in Section 3.6.1.3, face-to-face delivery is important in terms of academic satisfaction because of its potential to impact on the Task Identity and Feedback dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). The Face-to-Face Delivery variable was calculated as the count of the delivery options in which the respondent was involved during their most recent TNE teaching experience.

The question and response options are listed in Table 3-16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-16 Face-to-Face Delivery of Unit Content Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What involvement did you have with the delivery of the module content? (Please select all that apply).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Facilitated online learning' was added to the options from Study One in recognition of the growing awareness and adoption of alternative methods of curriculum delivery in Singapore; several of the local universities are adopting a flipped curriculum (e.g., http://www.straitstimes.com/opinion/universities-adopting-flipped-classroom-learning). Additionally, several foreign universities are modifying their existing curriculum for delivery in this mode in Singapore. For example, Murdoch University, an Australian TNE-provider university, is currently investing in transforming its TNE offerings to a flipped model (https://www.murdoch.edu.au/About-us/Annual-report/document/2015/2015-Annual-Report_Learning-and-Teaching.pdf).
Respondents were also given the option of providing more detail with an “Other” response.

Student Interaction was defined in this research as being the degree to which the academic interacts with the students, be it face-to-face or using some other remote or asynchronous modality. In Study Two, this was operationalised as a measure of teaching-related interaction the TNE academic had with students outside of the normal face-to-face teaching environment. This interaction could include, for example, answering queries from students about assignments, or offering additional assistance with lab or tutorial exercises. The question was asked in this way because it was anticipated that all of the respondents would have similarly high levels of in-class interaction with students. Three questions were asked, with the first being a simple yes/no question asking if, during the most recent teaching period, the respondent had any teaching-related interaction with the students outside of the scheduled class time. If the respondent answered ‘no’, then they were directed to the next section of the questionnaire, and the interaction scored as 0. Respondents were asked about the amount of time spent on student interaction during their most recent TNE teaching experience. The question, response options and scoring for the Student Interaction variable are listed in Table 3-17.
**Table 3-17 Time Spent on Student Interaction Item**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much time did you spend on this teaching-related interaction in a typical week.</td>
<td>Less than one hour per week</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 hours per week</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-10 hours per week</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10 hours per week</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to better understand how this interaction between the TNE academic and students took place, respondents were also asked to indicate the mode of interaction as listed in Table 3-18. Respondents were also able to provide other responses if required.

**Table 3-18 Measurement of Modes of Interaction with Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did this teaching-related interaction with the students outside of class take place? (Please select all that apply).</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Management System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Interaction is defined in this project as the degree of interaction that occurs between the academics at the home and TNE campus. In Study Two, this is operationalised as a measurement of the interaction the TNE academic has with the home campus academic. This variable relates to the Task Significance and Feedback dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Interaction with colleagues has also been reported as being important in academic job satisfaction (e.g., Martin, 2011; Oshagbemi, 1999). TNE academics were asked if they had any interaction with the home campus academic in their most recent TNE teaching period. If their answer was 'No' then their Staff Interaction was scored as 0. The Staff Interaction score of respondents who answered 'Yes' were
scored on the basis of how often the TNE academic interacted with the home 
campus teaching staff in their most recent teaching period. The question, 
response options and scores are listed in Table 3-19.

Table 3-19 Interaction with Home Campus Teaching Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often did you typically interact with the home</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campus teaching staff?</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to better understand the nature of the communication that occurred 
between the TNE and home campus teaching staff, two further questions were 
asked. The first asked about communication channels (Table 3-20), and the 
second, the subjects of the communication (Table 3-21). The response options 
for both questions were populated on the basis of the first study and the 
questionnaire piloting process. Both questions allowed respondents to provide 
and specify other responses.

Table 3-20 Modes of Communication Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you communicate with the home campus teaching staff? (Please</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>select all that apply)</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skype/telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What things did you communicate with the home campus teaching staff about? (Please select all that apply).</td>
<td>Clarification of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification of assessment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensions for student submission dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderation of assessment marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marking of assessment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadlines for completion of marking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.2.5 **Satisfaction**

Satisfaction of the local teaching staff with their involvement in TNE teaching was measured using firstly, two sets of questions based on those used in the first study, and secondly, a subset of questions from Sections One and Two of the shortened form of the JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1974). The subset of questions selected were those that corresponded to the five job dimensions: Skill Variety, Task Identity, Task Significance, Autonomy and Feedback.

To measure satisfaction with their latest TNE teaching experience, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with a number of statements regarding that experience (see Table 3-22). The items were all measured on 5-point Likert scales labelled from 1 ‘Strongly Disagree’ to 5 ‘Strongly Agree’. A composite variable, Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering, was calculated as the mean of the scores of the responses for each respondent.
Table 3-22 Items to Measure Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering Items

I am satisfied...

- with the support in running the units provided to me by the foreign university
- that my students are receiving an equivalent experience of the unit to the students at the home campus
- with the degree of control I have over the conduct of the module
- with the degree to which the students communicate with me regarding the unit
- with the degree of enthusiasm my students demonstrate toward their studies
- with the level of feedback I am able to provide to the students on their performance in the unit
- with the degree to which the home campus teaching staff communicate with me regarding the unit
- with the support the home campus teaching staff demonstrate toward the unit
- that I am adequately qualified to teach my unit
- with the level of feedback provided to me by the home campus teaching staff
- that I can confidently approach the home campus teaching staff with any issues I might have with the unit
- with the level of respect afforded to me by the home campus teaching staff

To measure satisfaction with TNE in general, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with a number of statements regarding that experience (see Table 3-23). The items were all measured on 5-point Likert scales labelled from 1 ‘Strongly Disagree’ to 5 ‘Strongly Agree’.
Table 3-23 Items to Measure Satisfaction with TNE in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item to Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in the units as being “my” students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the financial reward I receive for teaching the units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that I receive adequate recognition/praise for my teaching from the foreign university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I am an important part of the foreign university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching foreign sourced units has provided me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more interested in teaching foreign sourced units than local institutions’ units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A composite variable, Satisfaction with TNE in General, was calculated as the mean of scores of the responses for each respondent.

3.6.2.6 Job Diagnostic Survey

For this study, in order to gain additional insight into the use of that instrument in this context, 15 statements from the short form of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) were added (see Table 3-24) to the questionnaire. These statements were modified for the context of the study where required. For example, Item 9 from Part 2 of short form of the JDS reads, “The job denies me the chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in carrying out the work”, was modified for Study Two to say, “It denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in my teaching”, with reference to teaching modules sourced from foreign universities. The Respondents were asked to rank the accuracy of each of the statements using a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 ‘Very Inaccurate’ through to 7 ‘Very Accurate’.
Table 3-24 JDS Short Form Modified for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How accurate are the statements below with respect to teaching modules sourced from foreign universities?</th>
<th>JCM Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It requires me to do many different things that make use of a variety of my skills and talents</td>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It involves me from the start to the finish of the students’ learning experience</td>
<td>Task Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has a significant impact and important effect on the students</td>
<td>Task Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me complete responsibility for deciding how the module is delivered</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes use of my skills, training and knowledge</td>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides me the opportunity to completely finish the piece of work I begin</td>
<td>Task Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is simple and repetitive</td>
<td>Skill Variety (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is set up such that I get almost constant feedback about how well I am doing</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not really that significant in the broader scheme of things</td>
<td>Task Significant (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I teach and work</td>
<td>Autonomy (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is arranged in such a way that I do not have the opportunity to be involved in the teaching from beginning to end</td>
<td>Task Identity (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a job where a lot of people can be affected by how well I do the work</td>
<td>Task Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in my teaching</td>
<td>Autonomy (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides very few clues as to whether or not I am performing well</td>
<td>Feedback (Reversed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To calculate values for each JCM dimension for each respondent, the responses to the statements were grouped by the dimensions of the JCM to which they corresponded. A score for each of the dimensions was then calculated as the mean of the responses for the statements relevant to that dimension. The value
of the response for statements worded negatively were inverted prior to being included in the calculation.

Collection of these data allow for calculation of the Motivating Potential Score (MPS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), which is a measure of “...the overall potential of a job to prompt internal work motivation on the part of the job incumbents” (p.258). As can be seen from the formula below, and as discussed in Section 2.3.1, jobs that are high in the JCM dimensions of Autonomy, Feedback and one of the three dimensions of “Experienced Meaningfulness of the work”, will record a higher MPS score. The JCM suggests that this will lead to higher internal work motivation, higher quality work performance, higher satisfaction with the work and lower absenteeism and turnover.

The MPS was calculated based on the following formula:

\[
\frac{(\text{Skill Variety} + \text{Task Identity} + \text{Task Significance})}{3} \times \text{Autonomy} \times \text{Feedback}
\]

3.6.2.7 Comparison of Satisfaction of Home Campus and TNE Academics
In both studies, respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their satisfaction with their most recent TNE teaching experience and TNE in general. In order to compare the satisfaction of the home campus and TNE academics, analogous questions from the two studies were used to calculate summary variables representing the respondents' satisfaction that could be compared. These questions are listed in Table 3-25 and Table 3-26.
### Table 3-25 Analogous Items Used to Measure Satisfaction with Most Recent Experience of TNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study One Statement</th>
<th>Study Two Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>I am satisfied</em>....</td>
<td><em>I am satisfied</em>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the support in designing and running my transnational units provided to me by the university</td>
<td>with the support in running the units provided to me by the foreign university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that my transnational students are receiving an equivalent experience of my unit/course to my local students</td>
<td>that my students are receiving an equivalent experience of the unit to the students at the home campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of control I have over the conduct of my unit/course transnationally</td>
<td>with the degree of control I have over the conduct of the module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which my transnational students communicate with me regarding their unit/course matters</td>
<td>with the degree to which the students communicate with me regarding the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of enthusiasm my transnational students demonstrate toward their studies when compared with my local students</td>
<td>with the degree of enthusiasm my students demonstrate toward their studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of feedback I am able to provide to my transnational students on their performance in the unit/course</td>
<td>with the level of feedback I am able to provide to the students on their performance in the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which the transnational teaching staff communicate with me regarding unit/course matters</td>
<td>with the degree to which the home campus teaching staff communicate with me regarding the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the transnational staff are adequately qualified to teach my unit/course</td>
<td>that I am adequately qualified to teach my unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-26 Analogous Items Used to Measure Satisfaction with TNE Teaching in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study One Statement</th>
<th>Study Two Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in my transnational units/courses as being &quot;my&quot; students</td>
<td>I regard the students studying in the modules as being “my” students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next transnational unit/course</td>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the “reward” I receive for teaching my transnational units/courses</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the financial reward I receive for teaching the modules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching transnational units/courses has provided me</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching foreign sourced modules has provided me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.7 Phase Two: Semi-Structured Interviews

In both studies, the questionnaires were followed by a series of semi-structured interviews. This section details the processes involved in the preparation and conduct of the interviews in both studies.

As discussed in Section 3.5.2, the decision to conduct semi-structured interviews was made in order to come to a deeper understanding of the answers to the research questions. The flexibility inherent in semi-structured interviews as opposed to structured interviews or closed-ended questionnaires allows for the interview to be conducted more like a “conversation” (Fylan, 2005) that starts from a set of standard questions. In both studies, analysis of the data collected using the questionnaire provided the set of standard questions and points of interest for the semi-structured interviews.
3.7.1 Study One

Participants who responded to the questionnaire in Study One (i.e., academics involved in TNE at the home campus) were asked to indicate their willingness to be involved in the second phase of the research project that consisted of a recorded, semi-structured interview in order to explore the interviewees’ experiences of TNE as well as clarifying and exploring issues raised in the analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire. Of the 47 questionnaire respondents, 18 indicated a willingness to be interviewed regarding their survey answers.

The selection of interview subjects was based on a purposeful sampling strategy with maximum variation (Suri, 2011), in order to focus in depth on the experiences of academics with TNE and to identify themes that are common across different experiences of TNE. Five subjects were selected for interview on the basis of the following characteristics exhibited in the responses to the survey:

- Different institutions
- Different institutional approaches to TNE delivery (e.g., no student contact versus fly-in-fly-out versus extended teaching visits)
- Different involvement of the academic in TNE (different roles and levels of involvement)

Each of the potential interviewees was contacted initially by email, in order to determine whether they were still prepared to participate in the interview and to arrange a suitable time for the interview to be conducted.
3.7.1.1 Preparation for Interviews

A generic interview script was created to provide a common framework within which to conduct the semi-structured interviews. It included questions relevant to interaction and control as well as others developed following analysis of the questionnaire data (see Section 4.3). The additional items identified as being important to the questionnaire respondents concerned the timing of TNE workload and remuneration from participation in TNE.

As can be seen in Appendix G, the generic interview script also included several questions confirming the interviewee’s questionnaire responses with respect to the mode of TNE delivery adopted at their university, and to ensure that the questionnaire responses had captured any university-specific nuances that may have existed in their TNE delivery.

3.7.1.2 Interview Procedure

At the start of the interview, and as specified in the ethics approval for the project, the participant was provided with a copy of the information letter that was included in the email invitation to participate. They were reminded that all information provided in the interview would be treated as confidential and no information that might identify any participant would be used in any publication arising from the research. They were then asked to re-confirm the consent given in the questionnaire, and confirm that they consented to the interview being recorded. Once that consent had been confirmed the interview could continue. Four of the interviews were conducted using Skype and one was face-to-face. Those conducted using Skype were recorded using “Call
The face-to-face interview was recorded using a hand-held recorder.

The interview then followed the interview script asking questions related to the operationalisation of TNE at the interviewee's university. This was followed by discussion about how, if the interviewee were in a position to do so, they would change the way that TNE was delivered by their university. The final part of the interview was more general in its focus, allowing participants to raise and discuss other relevant issues.

3.7.2 Study Two

As in Study One, questionnaire respondents were asked if they were willing to be interviewed and to provide their email address if they were. Of the 55 survey respondents, 14 indicated they were prepared to be interviewed. Each of those respondents were contacted initially by email in order to determine whether they were still prepared to participate in the interview and to arrange a suitable time for the interview to be conducted. The selection of interview participants was based on a purposeful sampling strategy (Suri, 2011) in order to focus on the breadth of experience of academics employed in TNE roles in Singapore. The following characteristics were used to select the interviewees based on their responses to the questionnaire

- Different PEIs
- Different modes of employment
  - Employed on a casual contract

13 [www.ecamm.com/callrecorder/](http://www.ecamm.com/callrecorder/)
Employed full or part-time at a Singapore branch campus of an Australian university

Of the 14 questionnaire respondents who indicated a willingness to be interviewed, four were not considered because they were all employed at the same PEI, teaching courses sourced from the same Australian university, meaning that ten were interviewed.

3.7.2.1 Preparation for Interviews

A generic interview script was created (see Appendix H). It included items relevant to interaction and control. Following analysis of the questionnaire data (see Section 6.4.1) several items, such as the working conditions of those employed on a casual basis, were identified as requiring further examination. These were added to the generic interview script.

Each of the participants’ questionnaire responses was examined prior to the interview. Notes regarding their answers were prepared, particularly any that were unclear or required clarification, and added to the generic interview script.

3.7.2.2 Semi-Structured Interview Procedure

Prior to the commencement of the interview, each participant was provided with a copy of an information letter explaining the purpose of the interviews (see Appendix I). They were then asked to confirm they had read the information sheet and were invited to ask any questions about the project they might have. They were also asked to confirm that there was no compulsion to answer any of the questions and that consent to the interview could be withdrawn at any time. They were informed that no data that could identify them or the institution(s) at which they worked would be used in publications.
coming out of the study, and that no such data would be released to a third party unless required to do so by law. Permission was sought to record the interview and for the recording to be subsequently transcribed. At this point the participant was asked to sign the consent form (see Appendix J).

Once that consent had been confirmed the interview could continue. Each interview was conducted face-to-face in Singapore and recorded using both a hand-held recorder and a mobile phone.

The first part of the interview sought information about the participant's involvement in TNE teaching, including the number and types of modules they taught and the number of hours taught in a given week. Following this, information regarding their role in the assessment processes was sought.

In the second part of the interview, the respondents' questionnaire answers were discussed, including those concerning interaction with students and other teaching staff, as well as control over the modules in terms of delivery and assessment. Working conditions and a perceived lack of job security had been raised by several of the questionnaire respondents, so all interviews included discussion about this issue.

The final part of the interview was more general in its focus, allowing participants to raise any other relevant issues.

### 3.8 Data Analysis Procedures

This section describes the data preparation and analysis procedures that were used in the studies.
3.8.1 Study One

Study One, which focused on academics at a home campus, involved the administration of an online questionnaire that collected both quantitative and qualitative data, followed by a series of semi-structured interviews, the format and focus of which were informed by the analysis of the data from the questionnaire. The quantitative analyses were conducted using SPSS V21 as discussed in the next section. The qualitative data were analysed using Excel as discussed in Section 3.8.1.2.

3.8.1.1 Quantitative Data

The quantitative data from the questionnaire were downloaded from SurveyMonkey and imported into an Excel spreadsheet to recode a number of variables in order to facilitate analysis in SPSS V21. Descriptive statistics were calculated using SPSS.

As discussed in Section 3.6.1.5, two dependent variables representing respondents’ satisfaction were created. The first was Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering and the second, General Satisfaction with TNE. These were calculated as the mean of the individual item scores for each respondent. Both scales proved to be of acceptable reliability with a Cronbach alpha of 0.88 for Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering and 0.86 for General Satisfaction with TNE.

In order to determine if control and interaction influenced job satisfaction, six variables were first calculated. The variables concerned with control over unit delivery and management (discussed in Section 3.6.1.3) were Content Creation, Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking. The variables concerned with
interaction (discussed in Section 3.6.1.4) were Face-to-face Delivery, Student Interaction and Staff Interaction.

Multiple linear regression was then used to test the relationships. Hair et al. (2006) state the ratio of observations to independent variables should not fall below 5:1. As there were six independent variables, and between 37 and 41 valid observations for each of the variables, the ratio of observations to independent variables exceeded the minimum. However, as the ratio in this case was close to the minimum, it is possible that only stronger relationships were detected. Testing to determine if the individual variables met the assumptions required in order to conduct multiple linear regression (i.e., normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of the error terms) was carried out and is discussed in Section 4.4.1.

3.8.1.2 Qualitative Data

The recorded interviews from the first study were transcribed verbatim by a commercial transcription service. The responses from the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were added to the interview transcripts for analysis. In order to conduct the analysis, the text was unitized at the level of the “meaning unit” (Campbell, Quincy, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013, p.302). This choice was made for several reasons: firstly, while the open-ended responses from the questionnaire were clearly associated with a single theme, the interview transcripts were much broader and multi-thematic, meaning the transcripts themselves, or even the answers to a particular question, could not be used as the unit of analysis. Secondly, in some instances, the sentences or paragraphs were “too short to capture the full meaning of what a respondent
was saying about a particular theme” (Campbell et al., 2013, p.303). Each of the meaning units was then entered into a single row in an Excel spreadsheet, along with the participant ID (if from the questionnaire) or interview number (if from an interview transcript).

In the first cycle of the analysis, a descriptive coding method (Saldana, 2013) was used to allocate each of the meaning units an initial code determined by whether it was concerned with either control over unit delivery or interaction with students or TNE teaching staff. A number of meaning units concerning the impact of workload associated with TNE teaching were not able to be allocated to one of the initial codes so an additional initial code of Workload was added (see Table 3-27 for the initial coding schema).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Unit Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second cycle of coding, all meaning units coded in the first cycle were coded with a sub-code. For the Interaction and Control codes from the initial coding schema, these were based on the independent variables from the analysis of the questionnaire data. For the Workload code, four sub-codes were identified from the analysis of the meaning units. These second-level codes are listed in Table 3-28.
To demonstrate the replicability of the coding process for Study One, and using a method similar to that suggested by Campbell et al. (2013), a sample of 10% of the meaning units that had previously been coded was given to a colleague familiar with the study who was asked to allocate codes to each of the units using the final coding schema (see Table 3-28). These were then compared with the codes originally applied, demonstrating approximately 90% agreement between the coders. The simple proportional agreement method for determining inter-coder agreement (Morrissey, 1974) was used because of the simplicity of the coding schema for this study (three top-level codes with nine second-level codes) and the fact that the statistical analysis of the coded text was limited to a simple count of the occurrences of each code.
3.8.2 Study Two

The second study followed the same general method of data collection as the first study, in that an online questionnaire was administered followed by semi-structured interviews with a number of the questionnaire participants. The major difference, as discussed above, was that Study Two concentrated on the academic staff teaching in the TNE location; those teaching the foreign university's curriculum.

3.8.2.1 Quantitative Data

The quantitative data from the Study Two questionnaire were downloaded from SurveyMonkey and imported into an Excel spreadsheet. Several variables were recoded to facilitate analysis in SPSSnV21 as discussed below. Descriptive statistics were calculated using SPSS.

As discussed in Section 3.6.2.5, two dependent variables representing respondents' satisfaction were created. The first was Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering and the second, General Satisfaction with TNE. These were calculated as the means of the individual items scores for each respondent. Both scales proved to be of acceptable reliability with a Cronbach alpha of 0.91 for Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering, and 0.71 for General Satisfaction with TNE.

In order to determine if control and interaction influenced job satisfaction, seven independent variables were first calculated. The variables concerned with control over unit delivery and management (discussed in Section 3.6.2.3) were Content Creation, Content Modification, Assessment Creation and Assessment
Marking. The variables concerned with interaction (discussed in Section 3.6.2.4) were Face-to-face Delivery, Student Interaction, and Staff Interaction.

Multiple linear regression was used to test the relationships. As noted for Study One, Hair et al. (2006) state the ratio of observations to independent variable should not fall below 5:1. As there were seven independent variables, and between 42 and 45 valid observations for each of the variables, the ratio of observations to independent variables exceeded the minimum. However, as the ratio is close to the minimum, it is possible that only the stronger relationships would be detected (Hair et al., 2006). Testing to determine if the individual variables met the assumptions required in order to conduct multiple linear regression (i.e., normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and independence of the error terms) was carried out, and is discussed in Section 6.4.1.

As discussed in Section 3.6.2.6, data were collected based on questions from the short form of the JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) in order to calculate the Motivating Potential Score (MPS) for each of the questionnaire respondents. The items listed in Table 3-24 as being reversed were re-coded and all statements were grouped into the JCM dimensions for analysis. The inter-item reliability for each of the dimensions was tested and found to be low. Removal of the reversed-items improved reliability and summary statistics were then calculated for each of the dimensions.

3.8.2.2 Qualitative Data

The recorded interviews from the second study were transcribed verbatim by a commercial transcription service. The responses from the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were added to the interview transcripts for
analysis. As discussed in Section 3.8.1.2, the text was unitized at the level of the meaning unit (Campbell et al., 2013).

In the first coding cycle a descriptive coding method (Saldana, 2013) was used to allocate each of the meaning units an initial code determined by whether it was concerned with either control over unit delivery or interaction with students or TNE teaching staff. Two other themes emerged from the data that were not associated with either of Control over Unit Delivery or Interaction, those being Employment and Teaching.

In the second cycle of coding, all meaning units coded in the first cycle were coded with a sub-code. The final coding schema is listed in Table 3-29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Level Code</th>
<th>Sub-Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Campus Teaching Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locally Employed Teaching Colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Choosing this Type of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Exposure to New Curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposure to Different Pedagogies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Section 3.8.1.2, a sample of 10% of the meaning units that had previously been coded was given to a colleague familiar with the project who was asked to allocate codes to each of the units using the final coding schema (See Table 3-29). These were then compared with the codes originally applied, again demonstrating approximately 90% agreement between the coders.
3.9 Overview

This chapter has presented and justified the choices of research methods used in this thesis and the data collection methods and procedures for both studies. It then discussed the data analysis procedures employed.

The research involved two studies exploring the satisfaction of academics involved in TNE. The first study was from the perspective of academics at the home or sending campus. The second study was from the perspective of the academics at the TNE location. Both studies adopted a MMR approach in order to best address the objective of the overall project. Each study had two data collection phases, the first being an online questionnaire that collected quantitative and qualitative data. The second phase of data collection was a series of semi-structured interviews, partially informed by the results of the first phase.

The next chapter presents the results from the first study that focused on the satisfaction of academics involved in TNE at the home campus.
Chapter 4 Study One Results

4.1 Introduction

The primary objective of the research described in this thesis was to understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised relates to the satisfaction of the academics involved, particularly in terms of those aspects of academic life that have been identified as being associated with their job satisfaction: interaction with colleagues and students, and the control able to be exercised in their academic role.

This chapter reports on the results of the first study that was conducted as described in Chapter 3. This study focused on home-campus academics involved in TNE; that is, those academics located at the home campus who are responsible in some way for the offering of a unit in the TNE location. Depending on the way in which the unit is delivered, the role of the academic may include unit coordination, design and provision of curricula and teaching materials, or face-to-face delivery.

The study was conducted in two phases; the first involved an online questionnaire, and the second, semi-structured interviews. The online questionnaire was designed and conducted as discussed in Section 3.6.1 in order to collect information regarding the participants’ experiences of, and attitudes towards, TNE. Of particular interest was how the nature of their involvement in TNE impacted on their job satisfaction. The semi-structured interviews were conducted as outlined in Section 3.7.1 in order to develop a deeper understanding of the answers to the research questions.
The first part of this chapter reports on the descriptive analysis of the first phase of the study (the online questionnaire). It then reports on the investigation of a range of factors related to the respondents' satisfaction with TNE, primarily those concerned with interaction with students and TNE teaching colleagues, and the conduct and management of the unit delivery. The next section reports on the quantitative analysis of how these factors influenced academics' satisfaction. Following this, the analysis of the qualitative data that was collected in both the first (open-ended questions) and second (semi-structured interviews) phases of this study is presented. The chapter concludes with an overview of the findings, before the discussion of those findings in Chapter 5.

4.2 Background

The first phase of the study involved an online questionnaire as discussed in Section 3.6.1.2. This section presents the background information about the participants and their TNE experiences. A total of 47 responses to the online questionnaire were obtained, however, six were discarded, as they were largely incomplete, leaving a total of 41 valid responses.

4.2.1 Age of Respondents

The largest group of respondents by age grouping (see Table 4-1) was in the 50-59-year age group (40%), with a further 30% being in the 40-49-year age grouping. This was compared with Department of Education and Training (2016) academic demographic data, which show that across all Australian universities the 40-49 and 50-59 year groupings account for approximately 27% of the total workforce each. This may suggest that the respondents represent a cohort that is older than the general academic population in Australia.
Table 4-1 Respondents by Age Grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Number of Years Teaching Transnationally

Table 4-2 shows that 78% of respondents had been teaching in TNE for up to 10 years, with only a very small number (9.8%) having taught for more than 15 years, which corresponds with the growth in Australian universities’ involvement in TNE since the late 1990s (Clayton & Ziguras, 2011).

Table 4-2 Number of Years Teaching TNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Countries in Which Respondents Have Taught

In response to a request to list the countries in which they had taught, or where units for which they were responsible had been offered, respondents listed a total of 15 different countries (respondents could select multiple countries, see Table 4-3), with 31.7% listing a single country (see Table 4-4).
### Table 4-3 Countries in Which Respondents Had Taught, or Been Responsible for, Unit Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Country</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean number of countries listed by respondents was 2.8 (see Table 4-4).

### Table 4-4 Number of Countries in Which Each Respondent Had Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singapore and Malaysia were the countries most commonly listed by the respondents, accounting collectively for nearly 40% of the responses. China accounted for a further 14%. This is consistent with figures from the (Australian) Department of Education and Training (2015), which reported that Singapore, China and Malaysia were the three highest ranking countries by number of students in Australian-sourced TNE in 2014.

#### 4.2.4 Offerings Taught per Year

When asked to indicate the number of unit offerings for which they had responsibility in the past year, 61% of respondents indicated three or less (see...
Table 4-5). Two respondents indicated they had been responsible for more than 20 offerings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offerings in Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 Factors Affecting Satisfaction

This section provides descriptive information from the questionnaire that relates to the factors relevant to academics’ satisfaction.

#### 4.3.1 Content Creation

As discussed in Section 2.3.3, creation of learning materials, including assessment items, has been reported as having a positive impact on academic job satisfaction, in that it is a way in which the academic can have some control over their work, and autonomy in determining how they will work (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Paul & Phua, 2011; Winefield et al., 2003). With regard to the most recent TNE unit offering for which they had been responsible, respondents were asked, “*What content (apart from assessment) did you create for the transnational offering?*” Nearly all (92.7%) respondents reported creating Lecture Slides, and 90.2% reported creating the Tutorial/Laboratory Exercises (see Table 4-6).
None of the respondents reported creating only the Unit Learning Objectives, nor did any report creating only the Topic Learning Objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Created:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Learning Objectives</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Learning Objectives</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Lecture Slides</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial/Laboratory Exercises</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other learning materials reported as having been created for the TNE offering included: virtual machines, virtual crime scenes, additional readings and resources, and orientation materials for students and teaching staff.

A count of the types of materials created for the most recent TNE offering is shown in Table 4-7. Most of the respondents (73.2%) created materials in all four categories listed in Table 4-6, with only three respondents not creating any materials at all. One of these respondents stated that they were only responsible for making "small modifications to existing materials" (Respondent 31). While it was not clear as to why the academic might not have been responsible for content creation, it is possible they may have been taking temporary control of the unit for only a short time such as a single teaching period, or the unit may have an approved structure for a particular time period. It was also not clear if the materials were created specifically for the TNE offering of the unit, or the materials were those created initially for the home campus offering of the unit and subsequently modified.
Table 4-7 Count of Types of Materials Created for Most Recent TNE Offering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 Content Modification

Respondents were asked in an open-ended question if the teaching staff at the transnational location modified the content supplied to them, and if so, how that modification would happen. Some modification of learning materials was indicated in 17 of the 41 responses (41.5%). In these cases, materials were modified to suit local conditions; either by the inclusion of local case studies or where there was a need to accommodate changes in the computing environment or calendar. In most cases, there was some approval process, either explicit or implicit, most often as a result of discussion between the home campus academic responsible for the unit and the local teaching staff. One respondent reported that modification of materials by the TNE teaching staff was not permitted.

4.3.3 Assessment Creation

Respondents were asked about their involvement in creation and marking of assessment items in their most recent TNE unit offering. Nearly 77% of respondents indicated that they had created all of the assessment items for the unit (see Table 4-8). Local teaching staff had some degree of involvement in creation of assessment items in 23.1% of responses, ranging from cooperating with the unit coordinator, through to complete responsibility for assessment.
In the cases where TNE teaching staff had some involvement in the creation of assessment, it was generally reported as being modification for cultural reasons and clarification of local issues. For example, “In general the assessment is modified to take account of cultural differences and/or work-load issues for students” (Respondent 17), and provision of “...feedback on assignments set for cultural sensitivity or for clarity of English expression” (Respondent 10).

### 4.3.4 Assessment Marking

As can be seen from Table 4-9, 73.7% of respondents reported that they moderated all or some of the marking carried out by the teaching staff at the transnational location, whether it be subsequent to the provision of a marking guide (39.5%) or not (34.2%). Nearly half of the respondents reported some involvement in marking, with 13.2% marking all of the assessment, and a further 34.2% marking some of the items. Marking guides are provided and used either in conjunction with moderation (39.5%) or not (13.2%); for example, “I provide marking guides and rubrics, feedback pro-formas, marks spreadsheets. I have occasionally marked assignments myself where the offshore lecturer (through illness etc) was having trouble turning the assessment around in time” (Respondent 45).
Table 4-9 Allocation of Marking Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking Responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mark all of the assessment items</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use and then moderate the marking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mark some items and moderate the marking of others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Face-to-face Delivery of Units

As discussed in Section 3.6.1.3, the face-to-face delivery of unit materials is an important aspect of the interaction the academic can have with the TNE students, in that it relates to both the Task Identity and Feedback dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). Respondents were asked what physical involvement (i.e., face-to-face contact with the students) they had with the delivery of their most recent TNE unit, in particular, delivery of lectures and tutorials or laboratories. Sixty one percent of respondents reported having no face-to-face contact with students (see Table 4-10).

Table 4-10 Involvement with Face-to-face Delivery of Most Recent TNE Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Face-to-Face Contact</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures AND Tutorials/Laboratories</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.6 Interaction with Students

Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they interacted with the students and teaching staff at the transnational location, regardless of how that interaction took place. Slightly more than half the respondents (52.6%) indicated that they had either no interaction with the students, or if they did, it
was limited to once or twice during the teaching period, while 34.4% had weekly or fortnightly interactions (see Table 4-11).

**Table 4-11 Frequency of Interaction with Students During a Typical Teaching Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.7 Interaction with Teaching Staff

The respondents reported a higher level of interaction with the teaching staff than with the students, with 37.8% having weekly contact, and a further 29.7% fortnightly contact (see Table 4-12), however 13.5% reported either having minimal or no contact.

**Table 4-12 Frequency of Interaction with Staff at the Transnational Location During a Typical Teaching Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Satisfaction with TNE

This section reports on the quantitative analyses of data collected from the online questionnaire with regard to respondents’ satisfaction with TNE. It then examines and reports on the relationships between the respondents’ interaction with staff and students, the various aspects of control over unit delivery and their satisfaction.

As discussed in Section 3.6.1.5, respondents to the online questionnaire were asked a series of questions relating to satisfaction with their most recent TNE
offering, and then about their satisfaction with TNE in general. The responses are summarised below (see Table 4-13 and Table 4-14).

The means of the individual items relating to the respondents’ satisfaction with their most recent TNE (see Table 4-13) offering ranged between 3.16 and 3.84/5 (with 1 representing strongly disagree, and 5, strongly agree). The three highest scoring items relate to the respondents’ opinions of the local teaching staff: their enthusiasm toward the unit (3.84/5), the adequacy of their qualifications (3.73/5) and the degree to which they communicate about the unit (3.62/5). Conversely, the three lowest scoring items concern the TNE students: the level of feedback able to be provided to them (3.16/5), the degree to which the students communicate with the respondent (3.22/5) and the equivalence to the local students’ experience of the unit (3.27/5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With regard to your most recent TNE offering...</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the support in designing and running my transnational units/courses provided to me by the University.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that my transnational students are receiving an equivalent experience of my unit/course to my local students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the degree of control I have over the conduct of my unit/course transnationally</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the degree to which my transnational students communicate with me regarding their unit/course matters</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the degree of enthusiasm my transnational students demonstrate toward their studies when compared with my local students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of feedback I am able to provide to my transnational students on their performance in the unit/course</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the degree to which the transnational teaching staff communicate with me regarding unit/course matters</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the degree of enthusiasm the local teaching staff demonstrate toward the unit/course</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that the transnational staff are adequately qualified to teach my unit/course</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the level of support I need to provide to the transnational teaching staff</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were similarly asked to indicate their agreement with 6 statements in the context of TNE in general (see Table 4-14). The scores were lower than those for the most recent TNE offering, particularly when asked if they were more satisfied with TNE than with other forms of teaching (1.95/5), and satisfaction with the rewards received from TNE teaching (2.58/5). The highest scoring item concerned the respondents’ view of the TNE students as being “their” students (3.45/5).
Table 4-14 Summary of Satisfaction with TNE in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With regard to TNE in general...</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in my transnational units/courses as being &quot;my&quot; students</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next transnational unit/course</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the &quot;reward&quot; I receive for teaching my transnational units/courses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching transnational units/courses has provided me</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more satisfied with transnational teaching than other forms of teaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with transnational teaching because it provides me with an opportunity to reach students who would otherwise not have the opportunity to take my units/courses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 Influence of Control over Unit Delivery and Interaction on Satisfaction

In order to explore the influence of the control the academic could exercise over their TNE teaching (discussed in Section 3.6.1.3), and the interaction that academics have with TNE students and academics (discussed in Section 3.6.1.4), on academics' satisfaction with TNE, summary variables were calculated for Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering (10 items) and Satisfaction with TNE in General (6 items), as the mean of the individual item scores. Both scales were found to be of acceptable reliability with Cronbach's alphas of 0.88 and 0.86 respectively.

Multiple linear regressions, with simultaneous entry of all terms, were performed to determine if the independent variables relevant to interaction (Face-to-face Delivery, Student Interaction, Staff Interaction) and to control over unit delivery and management (Content Creation, Assessment Creation and
Assessment Marking) influenced the satisfaction experienced by the home campus academics.

Content Creation was calculated as a count of the range of materials created by the respondent in their most recent TNE offering, and the values ranged from 0 to 4, with 4 representing that the respondent had created all items. The majority of respondents had created all of the content for the unit (see Table 4-7).

The Content Creation variable was not normally distributed, with a skewness of -1.887 (SE=.369) and kurtosis of 2.472 (SE=.724). The variable was therefore re-coded to have three values: 0, meaning the respondent had not created any of the materials (None), 1, meaning the respondent had created some, but not all of the materials (Some), and 3 where the respondents had created all of the materials (All) (see Table 4-15). The re-coded variable had a skewness of -1.655 (SE=.369) and a kurtosis of 1.700 (SE.724), which is acceptable for use in the analysis (Hair et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials Created</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Creation was calculated as a value between 0 and 3 based on the involvement of the respondent in the creation of assessment items. If the respondent created all of the assessment items for the unit, the value would be 3. If they had no involvement at all, it would be 0. Similarly, Assessment Creation was not normally distributed with a skewness of -1.829 (SE=.369) and kurtosis of 2.200 (SE=.724). The variable was therefore re-coded to three values: 0,
meaning the respondent had not created any of the assessment items (None); 1, meaning the respondent either created or approved some of the assessment items (Some); and 2, when the respondent had created all of the assessment items (All) (see Table 4-16). The recoded variable had a skewness of -1.655 (SE=.369) and a kurtosis of 1.700 (SE.724), and was therefore acceptable for use in the analysis (Hair et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of standard residuals was carried out, which showed that the data contained no outliers (Std. Residual Min = -2.611, Std. Residual Max = 1.837). Tests to see if the data met the assumptions of collinearity indicated that multicollinearity was not a concern (Table 4-17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over Unit Delivery</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>1.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data also met the assumption of independent errors (Durbin-Watson value = 2.292). The histogram of standardized residuals indicated that the data contained approximately normally distributed errors, as did the normal P-P plot of standardized residuals, which showed points that were not completely on the line, but close. The scatterplot of standardized residuals showed that the data
met the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and linearity. The data also met the assumption of non-zero variances (Table 4-18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-18 Variances for Study One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Unit Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering the overall multiple linear regression model was significant \( (F(6,30)=2.560, p=0.027) \), and 36.1\% of the variability in Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering was explained by the model \( (R^2=0.361) \) (see Table 4-19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-19 Multiple Regressions Examining the Impact of Interaction and Control on Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Unit Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For General Satisfaction with TNE the overall multiple linear regression model was significant \( (F(6,30)=7.4.284, p=0.002) \) and 47.2\% of the variability in General Satisfaction with TNE was explained by the interaction and control variables \( (R^2=0.472) \) (see Table 4-20).
### Table 4-20 Multiple Regressions Examining the Impact of Interaction and Control on Satisfaction with TNE in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control over Unit Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>-0.804</td>
<td>0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
<td>-0.268</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-2.238</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4.1.1 Impact of Control over Unit Delivery on Satisfaction

There was no significant influence demonstrated on Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering by any of the control variables ((Content Creation (β=0.259, p=0.102), Assessment Creation (β=-0.547, p=0.588), Assessment Marking (β=-0.225, p=0.156)).

Nor did any of the Control variables have a significant influence on General Satisfaction with TNE (Content Creation (β=0.280, p=0.054), Assessment Creation (β=-0.110, p=0.428), Assessment Marking (β=-0.010, p=0.428)).

#### 4.4.1.2 Impact of Interaction with Students and TNE Teaching Colleagues on Satisfaction

Each of the interaction variables was found to be associated with Satisfaction with TNE in General, with Face-to-Face Delivery being the most influential. However, although Face-to-Face Delivery (β=0.348, p=0.023) and Student Interaction (β=0.358, p=0.020) had a positive association with Satisfaction with TNE in General, Staff Interaction (β=-0.322, p=0.033) was found to have a weak negative relationship with Satisfaction with TNE in General. Thus, it appears that although greater contact with students is satisfying, the results suggest that greater contact with TNE staff has the opposite effect.
However, the results of the regression to explore the influences on Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering indicated that only Face-to-Face Delivery was associated with level of Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering ($\beta=0.364$, $p=0.003$). Neither of the other interaction variables (Student Interaction ($\beta=0.021$, $p=0.745$) and Staff Interaction ($\beta=-0.008$, $p=0.929$)) had a significant influence on satisfaction.

### 4.5 Exploring the Factors that Affect Satisfaction

This section reports on the qualitative analysis of the textual data collected from the open-ended questions in the online questionnaire, and from the semi-structured interviews. In all, following unitization, there were 268 “units of meaning” (Campbell et al., 2013, p. 302) which were all single-issue meaning units. Each of these units was then allocated a code based on the schema in Table 3-27. Where a meaning unit could be associated with more than one code, it was duplicated and associated with both relevant codes. The meaning units were distributed between the top-level codes as shown in Table 4-21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Unit Delivery</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5.1 Interaction

This section focuses on interaction that the home campus academic had with the TNE students and TNE teaching colleagues. Of the 153 meaning units coded at the top-level as being relevant to Interaction, 90 concerned students, and 63 concerned TNE academic colleagues (Table 4-22).
Table 4-22 Frequency of Meaning Units Relevant to Final Schema Interaction Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TNE Students</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNE Academics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1.1 Interaction with TNE Students

The qualitative data confirmed the positive attitude of academics toward their TNE students identified in the quantitative study. For example, the opportunity to interact with a different or more diverse group of students than would be expected at the home campus was viewed positively by the participants, leading in one case to “...a better understanding of local international students” (Respondent 16). Similarly, the opportunity to interact with students “in-country” and experience different cultural perspectives was reported by one respondent to be “...as much a learning experience for me as for my students” (Respondent 20). Many of the respondents reported a positive recognition of the commitment and effort required on the part of the students, suggesting that the “...dedication and effort displayed by many transnational students is inspirational” (Respondent 27), and “I have very fond memories of the students and staff who work so hard, it makes me feel that I must also work hard for them” (Respondent 2). One academic, who teaches at Masters level, particularly enjoyed his time teaching at the TNE location because of the calibre of the students, who he said, “...are quite clever guys and come from a really interesting background, and can actually add quite a lot to what’s happening in a unit” (Interview 2).

Several of the respondents reported positive outcomes for their teaching arising from involvement in TNE. One commented that, “Teaching in both External and On-Campus mode forces you to try to think outside of the box. How can I provide innovative learning to all of my students – not just the ones I see on campus”
There was also an awareness of the potentially positive impact TNE teaching can have on students in that, "it reaches students it can’t normally reach" (Respondent 41), and, “I appreciate that I’m part of providing an opportunity for our students to study - whether a direct enrolment or via a partner - which they might not (otherwise) have” (Respondent 8).

Interestingly, the negative comments coded under the TNE Student code were from five respondents who reported dissatisfaction, not with the students per se, but with the lack of personal contact and opportunity to work with them, and the lack of time for quality interaction with the students, for example, “(I am) unable to spend time to provide the personal element to my units that makes a huge difference” (Respondent 45), and “…in the past when there was some face to face teaching I found that satisfying. But I do not find any aspects of teaching at a vast distance satisfying” (Respondent 36).

4.5.1.2 TNE Teaching Colleagues

While the quantitative data suggested a generally negative relationship between academic satisfaction and the amount of interaction with TNE teaching staff (in answer to the question ‘how often during a typical teaching period would you have some contact with individual teaching staff’), the qualitative data suggested a more positive picture of this relationship. This was most noticeable when discussing the TNE staff’s input to the unit in terms of collaboration in delivery or design; the assistance provided to the home campus academic by the TNE teaching staff was most appreciated: “…he takes real ownership of the unit even though it’s not his material and he’ll make suggestions, give me feed-back and so forth. And his marking is beautifully consistent” (Interview 5). Similarly, the
opportunity for input from “another set of eyes” from a different cultural and/or pedagogical background was appreciated, “I enjoying discussing the teaching aspects with the transnational staff, particularly in (terms of) cultural differentiations” (Respondent 21).

There were also positive comments made in the context of long standing relationships with individual TNE teaching staff, who had made a positive contribution to the delivery of the unit. “We’ve been extremely ... fortunate, we’ve got a good bunch of local lecturers who’ve been with us ... for seven, eight, nine years and they’re good” (Interview 5).

However, all comments regarding moderation were ambivalent, with comments such as, “A lot depends on how good your local lecturer is” (Interview 5), balanced with more negative comments such as, “I’ve gone through every single paper and made adjustments as needed” (Respondent 20). Another suggested that the moderation process might not have a positive impact on quality because, “Moderating too harshly and failing everyone leads to a whole lot of drama, so some staff end up turning a blind eye” (Respondent 32).

The two most negative comments suggested that the marking completed by TNE teaching staff was overly generous, with both suggesting that,

“One potential reason for this may be that they are attempting to "buy" the approval of the students as they are aware that a single complaint (no matter how absurd) may jeopardize their employment” (Respondent 39).
Similarly, there was concern raised by one respondent regarding “coaching” of the students in order to perform better in examinations being a focus of the teaching.

Two other circumstances were reported by respondents as being causes of dissatisfaction with the interaction with TNE teaching staff. The first is where there were multiple TNE teaching staff in a unit. One respondent complained,

“...staff are not always communicative. They also do not talk to each other and I have to carry out the same conversations with 2 or 3 lecturers delivering the same unit because they are not even aware of each other's existence” (Respondent 39).

Another participant complained that the interaction easily becomes more administrative and less collegial:

“(my role) is almost entirely composed of administration, creating spreadsheets, marking assignments and (often unsuccessfully) attempting to train the lecturers on how to assess and teach students in the way that we would do at this university” (Respondent 40).

4.5.2 Control over Unit Delivery

Bellamy et al. (2003), in a study of business academics, suggested that an important factor in determining academic job satisfaction is the degree of control academics can exercise over their work. In the context of teaching, the primary ways that academics exert control is in unit design, management and delivery. The quantitative study did not demonstrate a significant relationship between
any of the control variables examined and the participants' satisfaction. Two issues relevant to control over unit delivery were raised in the qualitative data, those being moderation of assessment marking and direct involvement with unit delivery. These are discussed below.

4.5.2.1 Moderation

As discussed in Section 4.5.1.2, several respondents expressed quite serious concerns about issues associated with moderation of assessment marking. Comments such as, “...what actually happens is often quite a black hole to us. We often find that assignments have been marked generously” (Respondent 32) and “…staff do not assess and mark work to the same standard in spite of the extremely detailed marking guides that are provided” (Respondent 39). These impressions are then reinforced when “the exam results ... confirm that the students do not have as good a grasp of the unit content as their assignment marks would suggest” (Respondent 32). One respondent suggested a sense of frustration in this regard,

“...the experience can often be quite unsatisfying as you can see that there are serious issues in these institutions but are quite powerless to do much about it (and that) moderating too harshly and failing everyone leads to a whole lot of drama, so some staff end up turning a blind eye” (Respondent 34).

Further concerns were expressed that suggested moderation is nothing more than an additional administrative task in that it, “...takes up more time doing admin work” (Respondent 18), and that there is little reward to be gained from it, with one respondent stating that the thing about TNE that caused most dissatisfaction was:
“The almost constant requirement to be writing assessment items, moderating and re-marking offshore work, and creating endless spreadsheets, exams, moderation reports and other volumes of administrative work occupy a lot of time and have little perceivable benefit” (Respondent 39).

This view of moderation as not being more than an administrative task is exemplified with one respondent telling us their role in TNE is “to provide the staff with assistance and to moderate. I’m not personally involved in the teaching” (Respondent 24).

4.5.2.2 Direct Involvement with Unit Delivery

Not having any direct involvement with the delivery of the unit and relying on others to perform the teaching was a concern for some participants, with one commenting that,

“I have virtually no knowledge of how the courses are being offered offshore,” and “I am unsure of how the content is delivered as I have never been to (TNE location) or met the people who I deal with on a daily basis” (Respondent 1).

In most instances, it appeared as though there was some process, either explicit or implicit, to deal with the need for modification of teaching materials by the TNE teaching staff. Some respondents however, did not seem to be aware as to whether or not the materials were being modified (“Unknown if the teaching staff modifies the content,” Respondent 41), which lead one respondent to question, “If I am not aware of what has been done to the materials, and how they are being
delivered, how can I ensure that there is equity in the learning experience between on campus and external students?” (Respondent 8).

4.5.3 Workload Recognition and Remuneration

An important theme that emerged from the qualitative data was workload. Most of the 72 comments coded under the Workload top-level code were negative in their sentiment, and concerned issues such as recognition of the work associated with TNE, timing of the TNE workload, travel, and the impact of TNE on the academic’s “normal” work. These themes were distributed as in Table 4-23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of TNE Workload</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of TNE Workload</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on normal work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues associated with travel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two of the 72 comments coded under the Workload top-level code could be considered to be positive, in that they described the remuneration for involvement in TNE as being adequate.

The recognition of TNE either in workload calculations or by additional payments was identified as being a significant issue. TNE is seen by the participants as having a significant workload associated with it, with one saying that, “A rough estimate would be 200 hours (spent on TNE) last year. Actually, this is probably the University’s estimate, mine would be higher” (Respondent 42).

Several commented that while participation in TNE had been considered as work outside normal load in the past (and so attracted additional remuneration), it was now considered by many universities as part of normal work. One suggested
that even though TNE is part of workload, “*it probably is additional work that is not really adequately compensated for*” (Interview 2).

The timing of workload associated with TNE was seen by most respondents as being a cause of dissatisfaction. The fact that it tended not to be synchronised with on-campus teaching periods, and was spread out across the year meant there were an increase the number of workload “peaks”; for example, exam marking for a TNE teaching period occurring during time that would otherwise be allocated to other activities. One respondent stated that, “*it is very difficult to take holidays as TNE teaching regularly occurs when domestic students are on their winter or summer breaks*” (Respondent 36), and another,

“*…our semesters and their trimesters fill the whole year except between Christmas Day and New Year’s Day – and even that time is spent in frantic preparation for the 2nd January start*” (Respondent 44).

Ten of the 72 meaning units related to Workload suggested that involvement in TNE interferes with the capacity to conduct research, with a typical comment being, “*It makes it much harder to be productive, and my working week is more fragmented, and I am unable to get reasonable length periods to focus on research*” (Respondent 36). This appears to be exacerbated when there is not adequate recompense for the work; “*It has a significant impact on my teaching and research time - with ZERO recompense financially or otherwise*” (Respondent 17).

Many of the respondents also complained about the amount of administrative work associated with TNE; again, this seemed to be exacerbated when they saw
there being no explicit return for their efforts. “So the administrative workload was just phenomenal” (Interview 3), and

“The almost constant requirement to be writing assessment items, moderating and remarking offshore work, and creating endless spreadsheets, exams, moderation reports and other volumes of administrative work occupy a lot of time and have little perceivable benefit” (Respondent 39).

This seemed to be more of an issue with respondents who did not have any face-to-face interaction with the students, “These same tasks may not be perceived as being so negative if there was any kind of contact or engagement with the offshore students” (Respondent 1).

4.6 Overview

This chapter has presented the results from Study One, which examined academics’ satisfaction with TNE from the perspective of the home campus academic. It began by presenting the quantitative analyses relevant to the impact the control over unit delivery and interaction with TNE students and TNE teaching staff have on academics’ satisfaction. It then presented the qualitative analyses that explored the factors affecting academics’ satisfaction.

In exploring the impact of respondents’ interaction with TNE students and TNE teaching staff on their satisfaction, the quantitative analysis discovered positive associations between interaction with students and the respondents’ satisfaction. Although face-to-face interaction with the students was the most influential, any interaction with students was positively associated with the
respondents’ satisfaction. Interaction with the TNE teaching staff was negatively associated with respondents’ satisfaction.

The qualitative analysis supported the generally positive feeling toward the TNE students by the home campus academics. Several reasons for this were expressed by the respondents, including: the respondent having the opportunity to interact with a more diverse group of students than would be found at the home campus, a recognition of the commitment to their studies and effort required by the students to be successful, and the provision of an opportunity to students who might not otherwise have the opportunity to study for a university qualification.

In contrast to the quantitative analysis, the qualitative analysis presented a more positive picture of the relationship between the home campus and TNE academics, particularly in terms of the positive contribution made by TNE located staff to the success of the unit at the TNE location. Less positive were the comments regarding marking and the need for moderation of the TNE lecturers’ marking. There were also negative comments regarding the administrative overhead associated with managing a team of several lecturers at the TNE location.

In the context of control over unit delivery, the quantitative analysis did not demonstrate any significant relationship with an academic’s satisfaction, however, there were concerns articulated in the qualitative data concerning marking standards, not having a clear understanding of how the unit was being delivered and lack of clarity concerning the modification of teaching materials.
Finally, several other factors impacting on home campus academics' satisfaction were discovered in the qualitative analyses. These concerned the recognition of the workload associated with TNE, and the timing of that workload, which was seen to have negative impacts on academics’ “normal” work.

The next chapter will discuss in detail the results presented in this chapter.
Chapter 5 Study One Discussion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of Study One presented in Chapter 4. This study examined the job satisfaction of academics at the home campus who are involved in TNE, and how that related to the way in which TNE was operationalized at their university.

In order to achieve the objective of the thesis, the primary research question was defined in the following terms:

- How does the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics' job satisfaction?

The aim of Study One was to answer the following subsidiary research questions with academics at the home campus as the focus:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ2: How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

The first part of this chapter discusses the results presented in the previous chapter relevant to the effect the nature and degree of control home campus
academics exercise over unit delivery has on their satisfaction with TNE. It focuses on moderation of assessment marking and associated processes, and the home campus academics’ concerns regarding their lack of direct involvement in the unit delivery.

This is followed by discussion of the impact of interaction with the TNE students on the home campus academics’ satisfaction, particularly in the context of there being little face-to-face interaction with those students. Discussion of the impact of interaction with TNE teaching staff on home campus academics’ satisfaction follows.

Finally, several other factors, such as workload recognition and timing of the workload associated with TNE, were identified from the study as having an impact on satisfaction (see Section 4.5.3), and these are discussed toward the end of the chapter. The chapter concludes with an overview.

### 5.2 Control over Unit Delivery

The first of the secondary research questions being addressed here asked how the nature and degree of control the academics have over the offering of a TNE unit impacts on the satisfaction they gain from participation in TNE. In Study One, control over the delivery of a TNE unit was examined from the perspective of the home campus academic.

As discussed in Section 2.3.3, the control an academic can exercise over the conduct of a unit is an important factor in their satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003). In Study One, three variables relevant to control over unit delivery were
examined from the perspective of home campus academics, those being: Content Creation, Assessment Creation, and Assessment Marking.

The quantitative analysis (see Section 4.4.1) did not demonstrate significant relationships between any of the variables related to control over unit delivery and the home campus academics’ satisfaction. A possible reason for this was that respondents (as discussed in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.3) were largely responsible for the creation of all the content and assessment items for the TNE units.

The possibility of the content and assessment items having been created for the on-campus offering of the unit and then re-used or modified for the TNE offering was not explicitly investigated. However, for many of the respondents, the unit(s) being delivered at the TNE location were the same ones for which they are responsible as at the home campus. It is possible therefore, that control over the delivery of TNE units was simply not related with satisfaction for home campus academics as the literature suggested it may have been, because they were not necessarily creating content and assessment items specifically for the TNE offering.

Further, and when viewed in light of the qualitative analysis (see Section 4.5.2), several participants reported that they did not see their role in TNE as being academic in its focus, rather they saw it primarily as an administrative role. Previous research has identified administrative tasks as a cause of dissatisfaction for academics (e.g., Paul & Phua, 2011), and, if TNE is viewed as being primarily an administrative set of tasks for the home campus academic, then it is not necessarily related to any of the factors suggested as being related to academic job satisfaction such as: community-acknowledgement; participation in decision-
making (Lacy & Sheehan, 1997); use of advanced skills (Martin, 2011); and ultimately, a decrease in autonomy (Winefield et al., 2003). As such, while not disagreeing with the previous research that demonstrates a positive relationship between control over curriculum design and academics’ job satisfaction, the findings here may suggest that the home campus academics don’t necessarily see much of the work associated with TNE unit design as being academic, and therefore not a primary source of satisfaction.

The qualitative analysis (see Section 4.4.1.1), identified that the level of control over some aspects of the TNE offering of a unit created concern for the home campus academics; in particular, moderation of assessment and the lack of direct involvement in the unit delivery. These are discussed below.

5.2.1 Moderation of Assessment Marking

Moderation of assessment marking is undertaken in the TNE context primarily as a QA measure in order to maintain equivalent and comparable course outcomes between different offerings of units (Mahmud et al., 2010). Confirming the problematic nature of moderation as reported in the literature (e.g., Dobos, 2011; Lim, 2008; Mahmud et al., 2010), and as discussed in Section 2.2.4, quite serious concerns were expressed by the participants (home campus academics) in Study One about moderation of assessment marking and the processes associated with it (see Section 4.5.2.1). These concerns were most noticeable in terms of the perceived standard of the marking completed by the TNE teaching staff, and an experienced disparity between the results received by students for in-term assessment items and the final examination (see Sections 4.5.1.2 and 4.5.2). Exacerbating these concerns was the view expressed by several
participants that moderation was an additional, administrative workload that was not recognised adequately in academic workload calculations. This view of moderation as being inadequately rewarded was previously reported by Lim (2008), who concluded that, “It is not surprising that the university academics lacked enthusiasm with regard to the moderation of the activities assigned to them” (p. 137).

Mahmud et al. (2010) found that the building of collegial relationships between home campus and TNE teaching academics was important in mitigating the “challenges to collaboration amongst transnational teaching teams undertaking moderation of assessment” (p.1), but that these relationships needed time to develop and mature, and that good relationships were the exception rather than the rule. This finding was confirmed in Study One, with respondents reporting a more positive outlook on assessment and moderation when they had developed a longer-term relationship with the TNE academic (see Section 4.5.1.2). This relationship is discussed further in Section 5.3.2.

When viewed in light of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976), moderation has negative impacts on the meaningfulness dimensions in that it is seen by the participants as being a mundane, administrative task that requires little in terms of skill (the Skill Variety dimension of the JCM), and also in that it is a “fragmented” task, in that it is not part of the “identifiable whole” of the teaching role (Task Identity). Exacerbating this is the lack of reward and recognition that the work attracts. As such, moderation is a task that has few or no intrinsic motivating aspects in it for the home campus academic. It is simply a task that is required to be completed, that takes time, and, as discussed above, results in
little return. This lack of motivating potential inherent in the moderation process, particularly in the absence of collegial relationships with the TNE academic staff, is a cause of dissatisfaction for some home campus academics, and potentially, in turn, a cause of many of the problems with the moderation process related by Mahmud et al. (2010), and discussed in Section 2.2.4.

5.2.2 Lack of Direct Involvement in Unit Delivery

Participants in Study One expressed concern (see Section 4.5.2.2) about the lack of direct involvement in the delivery of the unit at the TNE location. The concerns expressed by some of the participants were in the context of not understanding how the unit was being delivered, and how, or whether or not, the unit materials were being modified by the TNE teaching staff. As discussed in Section 2.3.3, an important aspect of academic job satisfaction can be the control academics have over their work (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Winefield et al., 2003). This control would appear to be reduced when the respondents report they are not aware of how the unit is being delivered at the TNE location.

In terms of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), lack of direct involvement in the delivery of the unit reduces the responsibility felt by the academic for the outcomes of the unit (the Autonomy dimension). When the academic's role is one of managing the unit delivery from afar, it becomes more difficult for the academic to identify the work associated with the TNE unit as being a whole (the Task Identity dimension) because the involvement is more sporadic than would be the case with an on-campus unit offering where the academic was responsible for face-to-face unit delivery.
However, as discussed in Section 4.5.1.2, this appears to be less of a problem when there is stability and consistency in the TNE academics teaching in the unit, and the relationship develops on a more collegial basis. Similarly, dissatisfaction associated with the “distance” from the delivery of the unit is less when there is a strong collegial relationship between the members of the “teaching team” and useful interaction with the TNE students. Development of these collegial relationships between home campus and TNE teaching staff will have positive results, not only in terms of moderation (Mahmud et al., 2010), but also the satisfaction of home campus academics. Interaction between the home campus academics and the TNE academics and students is discussed in the next section.

5.3 Interaction

Interaction with students and colleagues has previously been shown to be positively related to job satisfaction in academics (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Oshagbemi, 1999; Paul & Phua, 2011), and is discussed in Section 2.3.3. In Study One, interaction is of interest in terms of the interaction between the home campus academic and the TNE academics and with the TNE students. The second research question being addressed in this thesis asked how the nature and degree of interaction between the academic and the TNE students impacted on the satisfaction gained by the academic from involvement in TNE. Similarly, the third research question asked how the nature and degree of interaction between academics at the home and TNE campuses impacts on the satisfaction the academic gains from involvement in TNE.

The findings of Study One suggested that interaction with TNE students did result in some degree of satisfaction (see Section 4.5.1.1), but the same could not
be said about interaction with TNE academics, especially when the interaction was focused in the realm of administration/supervision (see Section 4.5.1.2). These findings are discussed further below.

5.3.1 Interaction with Students

The research question relevant to home campus academics and TNE students being investigated here was, “How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?”

The quantitative analyses (presented in Section 4.4.1.2) suggested that interaction with TNE students is a significant factor in job satisfaction for home campus academics. Face-to-face interaction with students in a learning and teaching environment through the delivery of lectures, tutorials or laboratories results in satisfaction for the respondents. Similarly, academics who are in contact with students, regardless of the mode of that contact, are also more satisfied than those who aren’t. This finding is interesting in that even though 61% of respondents to the questionnaire reported having no face-to-face contact with the students (Table 4-10) in their most recent TNE experience, only 23.7% reported having no interaction with the TNE students during a typical TNE offering (Table 4-11). This suggests that much of the interaction that does occur is not face-to-face.

The qualitative results, presented in Section 4.5.1.1, also suggest that increased involvement with the TNE students results in the academic being in a position to be able to experience and understand the positive impact they have on the
student, and recognise the efforts made by the students to succeed. In terms of Hackman and Oldham’s (1976) JCM, this relates to an increase in the Task Significance dimension of the JCM, leading to an increased sense of the meaningfulness of the work. Increased contact with the students also increases the opportunities for the home campus academic to receive timely feedback from the students (the Feedback dimension). Similarly, the opportunity to work in a different environment and with different cohorts of students using different pedagogical approaches, was reported as being satisfying. This represents an increase in the Skill Variety dimension of the JCM.

These findings largely agree with the previous research in this area that suggests that students are an important factor in academics’ job satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Oshagbemi, 1999; Paul & Phua, 2011). Much of that research however, was situated in the “traditional” face-to-face environment. Depending on the delivery mode, the interactions the academic can have with the TNE student will vary from completely face-to-face through to completely online. In this study, 61% of the respondents reported having no face-to-face interaction with the students, suggesting face-to-face interaction was only partly responsible for the satisfaction reported.

When investigating faculty satisfaction in an online teaching environment, Bolliger and Wasilik (2009) found that academics gained satisfaction in this context from being able to provide access to courses in a “flexible and convenient” (p.113) manner, and from a belief that the students were participating in their courses in an active manner. When asked about satisfaction with their most recent TNE teaching experience, the respondents (see Table
4-13) indicated some satisfaction with the degree of enthusiasm the TNE students demonstrated toward their studies (3.49/5), which may suggest agreement with the findings of Bolliger and Wasilik (2009). This finding is worth further investigation.

5.3.2 Interaction with Staff

As discussed in Section 3.6.1.4, the research question being addressed from the perspective of the home campus academic here is, “How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?”

The quantitative analysis suggested that the more interaction there was between the home and TNE campus academics, the less satisfied with TNE in general the home campus academic was (see Section 4.4.1.2). The qualitative data reinforced this when the focus of the interaction was related to close supervision and moderation of assessment marking. However, the qualitative data also suggested that when the relationship was primarily concerned with teaching, and collegial in nature, then there was a higher degree of satisfaction for the academic. This appeared to increase when there was an opportunity to develop a relationship over an extended period (see Section 4.5.1.2).

The quantitative analysis also suggested the home campus staff value their TNE colleagues’ work in the delivery of the units, particularly in terms of the TNE staff’s enthusiasm toward teaching the unit, the adequacy of their qualifications, and the degree to which they communicate about the unit (see Table 4-13).
While these outcomes may seem to be contradictory, the positive outcomes associated with interaction with TNE staff arise from the home campus academic engaging with a colleague in a constructive context, thus enhancing both the Feedback and Skill Variety dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). The Feedback dimension is also enhanced because the academic is receiving information about how the unit is progressing. Similarly, the Skill Variety dimension is enhanced because it gives the academic the opportunity to interact with a colleague working in a different environment. However, when the interaction with the TNE teaching colleague becomes increasingly focused on administrative and quality assurance-related tasks, there is a decrease in both the Skill Variety and Task Significance dimensions leading to a decreased sense of the meaningfulness of the work, which has become boring, repetitive and non-collegial.

These findings are consistent with the findings of previous research such as Bellamy et al. (2003), in that while relationships with colleagues are the most important factor in “achieving ideal work satisfaction” (p.25), administration is the least important factor. When the relationship between the home and TNE campus academics changes from being collegial, and focuses on administration, then the relationship becomes less satisfying.

5.4 Other Factors

The final research question asked about other factors that might have an influence on academics’ satisfaction with TNE. Recognition of the workload associated with TNE was a factor identified in Study One and will be discussed below.
5.4.1 Workload Recognition

The addition of TNE to formally recognised academic workloads was reported by the participants in Study One to be problematic. The quantitative analysis indicated that academics had lower levels of satisfaction with TNE than with other forms of teaching, and that one aspect of this was related to the rewards received for TNE teaching (see Table 4-14).

As discussed in Section 4.5.3, workload associated with TNE was also an important theme that emerged from analysis of the qualitative data. The participants reported that workload associated with TNE was either not recognised or recognised inadequately. The timing of the TNE workload was also discussed, particularly in the context of it not being synchronised with “normal” teaching calendars and resulting in negative impacts on the capacity to take leave, and to be involved in other scholarly activities such as research and unit re-design. The nature of the workload associated with TNE was also reported as being an issue with much of it being administrative rather than scholarly in its nature.

Participants reported that while TNE work had been considered to be outside of normal workload (meaning that additional financial payments would be made by the university) in the past, the work was now included as a component of normal workload. The lack of financial recompense is exacerbated by there being more general dissatisfaction with TNE.

These findings are consistent with previous research such as Paul and Phua (2011) that reported administration and non-academic work as being causes of
dissatisfaction, and Winefield et al., (2003) who found that major causes of stress in academics included work overload and insufficient recognition and reward.

5.5 Overview

This chapter has discussed the results of Study One as presented in the previous chapter. This study focused on the job satisfaction of home campus academics in the context of TNE.

Interaction with colleagues and students has been shown in a traditional (non-TNE) setting to be a cause of job satisfaction for academics. Similarly, the capacity for academics to exercise control over their work life, is believed to be a cause of job satisfaction. Study One set out to explore these relationships in the context of TNE because TNE delivery is different from the traditional setting in many regards, but particularly in terms of delivery mode, physical and culture setting, distance from the students and teaching colleagues.

The key findings of Study One suggest that academics’ satisfaction is enhanced by teaching-related interaction with host-country students and staff, but that communication with staff that is related to administration rather than teaching moderates the effect. This distinction between kinds of communication was enabled by the analysis of data from semi-structured interviews with a purposive subsample of the questionnaire participants.

The study did not demonstrate any significant influence of control over unit delivery on academics’ satisfaction. It did suggest however, that moderation of assessment marking and a lack of direct involvement in unit delivery were factors that caused concern for respondents.
The implications of these findings are discussed further in Chapter 8.
Chapter 6 Study Two Results

6.1 Introduction

The primary objective of the research described in this thesis was to understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved, particularly in terms of those aspects of academic life that have been previously identified as being associated with satisfaction: interaction with colleagues and students, and the control able to be exercised in the academic role.

This chapter reports on the results of the second study that was conducted as described in Chapter 3. The study focused on academics involved in TNE in Singapore, teaching curriculum sourced from foreign universities. It was conducted in two phases; the first involved an online questionnaire, and the second, semi-structured interviews. The online questionnaire was designed to collect information regarding the participants’ experiences of, and attitudes towards, TNE, in particular how the nature of their involvement in TNE impacted on their job satisfaction. The face-to-face, semi-structured interviews were designed to both seek clarification of issues raised in the questionnaire, and to further explore emergent issues.

The first part of the chapter presents the demographic information about the respondents collected in the online questionnaire as background. It then reports on the investigation of a range of factors and how they affected the respondents’ satisfaction with TNE, primarily those concerned with interaction with students and TNE teaching colleagues, and the conduct and management of the unit
delivery. The influence of those factors on respondents’ satisfaction is then examined, followed by analysis of the qualitative data collected in the online questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The chapter concludes with an overview of the findings before discussion of those findings in Chapter 7.

6.2 Background

A total of 54 responses to the questionnaire were collected. Of those received, seven responses were discarded because they were largely incomplete, leaving a total of 47 valid responses. It is not possible to estimate the participation rate because requests for participation were sent to potential participants by third party contacts in the institutions offering TNE courses as discussed in Section 3.6.2.1.

6.2.1 Age and Discipline Grouping of Respondents

The largest age grouping of the respondents was the 40-49-year age group, with smaller but similar numbers of respondents in the 30-39 and 50-59 groups (see Table 6-1). On average, this is a younger cohort than the home campus academics, where the 50-59-year age group was the largest (see Table 4-1).

Table 6-1 Age Grouping of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Grouping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2 shows that nearly half (48.9%) of the respondents were from the Business and Administration discipline. This is consistent with figures from the Singapore regulator (Council for Private Education Singapore, 2016) which show
that at the end of 2015, 48% of post-secondary courses offered by PEIs in Singapore were from the Business and Administration field of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business and Administration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.2 Number of Years of TNE Teaching

Table 6-3 shows that 42.4% of respondents had been involved in TNE teaching for five or fewer years, and a further 24.4% having had between five and ten years’ experience of TNE teaching. This proportion of respondents having ten or fewer years of TNE teaching experience is similar to that of the Australian home campus academics (78%, see Table 4.2.2), and reflects the growth experienced in TNE in Singapore from the mid 1990s (e.g., Ziguras, 2003) through to current times (e.g., Lim et al., 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=5 Years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 Years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.3 Teaching Characteristics

Many (64.4%) of the respondents had taught five or fewer modules sourced from foreign universities in the past year (see Table 6-4), with the average number being 5.4 (n=45, sd 3.8), and five respondents having taught nine or more.
Table 6-4 Number of Modules Taught in the Last Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of modules</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the number of hours spent teaching in this mode, Table 6-5 shows that 43.2% of the respondents taught between 11 and 15 hours per week for foreign universities, and a further 22.7% taught between 16 and 20 hours.

Table 6-5 Hours Spent Teaching per Week for Foreign Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Taught</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly all of the respondents (93.6%) had taught units sourced from Australian universities. While this reflects the fact that contact had been made with potential participants through Australian universities offering courses in Singapore, the sample also included 59.6% who had taught units sourced from the UK (see Table 6-6).

Table 6-6 Countries from Which Modules had Been Sourced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no question that explicitly sought to determine if the respondents were employed full-time at a branch campus or working on a casual basis, and as
such it was not possible to explore any significant differences that may exist between those two modes of employment.

6.3 Factors Affecting Satisfaction

This section presents descriptive analyses of the questionnaire data relevant to the factors being investigated in this thesis with regard to their impact on TNE academics’ satisfaction, those being control over unit delivery and interaction with students and home campus academic colleagues.

6.3.1 Content Creation

With regard to the most recent TNE unit offering for which they had been responsible, respondents were asked, “What content (apart from assessment) did you create for the transnational offering? (Please select all that apply). Only a small percentage (10.6%) of the respondents had been responsible for creating learning objectives for their most recent TNE offering (see Table 6-7); unsurprisingly, this is in contrast to the first study where 75.6% of the respondents, who were academics at the home campus, reported they were responsible for creating learning objectives (see Table 4-6). Obviously, learning objectives are central to the unit design in order to express the desired outcomes for students from successful completion of a unit. They also allow for assessment of a unit and course’s level of study (Australian Qualifications Framework Council, 2013).

Topic objectives were created by 12.8% of the respondents (78.0% in the first study), and while 55.3% of respondents were responsible for creating tutorial or laboratory exercises (90.2% the first study), 31.9% were not responsible for the
creation of any content at all, in contrast with the first study, where only 7.3% reported not creating any material (see Table 4-7).

Table 6-7 Content Creation by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Created</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Lecture Slides</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial/Laboratory Exercises</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No content created</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were given the opportunity to indicate and specify which other materials they had created. A number of the questionnaire respondents reported they had created ancillary teaching materials, including, “short revision quizzes” (Respondent 25), and “revision notes to help students” (Respondent 48).

6.3.2 Content Modification

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had modified the teaching materials supplied by the foreign university in their most recent TNE teaching period, and if so, the nature of the modification and how the modification process was managed. In response to the question, “Do you modify the module content supplied by the foreign university?”, over half of the respondents (54.5%) indicated that they had made modifications to the supplied content.

The most common way in which content was modified was through the addition of local case studies (51.1%) or modification of the content to reflect local conditions (40.4%) (see Table 6-8). This type of modification may be necessary to accommodate different terminology or naming conventions (e.g., “mobile phone” is referred to as “hand phone” in Singapore).
Table 6-8 Modification of Content by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Modification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition of local case studies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify content to reflect local conditions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial/lab worksheets modified to reflect local conditions (e.g., login instructions)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify calendar to account for local public holidays</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with the creation of ancillary teaching materials, modifications other than those listed above included similar additional support materials for the students, for example, “adding more detailed assignment and examination preparation notes” (Respondent 27). In cases where the materials supplied were not of the highest quality, one respondent suggested there was a need to change the formatting of the supplied materials because they found “that the slides are often poorly designed (small fonts, too wordy, no visual continuity, etc.)” (Respondent 29).

If the content had been modified, respondents were asked to indicate how the change process was managed (see Table 6-9). About the same percentage of respondents (44.8%) modified the content following discussion with the module coordinator as those who made the changes without consultation (41.4%).

Table 6-9 Process for Modification of Content by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process for modification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and the coordinator makes the changes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and then make the changes myself</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make the changes without reference to the Unit Coordinator</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Assessment Creation and Marking

Respondents were asked to indicate the role that they played in the creation of assessment items in their most recent offering of a TNE unit. More than half (70.2%) reported they had no involvement in the assessment creation process,
indicating that normal practice was for assessment items to be wholly created at the home campus (see Table 6-10). This is confirmed by the results from the first study where 76.9% of respondents reported they had created all of the assessment for the unit (see Table 4-8). The remaining respondents created the assessment items either in cooperation with the home campus academic or for approval by the home campus. Only a small percentage of respondents (4.3%) created the assessments without any involvement of the home campus.

Table 6-10 Creation of Assessment Items by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I create all of the assessment items for the module</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create the assessment items for the module in cooperation with the teaching staff at the foreign university</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment items created by me are approved by the teaching staff at the foreign university</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no involvement in the creation of the assessment items used in the module</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where respondents had some involvement in the creation of assessment items, it involved input into assessment design, or modification of the items for cultural or teaching environment differences (see Table 6-11).

Table 6-11 Involvement of TNE Academics in Creation of Assessment Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification of those items for cultural reasons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modification to allow for differences in the teaching environment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input into exam/assignment questions</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The local teaching staff carried out the majority of assessment marking, with less than 10% of respondents (9.1%) having no involvement in the marking of assessment items (see Table 6-12). A large portion of respondents (70.5%)
reported that moderation of their marking was carried out by staff at the home campus, and only 4.5% marked the items to a marking guide they created themselves. This reflected the findings of Study One where only 13.2% of home campus academics reported marking all of the assessment items (see Table 4-9).

Table 6-12 Marking of Assessment Items by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I mark all items using my own marking guide</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mark all the assessment items using a marking guide supplied by the foreign university</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mark the assessment items using a marking guide, then the marking is moderated</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some items are marked by the home campus staff, I mark the others and that marking is moderated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no involvement in the marking of the assessment items</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked about the types of assessment they marked (see Table 6-13), more than half (56.5%) responded that they marked assignments, and 23.9% marked all assessments.

Table 6-13 Types of Assessment Items Marked by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignments</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab/workshop submissions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4 Face-to-Face Delivery of Units

Respondents were asked what teaching methods they had used in the delivery of the unit in their most recent TNE experience. Most of the respondents had conducted lectures and tutorials (see Table 6-14). A smaller number had been responsible for online content delivery. This contrasts markedly with Study One, where 61% of respondents had no direct involvement with the delivery of the units (Table 4-10).
Table 6-14 Face-to-face Delivery by TNE Academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery method (multiple responses possible)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver online content</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.5 Interaction with Students out of Class

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had any interaction with the students out of class time (i.e., over and above the time spent interacting with students during classes), with 93.3% reporting that they did interact with students outside of class. The amount of time they spent on this interaction varied, though 66.7% reported spending between one and five hours per week on this activity (see Table 6-15).

Table 6-15 Time Spent by TNE Academics on Interaction with Students

| Less than one hour per week | 9 | 20.0 |
| 1-5 hours per week          | 30 | 66.7 |
| 5-10 hours per week         | 5  | 11.1 |
| More than 10 hours per week | 1  | 2.2  |
| Total                       | 45 | 100.0 |

When asked to indicate the ways in which this interaction took place, respondents reported that email was the most used mode (93.3%), with face-to-face interaction (64.4%) as the next most reported (see Table 6-16).

Table 6-16 Mode of Interaction by TNE Academics with Students Out of Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online forums</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning management system</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71.2% of responses indicated the use of more than one mode of interaction, with only 6.4% showing there was no interaction out of class.
6.3.6 Interaction with Home Campus Teaching Staff

Respondents were asked about the interaction they had with the home campus teaching staff during their most recent TNE teaching experience. Nearly all respondents (92.9%) indicated that they had some interaction with teaching colleagues on the home campus.

When asked to indicate the frequency of interaction with the home campus teaching staff, nearly half (46.3%) of the responses indicated there was contact only once or twice during the teaching period (see Table 6-17), with 19.5% reporting having weekly contact. This level of contact is lower than that reported by respondents in the first study where 67.6% reported having weekly or fortnightly contact (see Table 4-12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice during the teaching period</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several of the respondents reported that interaction with the home campus staff would vary depending on need, with one stating, "Sometimes we do not need to communicate when things are mundane and normal" (Respondent 30).

The first study had indicated a negative association between the amount of contact with the TNE teaching staff and the home campus academics' satisfaction (as discussed in Section 4.4.1.2). In order to explore this relationship further, two additional questions regarding this contact were asked. The first was about the mode of communication, and the second, the subject of the communication.
Email was reported as being the most used mode of communication with home campus staff (see Table 6-18). Only one respondent selected social media as a mode used, stating that, “Staff who are on Skype and FB and encourage discourse and communication are easier to contact and to work with” (Respondent 29).

**Table 6-18 Modes of Interaction by TNE Academics with Home Campus staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skype/telephone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-19 shows that clarification of content or assessment items were the reasons given most often for being in contact with the home campus. Other reasons suggested by respondents in the open-ended question, included dealing with student complaints, or administrative concerns such as accessibility of learning objects.

**Table 6-19 Reasons for TNE Academics Being in Contact with Home Campus Academics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of content</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of assessment items</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions for student submission dates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderation of assessment marking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking of assessment items</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines for completion of marking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Satisfaction with TNE

This section reports on the quantitative analyses of data collected from the online questionnaire with regard to respondents’ satisfaction with TNE. It then examines and reports on the relationships between the TNE academics’ interaction with home campus staff and students, the various aspects of control over unit delivery and satisfaction.

As discussed in Section 3.6.2.5, respondents were asked about their satisfaction with both their most recent TNE offering, and then with TNE in general. Both
were measured on a five point Likert-scale. Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE offering is summarised in Table 6.20. The means of the responses ranged from 3.80/5 to 4.67/5. The lowest level of agreement was with the statement regarding the degree of control the respondent had over the conduct of the unit (module) (3.80/5). Other statements with a mean less than four were with regard to the equivalence of the students' experience with that of the home campus (3.95/5), communication with the home campus staff (3.91/5), and the enthusiasm demonstrated by the students toward their studies 3.95/5. The items with levels of agreement greater than 4.2 were with regard to the support offered by the foreign university (4.25/5), confidence in approaching the home campus teaching colleagues (4.34/5), the level of respect afforded by the home campus teaching staff (4.36/5), and an assessment of the adequacy of the respondent's qualifications to teach the unit (4.67/5).
Table 6-20 TNE Academics’ Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am satisfied...</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With the support in running the modules provided to me by the university</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That my students are receiving an equivalent experience of the module to the students at the home campus</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the degree of control over conduct of module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the degree to which the students communicate with me regarding the module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the degree of enthusiasm my students demonstrate toward their studies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the level of feedback I am able to provide to the students on their performance in the module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the degree to which the home campus teaching staff communicate with me regarding the module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the support the home campus teaching staff demonstrate toward the module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I am adequately qualified to teach my unit/course</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the level of feedback provided to me by the home campus teaching staff</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I can confidently approach the home campus teaching staff with any issues I might have with the module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the level of respect afforded to me by the home campus teaching staff</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with TNE Teaching in General is summarised in Table 6-21. The means ranged from 3.20/5 to 4.73/5. There was a high degree of agreement with the statements, “I regard the students studying in the modules as being ‘my’ students”, and “I look forward to teaching my next module” (4.59/5 and 4.73/5, respectively). Lower levels of agreement were recorded for the other statements, with the lowest being with regard to the opportunities for professional development (3.2/5).
Table 6-21 TNE Academics’ Satisfaction with TNE Teaching in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in the modules as being “my” students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next module</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the financial reward I receive for teaching the modules</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that I receive adequate recognition/praise from the foreign university</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I am an important part of foreign university</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching foreign sourced modules has provided me</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more interested in teaching foreign sourced modules than local institutions’ modules</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.1 Influence of Control and Interaction on Satisfaction

As in Study One, several variables related to the control the respondent was able to exercise over the unit were examined, those being: Content Creation, Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking. Added to those was a further variable, Content Modification, which acknowledges that a common mode of unit delivery in TNE is for the unit to be delivered to the specification of, with materials supplied by, the home campus. This is borne out by the survey in that nearly one third of the respondents (31.9%, see Table 6-7) were not responsible for the creation of any materials for the units in which they were teaching. However, more than half of the respondents (54.5%) indicated that they modified the supplied content in some way. The Content Modification variable then, reflects the control the academic can exercise over the conduct of their teaching through making changes to the supplied content.
In order to explore the influence of Control and Interaction on academics’ satisfaction, as described in Sections 3.6.2.3 and 3.6.2.4 respectively, summary variables for each respondent were calculated for Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering (12 items) and Satisfaction with TNE in General (seven items), as the mean of the individual item scores. Both scales were found to be of acceptable reliability with Cronbach’s alphas of 0.91 and 0.71 respectively. The overall mean for Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE offering was 4.13/5 (SD=.61) and for Satisfaction with TNE in General, 3.95/5 (SD=.57).

Multiple linear regressions, with simultaneous entry of all terms, were performed to determine if the different aspects of Interaction (Face-to-Face Interaction, Interaction with Students, Interaction with Staff at the Home Campus) and Control (Content Creation, Content Modification, Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking) influenced the satisfaction experienced by the TNE academics.

Preliminary assumption testing was performed to test for normal distribution of the independent variables (Hair et al., 2006). The Assessment Creation variable was not normally distributed, with a skewness of 1.661 (SE=.347) and kurtosis of 1.759 (SE=.681). This was because the Assessment Creation variable was initially scored on the basis of the answer to the question, “What degree of responsibility do you have for the creation of the assessment items in the module?”, such that a score of three corresponded to the answer, “I create all of the assessment items for the module”, and 0 represented that the respondent had no involvement in the creation of the assessment items. As shown in Table 6-10, a large majority of respondents had no involvement in the creation of assessment items (70.2%).
The variable was recoded therefore to be binary, with 0 representing those respondents who were involved in the creation of assessment items, and one, those who were not (see Table 6-22). The recoded variable had a skewness of .913 (SE=.347) and kurtosis of -1.220 (SE=.681), and so was suitable for further analysis.

Table 6-22 Re-coded Assessment Creation Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involved in Creation of Assessment Items</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Involvement in Creation of Assessment Items</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of standard residuals was carried out, which showed that the data contained no outliers (Std. Residual Min = -2.490, Std. Residual Max = 2.150).

Tests to see if the data met the assumption of collinearity indicated that multicollinearity was not a concern (see Table 6-23).

Table 6-23 Collinearity Statistics for Study Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face Delivery</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>1.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>1.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over Unit Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Modification</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>2.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>2.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data also met the assumption of independent errors (Durbin-Watson value = 1.741), and the histogram of standardised residuals indicated that the data contained approximately normally distributed errors, as did the normal P-P plot of standardised residuals. The scatterplot of standardised predicted values showed that the data met the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and
linearity. The data also met the assumption of non-zero variances (see Table 6-24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-24 Variances for Study Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Interaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Control over Unit Delivery</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering the initial overall multiple linear regression model was not significant (p>.05). A backward elimination approach (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010) was then used to determine which of the independent variables did not have an influence on satisfaction. The least significant of the regressors, Assessment Marking was removed from the model, which improved the significance: (F(6,43)=2.614, p=.033), with 29.8% of the variability in Satisfaction with Most Recent TNE Offering being explained by these variables (R²=0.298).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-25 Multiple Regression Examining the Impact of Interaction and Control on TNE Academics' Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.521                                                                   0.374          9.414          &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interaction                                                                                                                  |
| Face-to-face Delivery          | 0.081          0.107          0.758          0.453                                                                 |
| Student Interaction            | 0.131          0.139          0.945          0.351                                                                 |
| Staff Interaction              | 0.126          0.066          1.912          0.064                                                                 |
| Control                                                                                                                      |
| Content Creation               | 0.118          0.091          1.289          0.206                                                                 |
| Content Modification           | -0.148         0.068         -2.164         0.037                                                                 |
| Assessment Creation            | -0.156         0.259         -0.601         0.551                                                                 |

Table 6-25 shows that the only variable that had a significant influence on Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering was Content Modification (β=-2.164,
This influence was negative in that the less content modification was required, the more satisfied the respondent was. None of the Interaction variables appeared to influence satisfaction with the most recent TNE offering.

To determine satisfaction with TNE more generally, an analysis of standard residuals was carried out with Satisfaction with TNE in General as the dependent variable. This showed that the data contained no outliers (Std. Residual Min = -2.095, Std. Residual Max = 2.047). Tests to see if the data met the assumption of collinearity indicated that multicollinearity was not an issue (see Table 6-23).

The data met the assumption of independent errors (Durbin-Watson value = 2.083), and the histogram of standardised residuals indicated that the data contained approximately normally distributed errors, as did the normal P-P plot of standardised residuals. The scatterplot of standardised predicted values showed that the data met the assumptions of homogeneity of variance and linearity. The data also met the assumption of non-zero variances (see Table 6-24).

As a non-significant linear regression model (p>.05) was obtained, a backward elimination approach was then used to determine influences on satisfaction, removing the least significant regressor at each step until the model became significant. The final model was significant, (F(3,43)=3.184, p=.034), with 19.3% (R²=0.193) of the variability in Satisfaction with TNE in General being explained by the variables listed in Table 6-26.
Table 6-26 Multiple Regression Examining the Impact of Interaction and Control on TNE Academics’ Satisfaction with TNE in General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>15.315</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Delivery</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>1.752</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Modification</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-2.790</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Creation</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with Satisfaction with Latest TNE Offering, the only variable that had a significant influence on Satisfaction with TNE in General was Content Modification ($\beta=-0.178$, $p=0.008$). Again, this influence was negative in that the less content modification was required, the more satisfied the respondent was.

In summary, of the four Control variables examined, only Content Modification ($\beta=-2.164$, $p=0.037$) appeared to have a significant influence on Satisfaction with the latest TNE offering (see Table 6-25). Similarly, Content Modification was the only variable that had a significant influence on Satisfaction with TNE in General ($\beta=-0.178$, $p=0.008$).

None of the Interaction variables examined (Face-to-Face Delivery, Interaction with Staff, Interaction with Students) was shown to have a significant influence on satisfaction with either the latest TNE offering, or TNE in General.

6.4.2 Job Diagnostic Survey

As discussed in Section 3.6.2.6, 15 statements from the short form of the JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) were included in the questionnaire for Study Two. Respondents were asked to indicate, on a scale of one to seven, how accurate they thought each statement was with regard to teaching modules sourced from foreign universities. Five of the questions were worded negatively and the
responses to those questions were reversed prior to analysis. The responses are summarised in Table 6-27.

The means of the individual items ranged from 3.48 and 6.07/7. The three highest scoring items were from the Skill Variety (“It makes use of my skills, training and knowledge”, and “It requires me to do many different things that make use of a variety of my skills and talents”), and Task Significance (“It has a significant impact and important effect on the students”) dimensions of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

In order to calculate a summary variable for each of the five JCM dimensions, the responses to the statements were then grouped by the dimension of the JCM to which they corresponded (see Table 3-24). Tests for internal reliability for each of the dimensions was carried out. The data demonstrated low internal reliability, with the negatively worded questions having the largest impact. These were removed and the internal reliability of each of the scales was improved.
### Table 6-27 JDS Responses

How accurate are the statements below with respect to teaching modules sourced from foreign universities? Reverse coded questions marked with *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Valid Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It requires me to do many different things that make use of a variety of my skills and talents</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It involves me from the start to the finish of the students’ learning experience</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has a significant impact and important effect on the students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me complete responsibility for deciding how the module is delivered</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes use of my skills, training and knowledge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides me the opportunity to completely finish the piece of work I begin</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is simple and repetitive*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is set up such that I get almost constant feedback about how well I am doing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not really that significant in the broader scheme of things*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I teach and work</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is arranged in such a way that I do not have the opportunity to be involved in the teaching from beginning to end*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a job where a lot of people can be affected by how well I do the work</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in my teaching*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides very few clues as to whether or not I am performing well*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 6-28, the scores for the dimensions relevant to the experienced meaningfulness of the work critical psychological state (see Table 2-3) scored higher than those associated with experienced responsibility for the outcome of the work and knowledge of the results of the work. These results suggest that while the respondents believe their work to be “generally meaningful, valuable and worthwhile” (Hackman & Oldham, 1976 p.256), they feel less accountable and responsible for the outcomes of the work, and have less knowledge of how well they are performing the work. These findings will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

The MPS (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) was calculated based on the following formula:

\[ \text{MPS} = \frac{(\text{Skill Variety} + \text{Task Identity} + \text{Task Significance})}{3} \times \text{Autonomy} \times \text{Feedback} \]

From 42 valid responses, the MPS was calculated to be 150.04 with a standard deviation of 86.188. When compared with the norms for the JDS (Oldham, Hackman, & Stepina, 1978), the MPS for TNE academics is close to those for professional and graduate workers. These findings will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Variety</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Identity</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Significance</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 Exploring the Factors that Affect Satisfaction

This section reports on the qualitative analysis of the textual data collected from the open-ended questions in the online questionnaire, and from the semi-structured interviews.

Following unitization, each of the "units of meaning" (Campbell et al., 2013, p. 302) were allocated a code based on the schema discussed in Section 3.8.2.2. Where a meaning unit could be associated with more than one code, it was duplicated and associated with both relevant codes. In all, there were 445 units of meaning. The meaning units were distributed between the Level 1 codes as shown in Table 6-29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.1 Interaction

Interaction was the most commonly recorded top-level code, accounting for 41.8% of the coded meaning units (see Table 6-29). Table 6-30 lists the second level of coding for Interaction, and shows that more than half of the meaning units (51.6%) concerned interaction with students, and a further 28.5% interaction with the home campus academic staff. The next sections will discuss each of these in turn.
Table 6-30 Frequency of Meaning Units Relevant to Level 2 Interaction Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Campus Teaching Staff</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Employed Teaching Colleagues</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5.1.1 Interaction with Students

Although the quantitative results did not demonstrate that interaction with students had a significant impact on satisfaction, of the meaning units relevant to interaction with students, 68.8% were positive in their outlook. One of the aspects that was reported positively was the impact the participants see they have on their students. For example, when asked what about teaching in TNE causes satisfaction, one respondent said, “Delivering an opportunity to students who, in the absence of foreign universities, would miss out on an important life experience” (Respondent 34). Another suggested satisfaction arose from, “Seeing my students succeed” (Respondent 27), and “You feel like you’re making a difference. It really does” (Interview 10).

This interaction with the students was also seen by a participant to provide an opportunity for interaction with a diverse range of students:

“Having Russians, and a girl from Finland in my classes this trimester ... it is nice. Of course, the Vietnamese, the Indonesians, the Filipinos and the mainland Chinese. They teach you things, you know?” (Interview 4).

Another suggested it was not just about national backgrounds, but the “exploring of shared experiences especially from social, gender and age dimensions” (Respondent 18). The fact that many of the students were “working adults” also meant that the students are,
“...already in the industry, so they give good cases that I wouldn’t even know about. I am hoping to use some of the cases that they have actually included in their essays in future as some of the case studies” (Interview 10).

Interaction with students was also seen by several respondents as being positive in that it, “keeps me intellectually stimulated” (Respondent 41), and it provides an opportunity for, “learning from the learners as I share knowledge with them” (Respondent 50).

The small number of negative phrases were concerned primarily with students’ preparation, or lack of it, for classes. When asked about something that caused the respondent dissatisfaction, one responded:

“The students don’t do the work assigned to them by the university. Most of them attend without reading the material assigned for the week, which makes my job that much more difficult” (Respondent 33).

The quantitative results suggested that the TNE academics make themselves available to students outside of class time; 93.3% of questionnaire respondents reported being in contact with students out of class time. A similar percentage reported using email as their primary mode of contact (see Table 6-16). This was also noted in the qualitative data, with one participant reporting they tell the students:

“I say, yeah, you can email me anytime. You can email me as many times as you want, if you have a question... I always help those who help themselves” (Interview 5).
6.5.1.2 Interaction with Home Campus Teaching Staff

As with student interaction, the quantitative analysis did not suggest that interaction with home campus staff had a significant impact on satisfaction.

Consistent with this, the units coded as being relevant to Home Campus Teaching Staff did not appear to indicate either satisfaction or dissatisfaction, rather, the majority concerned interaction focused on the mechanics of teaching the unit.

Clarification of content and assessments or classroom activities were reported as major reasons for interaction, for example, “I don’t understand a particular way he (the home campus staff) has explained the concept or an example” (Interview 7).

Clarification of issues or problems that arise was also reported as an important reason for interaction to occur:

“If I can’t solve the problem, I will bring it to the unit coordinator and if there is some discrepancy in information in the slides versus what is in the reference text, then I would bring it up” (Interview 4).

The need for this interaction to happen seems to reduce with time.

“The more comfortable I am, surprisingly, the less I interact (with the home campus staff) I know her style, so I just email and talk to her” (Interview 3).

While very few of the respondents reported positively on their interactions with the home campus staff, one suggested that feedback was appreciated.

“A lot of UCs send emails at the end of the semester saying, ‘Thank you, great job... some of your students wrote fantastic exam papers” (Interview 2).
In some cases, the feedback was in the other direction and relevant to ongoing modification of the curriculum at the providing university:

“I give a lot of feedback in terms of, ‘Have you thought of changing this assignment because I don’t think that really works and it is really difficult for the students? Can we not incorporate something like this and like that?’ I am probably a pain in the bottom to the UCs because they spend all this time coming up with their brilliant modules and then someone goes, actually, it could be better” (Interview 2).

There were a small number of negative comments made about interaction with the home campus staff with one respondent referring to them as being “...arrogant” (Respondent 1).

While the first study suggested that the more interaction, the less satisfaction for the home campus academic, this study did not suggest a significant impact on satisfaction. This will be discussed at more length in Section 7.3.2.

6.5.1.3 Interaction with Local Teaching Colleagues

As discussed in Section 3.7.2.2, the interviewees were asked about the interactions they had with locally-based colleagues. Interaction between locally employed teaching colleagues, where it happens, seems to be quite informal. For example, “If there is a gap in between (classes) we might go have a coffee, have lunch... hang out and talk” (Interview 1). These conversations might be about conditions with another employer, assignments, or even, “A bit of old gossip and all that” (Interview 3). Several participants suggested there are difficulties in creating this interaction because, mostly, they are “free agents” (Interview 4), meaning they are not employed full-time at a single institution, rather taking
teaching appointments at multiple institutions. Where the interaction seemed the strongest was in a smaller discipline grouping (Tourism) at a single PEI where the academic staff were quite settled and had worked together for some time.

6.5.1.4 Interaction with the Foreign University

Interaction with the foreign university was a theme that emerged from the data analysis. Units coded as being relevant to the foreign university, were generally negative in their tone, and this was in agreement with the findings of the quantitative analysis, in that several items used in the measurement of Satisfaction with TNE in General (see Table 6-21) that were concerned with interaction between the respondent and the foreign university, were among the lower scoring items. Those included: Recognition from the foreign university (3.75/5, SD=1.184); being seen as an important part of the foreign university (3.89/5, SD = 1.104); and, provision of professional development opportunities (3.20/5, SD = 1.069).

The lack of formal recognition of teachers at the TNE location was seen as an issue for some, with one suggesting that regardless of their previous teaching experience, or the quality of their teaching, the teachers at the TNE location are treated the same as each other; “There is no change. There is nothing. That is not exactly a big carrot to dangle” (Interview 2). Other negative comments regarded the lack of formal recognition of the role played by the participants, with the suggestion being that more formal recognition may result in the “Adjunct/affiliates having deeper ties with the institutions they are representing” (Respondent 39), thus increasing their sense of loyalty to the university.
The lack of interaction with the foreign university was also noted in the lack of continuing professional development opportunities, “probably because they (the foreign university) don’t know what we need, and we don’t say what we need” (Interview 8).

6.5.2 Control

Each of the units coded as Control at Level 1, were allocated to one of three Level 2 codes; Assessment, Curriculum, or Quality Assurance as per Table 6-31. These are discussed in turn.

| Table 6-31 Second Level Coding for Control |
|-------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Frequency | Percent |
| Assessment | 27 | 26.2 |
| Curriculum | 68 | 66.0 |
| Quality Assurance | 8 | 7.8 |
| Total | 103 | 100.0 |

6.5.2.1 Control Over Assessment

The quantitative analysis of data collected in Study Two did not demonstrate any significant impact of the assessment-related variables (Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking) on the participants’ satisfaction. However, three main themes emerged from the items coded as being relevant to Assessment. The first was there being a need to amend the content of the assessment items to be more reflective of the local context. This was an issue because of both language and the use of examples relevant to the students’ own experiences. One participant was concerned about the students’ ability to cope with Australian slang terms in an examination:
“I have seen some examples where, seriously, a couple of slangs (sic) or words used that are very Australian in nature, and I think, oh my God, the students might not have understood” (Interview 3).

One of the participants encouraged the students to give examples from their own experiences in class because “…many of them are already in the industry so they give good cases that I wouldn’t even know about” (Interview 10). She was concerned, however, that this focus on locally relevant examples may put the students at risk if the exam questions were not inclusive of, or relevant to, local conditions and terms. Localisation of the curriculum was also an important issue in teaching law and related disciplines; one interviewee who lectured in business law said that while some foreign universities did not allow for any amendment to examination questions to allow for jurisdictional differences, others did, allowing the local lecturers to “set the papers according to the local law” (Interview 3).

The second theme was involvement in writing of examination and assessment questions. The responses were somewhat ambivalent, with the capacity to exercise control over the process being a positive and time constraints being the main negative:

“Maybe you could also create a very interesting exam, if you have the time. At the same time, it is time consuming to write a good exam and a supp exam and all the assignments... but if you are a person who likes to have control over the whole process, then of course, that is an advantage.” (Interview 6).

This ambivalence is echoed in the comment, “Honestly, I wouldn’t mind (setting and marking the exams). I mean, it would be more burnt (lost) weekends” (Interview 6).
The third theme was marking of assessment items and the role the TNE academic played in it. The requirement for marking to be turned around relatively quickly is a cause of some concern for some:

“There was a guy with a pile that was like at least 50 assignments. He marked that in half an hour... That is what happens when teachers end up teaching ten modules or whatever in order to earn the money” (Interview 2).

6.5.2.2 Control over Curriculum

Two variables related to control over the curriculum were examined in the quantitative analysis, those being Content Creation and Content Modification. No significant impact of Content Creation on the satisfaction of the local staff was demonstrated, but Content Modification was shown to have a significant negative impact on both satisfaction with the most recent TNE offering, and TNE in general.

Creation of the teaching materials based on a provided curriculum appeared to be a feature of some of the teaching, particularly where the curriculum was sourced from the UK: “The subject guide is provided. The syllabus is provided but the teaching materials are not. We prepare them, including the slides” (Interview 3). Participants saw this as being a lot of work; particularly the first time they taught a unit. Those who had experience of both this approach and the more controlled approach where teaching materials were provided found it “a lot easier to deal with ... where things are provided” (Respondent 36).

The quantitative analysis showed a negative relationship between Content Modification and satisfaction, suggesting the more modification of the content that was required, the lower the level of satisfaction. However, it seems the
situation is quite a deal more complex than that. A broad range of practices with regard to content modification were reported, ranging from those who wanted to make modifications but were not permitted to, to those who made modifications because they felt they had to, but at the discretion of the home campus teaching staff, to those who just made the changes, to those who didn’t want to make changes because of the additional work.

The need to be, and process for, dealing with modification to the content was commented upon frequently. This is consistent with the quantitative analysis, where 54.5% of respondents reported having modified the supplied content in some way (see Table 6-9).

Some respondents reported they were able to, and did, make changes to the lecture materials for the sake of understandability and localization. One said that:

“The core concept is always delivered the same, but it is always supplemented with an example of the local context, or in some cases, the sentences are rephrased so that they work better for the local context” (Interview 7).

At the other end of the spectrum, some participants reported that they were explicitly told not to modify the materials in any way at all, and that this caused them some concern. One stated that,

“It was pretty difficult for me to come into (Australian university) in the early days because I had to use somebody else’s slides…(this) means somebody else’s thought flow. I understand the stuff, but I can’t change the
slides. I cannot for consistency. Now, that slide slows my teaching style”
(Interview 3).

Questionnaire respondents had been asked to explain something they found
dissatisfying about teaching for foreign universities. One responded, “The fact
that the PowerPoint slides may not be amended to allow for variation in delivery”
leading to there being, “little room for self-expression and modification”
(Respondent 7). One participant stated that if they were in a position of not being
able to modify the curriculum or materials they,

“...wouldn’t enjoy it so much. I guess I would lack the active intellectual
engagement with the materials and I would feel stifled and controlled, which
I don’t particularly like” (Interview 6).

Some participants were frustrated by the lack of capacity to change or modify the
teaching materials provided because they were not of high quality or as one
respondent stated, “Most of the materials and readings used were totally
outdated” (Respondent 38). Another said that having to deliver materials created
by someone else means there is a need for “…you to familiarize yourself but it is
somebody else’s content. That is the part of the experience I don’t really enjoy”
(Interview 7).

In other cases, local teaching staff were given some capacity to make
amendments to the curriculum, though this seemed to be within certain limits. In
many cases, these amendments might include the addition of local cases, but
with the knowledge of the home campus staff:
“If we add, we have to let the Unit Coordinator know. The whole purpose is that they want to ensure that whatever may be added or taken out is not going to affect the core of the content” (Interview 4).

One of the participants, though, said they had been,

“...a bit naughty (lately) because I have been changing it (the lecture content) a bit fast, but the context is still the same. I get the Aussie notes and write a Singapore context to make them (the students) understand the example better” (Interview 8).

On the other hand, two of the participants found the situation of not being able to (or expected to) make any changes to the materials provided by the home campus to be advantageous, with one saying that it "Makes teaching a breeze" (Respondent 6). However, another said that this approach created additional work because of the need to “go through those slides and (work) it out in our heads how we are going to convey it” (Interview 4).

6.5.2.3 Quality Assurance

The main quality assurance mechanism the participants discussed was moderation of their marking. Student evaluations and their impact were also discussed, but they saw student evaluations as being more concerned with re-employment rather than quality assurance. Student evaluations and their impact will be discussed at more length in Section 6.5.3.

A majority of participants (70.5%, see Table 6-12) had their marking moderated by academics at the home campus. Moderation was seen by some to be negative, and a cause of dissatisfaction:
“I know some people don’t like moderation because they think that you (the unit coordinator) are checking up on their work” (Interview 5).

The need for this moderation of the marking by home campus academics caused one respondent to suggest that this made her feel like, “a second-class academic”, because of a lack of “autonomy to mark assignments without home campus lecturers’ moderation” (Respondent 41).

While it seems that moderation is a source of dissatisfaction for some, others see it as being a necessary part of the situation when there are multiple markers:

“I think it is just to ensure fairness and equity, if you have someone marking too high or too low or too strict, it can be balanced... the marking unit coordinator later told me I am too lenient. Boy, she was a machete... but after one trimester, I knew what her expectations were. Marking guides don’t tell you everything” (Interview 4).

6.5.3 Employment

Issues related to the conditions of employment were reported as being important by many of the participants, with the majority (73.3%) of meaning units with a Level 1 code of Employment, having a Level 2 code of Conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-32 Second Level Coding for Employment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment processes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple affiliations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for choosing this type of employment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three main themes emerged from the Employment: Conditions code, and they were the casual nature of the work, the workload and the remuneration.
6.5.3.1  *Conditions of Employment*

A feature of the private education teaching workforce in Singapore is the large portion of teachers who are not employed as full-time teachers. The Council for Private Education Singapore reports the percentage of full-time teachers in PEIs (across all levels including Higher Education) in Singapore as being between 28% in 2012/13 (Council for Private Education Singapore, 2013b) and 50% in 2015/16 (Council for Private Education Singapore, 2016). While the questionnaire in Study Two did not seek to explicitly determine whether or not the respondent was employed full-time or part-time, there were meaning units that clearly referred to a situation where the participant was employed on a casual basis.

Very few of the meaning units referring to the casual nature of the employment were positive in their outlook. There were three responses that were positive, and they concerned the increased flexibility that this form of employment afforded. For example, one respondent suggested this allowed her to, “...*arrange my hours to my satisfaction, so I can plan my own external work around it*” (Respondent 30). However, the casual nature of the employment created many concerns in terms of security of employment and income, and reduced capacity for forward planning. “*If we don’t teach we have no income, so to us, it is really survival*” (Interview 1), was a comment made with regard to the need to work in order to generate an income. This lack of certainty was blamed for the propensity for, “*good lecturers to leave and poor ones to stay on*” (Respondent 29). This becomes an issue when no total minimum teaching hours are guaranteed, potentially resulting in academics who will, “*run after classes*”
(Respondent 29) at a range of PEIs in order to generate an income. As one interviewee stated:

“...because we are part-time associate lecturers, we don’t attach ourselves to one institution. We actually need to have multiple assignments to be going at one time. It is not unusual for me to teach nine hours a day; morning, afternoon, sometimes evening, sometimes the weekend. That is where money comes in” (Interview 1).

This is further exacerbated when the increase in places offered by the government-funded universities (e.g., Teng, 2016) is taken into account. These factors have resulted in fewer students for the PEIs in Singapore and thus academics, “competing for the same pool” (Interview 1) of work. Forward planning for casually employed academics becomes difficult, with appointments being made (or not, as the case may be) up until the last minute: “It is always hard for us (casual teachers) to plan ahead. You never know what’s coming” (Interview 4).

For many of the casually employed academics, income is tied to the amount of work or number of classes they can teach. As one suggested, “You have to make a decision between, do you want to earn money, or do you want to do a good job?” (Interview 2). There is some acknowledgement that this is not perhaps the best way to approach teaching because:

“You not only have these totally overworked lecturers, you also have totally overworked lecturers that never get a break. That is even worse. All of this is not beneficial for the students” (Interview 2).
This need to take on additional work to provide an income, also has potentially negative impacts on work-life balance,

“Ideally, I teach for three days, but otherwise the maximum is four days. That leaves two days roughly, for me to do marking, research, catch up on work and things like that, and then one day to rest. Sometimes we don’t get to rest that last day…” (Interview 5).

6.5.3.2 Appointment Processes

Feeding into the concerns regarding the casual nature of the work and workload are the processes by which appointments for casual teaching staff are made at some PEIs. For some of the participants, continued appointment is reliant upon feedback from students. One suggested that,

“If I buy a bag of chocolate and I go into the classroom and say, here is some chocolate because today is teacher evaluation, I get full marks. It works!” (Interview 2).

When one participant had received poor ratings from students and was subsequently not re-employed, she was told that the feedback suggested that the, “Content was not very well developed. Yeah, but I have no control over that” (Interview 4), as the content was developed by the home campus academic staff.

One of the participants suggested that chances for re-employment at a PEI are enhanced by good relationships with the people at the PEI. For example, having been asked, and agreeing, to assist at a weekend function such as a course preview or similar marketing event, can lead to more employment:
“Next thing they say, ‘We have a new course. Do you want to do it?’... Those of us, I guess, who do more of this can just stand in a better position to get anything coming” (Interview 1).

However, this relationship with employer staff can cause problems, particularly when employment decisions are seen by the TNE academic as having been made for other than academic reasons, for example:

“We get ‘fired’ by some 23-year old administrator who feels one day that we have made her job just a bit more difficult and never get called back or offered another teaching contract, and she leaves the job in four months anyway, and we never know what happened” (Respondent 38).

As discussed in 6.5.3.1, this adds to the sense of a lack of security of income and employment, as well as a reduced capacity for the academics employed in this way to make plans ahead of time.

6.5.3.3 Multiple Affiliations

From the casual nature of the employment for many, comes the need to work for several PEIs concurrently, teaching curricula sourced from multiple universities, and potentially, from different source countries. One of the interviewees explained that for him, this means that, “I work on average (at) about two to three private schools” (Interview 1).

This has implications in terms of development of the longer-term relationships that are important in the satisfaction of the home campus academics (as discussed in Section 4.5.1.2). There are also implications in terms of having to deal with the differences in the approaches of the various universities.
“When we work with different universities ... different universities have different ways of doing it. Some will say, okay, this is what we do. Just reproduce it. That is what we do on campus. Don’t change anything. Don’t touch anything. Just do it. That is fine. Some will say, this is the text book, that is syllabus, go and do it. It is like a varied spectrum. The spectrum is very wide” (Interview 1).

6.5.3.4 Reasons for Choosing This Type of Employment

For many of the participants, the choice to work in this type of industry appears to be in the nature of a lifestyle choice.

“I used to work as a Human Resources Manager and after years of seeing what happens in the corporate world and what kind of things can be done to people in the name of profit... there has to be a better way to live... maybe it is time to change” (Interview 1).

For some others, the choice was the opportunity to work part-time, “I just wanted to take it easy. I didn’t want to work full-time, so this was a nice compromise” (Interview 4).

Once working in the sector, the nature of the work appears to be a motivating factor for people to stay:
“We are a second chance school. Students come into private education because they can’t get into university. I went through this route. I know what it is like to be told that you are not good enough to go to university. I believe I keep doing this because of the students” (Interview 5).

6.5.4 Teaching

Comments with regard to teaching were generally very positive and concerned the opportunity for exposure to curricula that were new and different to those offered by local universities, and the opportunity to adopt different pedagogic approaches (see Table 6-33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-33 Second Level Coding for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to new curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to different pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When referring to exposure to new curriculum, participants made the point that the modules on offer were more diverse, more interesting, and “more liberal” (Respondent 46) than might be found in Singapore. One stated,

“It has provided me many opportunities (to teach in an area not offered by Singapore universities) as an academic in this regard. And for that, I am very grateful!” (Respondent 39).

In a similar way, participants suggested they were given opportunities to teach in a different manner, with one saying,

“There is some degree of flexibility in most modules that allows me to deliver the module in a variety of ways. I just have to teach the content but can choose how I teach it” (Respondent 48).
There were some negative comments in this area, primarily concerned with workload associated with preparation for teaching. This additional impost could be minimized when local teaching staff were teaching a module they had taught before or working with staff from the home campus with whom they had previously worked, meaning that less preparation was required. Even when teaching the same module over and over again though, one respondent stressed the need to still be prepared, “...because each intake is different, and I need to make sure I have myself ready for each class” (Interview 8).

However, when the materials are not of a high quality, or delivered late, there is additional work required, with one respondent being critical of the quality of the teaching materials supplied, saying that:

“Sometimes we have to spend significant amounts of time to make sense of the lecture slides. We also don’t get the material until 2 weeks before the start of the term and leaves us with little time to properly prepare” (Respondent 46).

Seeing how students improve over time is also a reason for teaching, “My whole satisfaction is from seeing the students learn something; otherwise, why would we do it?” (Interview 2).

6.6 Comparison of Satisfaction between Home Campus and TNE Academics

As discussed in Section 3.6.2.7, the satisfaction of the home campus and TNE academics was compared. Because the data were not normally distributed, Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine if there were significant
differences between the satisfaction of the home campus and TNE academics as
discussed in Sections 4.4 and 6.4 respectively.

Analysis of the respondents' satisfaction with latest TNE offering showed that
there was a difference (U=350, z=-4.531, p=0.000), with TNE academics (Mdn =
4.125) demonstrating a higher degree of satisfaction with their most recent TNE
teaching experience than those at the home campus (Mdn = 3.500).

Similarly, analysis of satisfaction with TNE in general showed there was a
difference (U=366.5, z=-4.389, p=0.000) with TNE academics (Mdn = 4.125)
demonstrating a higher degree of satisfaction with TNE in general than home
campus academics (Mdn = 3.125). These results are discussed further in Chapter
7.

6.7 Overview

This chapter has reported the results from Study Two that was conducted as
explained in Chapter 3. The focus of this study was academics teaching curricula
for foreign universities in Singapore. The first section of the chapter presented
the results of the analysis of the quantitative data collected using an online
questionnaire, focusing firstly on the demographic data and then the factors
affecting academics; satisfaction. This was followed by analysis of the
respondents' satisfaction and how it was related to the control they could
exercise over the conduct of the unit they were teaching, and the interaction they
had with their students, other academics at the TNE location, and academics at
the home campus. Analysis relevant to the Job Diagnostic Survey was then
presented, and then a brief comparison of the home campus and TNE academics' satisfaction.
The chapter then presented the results of the qualitative analyses of the data collected in both the online survey and the face-to-face interviews. In addition to interaction and control, factors such as employment conditions and matters concerned with teaching emerged from these analyses.

In exploring the effects of interactions with students and home campus academics on the TNE academics’ satisfaction, the quantitative analysis did not demonstrate any significant relationships. The qualitative analysis however, did suggest a positive impact on satisfaction from interaction with students. Interaction with home campus academics was not demonstrated to have any impact on satisfaction, rather that the interaction was focused primarily on the mechanics of teaching the unit.

In terms of control over unit delivery, only modification of a unit’s content was shown in the quantitative analysis to have any significant impact on satisfaction, and this impact was negative in that the more modification the TNE academic undertook, the lower their satisfaction became. The qualitative analysis suggested issues of concern to participants with regard to control over unit delivery were the need to modify assessment items to be more reflective of local content, the quality of the teaching materials supplied in some circumstances, and processes associated with moderation of assessment marking.

Other issues that were raised in the qualitative analysis included employment conditions, in particular the processes associated with the appointment processes and issues associated with working at multiple PEIs teaching curricula from multiple foreign universities.
The next chapter will discuss these results.
Chapter 7 Study Two Discussion

7.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of Study Two presented in Chapter 6. This study examined the job satisfaction of academics at the TNE location in the context of their involvement in various aspects of TNE teaching.

Before moving to this discussion, it is useful to return to the primary research question being addressed in this thesis is, "How does the nature and degree of involvement in TNE influence academics' job satisfaction?"

The aim of Study Two was to answer the following subsidiary research questions with TNE academics as the focus:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ2: How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

The first part of the chapter discusses the results presented in the previous chapter relevant to the effect the nature and degree of control TNE academics can exercise over unit delivery has on their satisfaction, focusing on aspects such as assessment, curriculum and quality assurance.
The second part of the chapter discusses the results associated with interaction between TNE academics and their students, teaching colleagues at the home campus, and with teaching colleagues at the TNE location.

The third part discusses other factors that were seen to impact on academics’ satisfaction that emerged during the project. The chapter concludes with an overview.

7.2 Control Over Unit Delivery

The research question being addressed here asks how the nature and degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impacts on the satisfaction they gain from participation in TNE. As discussed in Section 2.3.3, the control an academic has over the delivery of the unit has been shown to be an important manifestation of their capacity to control their work environment, a factor that is discussed in the literature as being important in academic job satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Lacy & Sheehan, 1997). With regard to unit delivery, control can be exercised over the curriculum and assessment: curriculum, in terms of creation and modification; and assessment in terms of design and marking (Mahmud et al., 2010). In Study Two, control over the delivery of a TNE unit was examined with regard to curriculum and assessment from the perspective of TNE academics.

Study One identified the lack of direct involvement in the delivery of the unit at the TNE location and the work associated with moderation of assessment marking as causes of concern for home campus academics, but no significant relationship between control and satisfaction was found. In Study Two, four
variables relevant to control over unit delivery were examined from the perspective of the TNE academics: Content Creation, Content Modification, Assessment Creation and Assessment Marking. These results are discussed below.

7.2.1 Content Creation and Modification

Analysis of the questionnaire responses relevant to creation of content suggested that the TNE academics’ role mainly involved the creation of lecture slides and tutorial/laboratory exercises (see Section 6.3.1), with very few playing any role in the creation of learning objectives at either unit or topic level. This reflects the centrality of the unit and topic objectives in the design of units and is not surprising given the Australian regulator’s requirement for there to be equivalent outcomes for students regardless of location or mode of study (TEQSA, 2017a).

No relationship between content creation and satisfaction was demonstrated from the quantitative analysis (see Section 6.4.1). As discussed previously, the small sample size may be a factor in this. It is also possible that creation of unit content is simply not seen by TNE academics as being part of their role in unit delivery. Those participants who had experience of teaching where they were required to create content, reported that it was much easier for them when the content was provided. This reduction in workload could balance the motivating potential that may arise from additional control.
A majority of TNE academics also modified materials supplied by the home campus, in particular through the addition of local case studies and other modifications in order to reflect local conditions (see Section 6.3.2).

The quantitative analysis demonstrated that a negative relationship existed between the amount of modification of the supplied materials undertaken by the TNE academics and their satisfaction; that is, the more modification of materials the TNE academics perform, the less satisfied they become. This is consistent with the trade-off between the motivating potential of additional control and additional workload identified above.

The qualitative analysis suggested some dissatisfaction from the TNE academics with the materials provided to them. This was because they felt the materials from the home campus either did not suit their style of teaching, or, in the form in which they were provided, made teaching more difficult.

The importance of curriculum (and assessment) being relevant to the local environment is an important aspect of student and academic engagement, with Crosling (2012) suggesting that:

“...student alienation can occur if the educational programme and its assessment do not reflect the milieu's situation and concerns. Furthermore, the teaching staff may be alienated if their milieu is not reflected in the subject matter...” (p. 199).

As such, the need to localise the content, if it has not been created with input from the TNE academic at the design stage, is necessary if the TNE students are
to remain engaged. The importance of the input of TNE students into security of future employment of the TNE academics is discussed further in Section 7.4.1.

Exacerbating this dissatisfaction with the provided teaching materials is the suggestion that some TNE academics are expressly forbidden from modifying the materials in any way. Some others reported being able to modify the materials, but only under certain circumstances, and with the permission of the home campus academic. This places the TNE academics in the position of potentially having to work with or modify suboptimal materials, in order to make them acceptable for the students. It was unclear as to whether or not the TNE academics employed on a casual basis would be paid for the time taken to modify materials, and this should be investigated in future research as it has implications for satisfaction.

As shown in Table 6-28, TNE academics reported lower JDS (Hackman & Oldham, 1974) scores for the Autonomy and Feedback dimensions than for the other dimensions. The minimal degree of involvement in the curriculum creation process, which results in a need for modification of the materials in order to make them palatable for the TNE students may be responsible for the lower scores on Autonomy and Feedback.

7.2.2 Assessment Creation and Marking

Previous research (Mahmud et al., 2010) suggests that assessment in TNE is a cause of tension for academics at the TNE location. This is because TNE teaching staff, regardless of their qualifications or experience, are not generally included in the assessment creation process and are rather relegated to the lesser role of
tutors. Further, their marking standards are open to challenge and moderation, and this often comes with little feedback from the home campus academics.

The lack of involvement in the creation of assessment items reported in the literature was reflected in Study Two (see Section 6.3.3), where very few TNE academics had the capacity to create assessment items without any involvement of the home campus staff, with many having no involvement in the assessment creation process at all.

The quantitative analysis (see Section 6.4.1) did not demonstrate significant relationships between any of the variables related to assessment creation and marking and the TNE academics’ satisfaction. While this may be associated with the small sample size, it is also possible that the operationalisation of these variables had an impact on the result. The small proportion of respondents who indicated they had any participation in the assessment creation process meant the Assessment Creation variable had little variation and so its use as a predictor of satisfaction was lessened. It is also possible that the TNE academics do not see their role as including the creation of assessment items, and so it is not an issue that impacts on their satisfaction.

The qualitative analysis (see Section 6.5.2.1) suggested an ambivalence toward involvement in the creation of assessment. On the one hand, being able to be involved in the creation of assessment may have allowed for some mitigation of the TNE academics’ concerns about the language used in assessments and relevance of examples to the students’ situation. However, some respondents suggested that creating assessment items was a time-consuming activity in an already time-poor schedule.
As discussed in Section 6.3.3, the majority of assessment marking was conducted by the TNE academics, with the most common practice being for marking to be completed using a marking guide, prepared and provided by the home campus academics, followed by home campus moderation of the marking.

The Assessment Marking variable was scored as discussed in Table 3-15, and originally assumed an increasing degree of control with reduced amounts of moderation. However, this assumption may not be the case. It is also possible that, as with assessment creation, marking and having that marking moderated is an expected aspect of the respondents’ work, and so has little impact on their satisfaction.

Moderation of assessment marking is a key feature of TNE teaching (e.g., Goldacre & Briguglio, 2008; Mahmud et al., 2010). In Study One, from the home campus academics’ perspective, moderation was considered a mundane task that was low in skill requirements, disconnected from the whole task of teaching, and as such, not particularly significant. The qualitative analysis in Study Two suggests that from the TNE academics’ perspective, moderation is something that simply has to be done. While the TNE academics acknowledge the necessity of moderation, for some, it was considered as a somewhat patronising process in that it involved “checking up” on the quality of their work, as though they are not capable of doing, or trusted to do, a competent job.

As with the creation and modification of content, the TNE academics’ role in assessment creation and marking is not a leading one; there is little in terms of responsibility for, or input into, the design of the assessment. The majority of the work is associated with marking that is directed by the home campus academics.
and subject to their approval. This is consistent with the lower scoring for the Autonomy dimension of the JCM as reported in Section 6.4.2.

7.3 Interaction

There were two research questions relevant to interaction; the first, related to interaction with the TNE students, and the second, interaction with the home campus academics. The findings of Study One suggested that from the perspective of the home campus academic, interaction with TNE students did result in a higher degree of satisfaction (discussed in Chapter 5.2). The same could not be said about interaction with TNE teaching staff, where the satisfaction of the home campus academics decreased as interaction with the TNE teaching staff increased, especially when the interaction that did occur was focused in the realm of administration/supervision. In comparison, the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data from Study Two did not demonstrate any significant relationship between the degree of interaction with either students or teaching colleagues at the home campus and satisfaction for the academics. Both are discussed further below.

The qualitative analyses however, did suggest a positive attitude toward the students, but a more ambivalent attitude toward colleagues at the home campus. These attitudes and how they might impact on satisfaction are discussed in the next two sections. It will be suggested later in the chapter that the conditions under which many TNE academics tend to be employed (i.e., as sessional appointments) moderates the impact that interaction with students and colleagues has on TNE academics’ satisfaction.
7.3.1 Interaction with Students

The research question related to interaction with students seeks to determine how the nature and degree of the interaction between TNE academics and the students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE. Interaction with students has been shown in the literature to be a major source of satisfaction for academics (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Paul & Phua, 2011), see Section 2.3.3 for more detailed discussion. For the home campus academics, as discussed in Chapter 5.3.1, that interaction came mainly from online interaction, and, to a lesser extent from face-to-face delivery of the unit, and these interactions resulted in an increased level of satisfaction. In Study Two, all of the participants had some involvement in the physical delivery of the units. As such, physical delivery of the unit was not a factor that was able to be used to predict satisfaction. Therefore, in order to explore interaction with students in this study, the interaction the TNE teaching academics had with students outside of the scheduled class time was used. However, the quantitative analyses of the impact of interaction with students on TNE academics' satisfaction did not demonstrate any significant relationship. This could be because of the relatively small sample size, as the use of multiple regressions with a small sample size would tend to reveal only very strong relationships (Hair et al., 2006). Further, using the interaction with students out of class time to measure interaction was problematic because given the TNE academics’ high workloads, it may be that out of class interaction means more work and therefore less satisfaction. In turn, this may reduce the motivating potential of the additional interaction with the students.
The analysis of the qualitative data suggested TNE campus academics did see their interactions with students in a positive light. This was particularly noted in terms of being able to see the improvement in the students' understanding of the unit materials and the positive impact their teaching has on their students. Similarly, opportunities to learn from a cohort of students that was perceived by respondents as being diverse in terms of nationality/culture, educational background and pathways were viewed positively.

When viewed in light of Hackman and Oldham’s JCM (1976), and in a similar way to home campus academics, interaction with students results in an increased sense of the meaningfulness of the work (the Task Significance dimension) because the academic is able to see and experience at first-hand the positive impact their work has on the students. The JDS results (see Section 6.4.2) confirm this in that the three meaningfulness dimensions (Skill Variety, Task Identity, and Task Significance) scored higher than the Autonomy and Feedback dimensions.

The predominantly face-to-face nature of the TNE academics’ interaction with their students also affords opportunities for immediate feedback (the Feedback dimension). However, the need for fulfilment of context needs, such as salary and job security, is potentially a moderating factor, in that it reduces the impact of Task Significance and Feedback.

These findings with respect to interaction with students, highlight one of the fundamental differences that exist between those academics located at the home and TNE locations, in that TNE academics, particularly those employed on a sessional or casual basis, have very different needs from their home campus
colleagues. Interaction with students is not enough, in and of itself, to be a major cause of satisfaction, particularly when the context needs are not necessarily being met.

It is also important to note the important role that students can play in the TNE academics’ continued employment, particularly if they are employed by PEIs who use student surveys and feedback in employment decisions. This will be discussed further in Section 7.4.

On the basis of these analyses, there is support for concluding that interaction with students can have a positive impact on TNE campus academics’ satisfaction. The analyses further suggest though, that as a result of the sessional nature of many of the TNE academics’ employment, they are more concerned about salary, security and employment conditions, than they are with their interactions with the students. This is similar to the findings of Valadez and Antony (2001), and subsequently Antony and Hayden (2011), who, when examining part-time faculty in community colleges in the US, found that while these faculty members enjoyed teaching, their major concerns were about job conditions, and that they would move on from their current position to one that offered better pay, conditions and security, given the opportunity. This could suggest that the reason TNE academics want to teach is because they enjoy it, and that interaction with students is important as a reason for taking on the work initially, but not necessarily as an ongoing and significant source of satisfaction for them.
7.3.2 Interaction with Staff

With regard to job satisfaction, interactions between academic colleagues have been identified as an important source of satisfaction (e.g., Bellamy et al., 2003; Lacy & Sheehan, 1997; Oshagbemi, 1999; Ward & Sloane, 2000). The research question related to staff interaction investigates how the nature and degree of the interaction between academics at the home and TNE locations impact on the satisfaction the academics gain from their participation in TNE. Previous research suggests that interaction between teaching staff at the home campus and TNE locations is important for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the potential to make the moderation process work better (e.g., Mahmud et al., 2010). However, McLean (2007) suggests that the establishment and maintenance of these relationships is difficult, because of differences in power in the relationship and the lack of opportunities to develop collegial relationships.

In Study One, described in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, it was noted that when the nature of the interaction between academics at the home and TNE locations focused on administrative matters, there was a decrease in the satisfaction of the home campus academics. This dissatisfaction was mitigated somewhat when the relationship became more focused on teaching, and had developed over a longer time period.

In Study Two, and as discussed in Section 6.3.6, the TNE teaching academics did not have frequent interaction with the home campus academics, with nearly half of the participants reporting being in contact with the home campus academics no more than “Once or twice during the teaching period”. This may have been a reason for the quantitative analysis for this study not demonstrating that
increased interaction between academics at the home and TNE campuses had any influence on TNE academics’ satisfaction, though as suggested earlier, the small sample size means that only strong relationships will be identified. It may also be that the home campus academics are not seen by the TNE academics as colleagues, rather as providers of unit materials and arbiters of the quality of their work, meaning that interaction is not collegial and therefore, not a potential source of satisfaction.

This relative lack of interaction between the home and TNE academics was mirrored in the qualitative analyses, which suggested some ambivalence in the attitude of the TNE academics toward the home campus staff. The relationships that did develop between the home and TNE campus academics were not collegial in nature, though not only for the reasons suggested by McLean (2007), such as limited opportunities for face-to-face discussion. Rather, it is suggested here that this is because the relationships that develop are primarily task-oriented, in that they are about the mechanics of getting the job done; for example, being focused on clarification of content or assessment items. The relationship, from the perspective of both the home campus and TNE academics, seemed to be better when the relationship reduced the work required on both sides: not having to chase up marks or become involved in heavy moderation from the perspective of home campus academic, and not having to modify materials in order to make them useful from the perspective of the TNE academic.

As will be discussed in Section 7.4.1, the importance of positive student feedback in appointment decisions by some PEIs means that supplied teaching materials
which the TNE academics see as being of low quality or lacking in relevance to
the local context, or the need to clarify assessment items, may impact on that
feedback. For the TNE academic, having to modify materials to better suit the
local conditions, for example, is a task that needs to be completed in order to
maintain positive feedback from the students.

Interaction between the TNE and home campus academics occurred on an as-
needed basis, and, as discussed in Section 6.3.6, focused almost entirely on
administrative matters associated with operational matters. It effect, the
relationships focus on the fulfilment of context needs, and don’t impact on any of
the JCM factors.

Mahmud et. al. (2010) suggested that strong relationships between academics at
both locations was the ideal situation to enhance the quality of moderation
processes, with the TNE academics having more input into unit design as the
relationship matured. At this stage, many of the relationships reported in this
study do not appear to be at a point where input into unit design is a possibility.
A possible reason for this is the turn-over of staff on both sides of the
relationship.

Study Two also examined the relationships between the teaching academics at
the TNE location to determine if collegial relationships existed, in an
environment where factors such as power differentials would not be so great.
However, the opportunities to develop those relationships are problematic when
the academics are employed on a casual basis with varying rosters and teaching
assignments at multiple times and institutions. May, Strachan and Peetz (2013)
discussed the need for casual academics to work across multiple institutions in
order to make a living, labelling them “taxi-cab professors” (p.6). Potentially added to this is the notion that TNE academics are potentially in competition with one another for teaching appointments. The qualitative analysis in Section 6.5.1.3 suggested that the interaction that does occur between the TNE academics is not focused on academic matters, such as course content or research, rather it is about employment conditions, and perhaps some gossip. The capacity therefore, to gain satisfaction from interaction with co-located academic colleagues is reduced in this context. Where there did seem to be some collegial interaction, it was in a smaller discipline, with a more settled cohort of colleagues who possibly do not see themselves as being in competition with one another for teaching appointments.

It can be argued then, that academics working at TNE locations, particularly those employed on a casual basis, do not appear to have the opportunity to develop the collegial relationships (with either home campus or local colleagues) that have been reported previously as being important in influencing academic job satisfaction (Martin, 2011). It is also worth noting that the relationships that TNE academics have with other academics are not necessarily academic in their focus. There is seems to be little discussion of research or pedagogy; rather the relationships are grounded in pragmatism, around the collective need to get the job done. The casual nature of many TNE academics’ employment is discussed in more detail in the next section.

7.4 Other Factors

The final research question being investigated was to determine if there were other factors related to participation in TNE that impacted on academics’
satisfaction. In Study One, two factors were identified as impacting on home campus academics’ satisfaction, those being the lack of workload recognition for TNE teaching, and the lack of downtime. These resulted in difficulties for the home campus academic in allocating dedicated time to research and other scholarly activities. In Study Two, two additional factors were identified that cause concerns for TNE academics. The first was the employment and appointment process for some TNE academics, and the second was the nature of TNE academics’ relationship with foreign universities. These are discussed below.

7.4.1 Employment and Appointment Processes

The qualitative analysis demonstrated that the ways in which the employment of TNE academics is handled by some PEIs was of some concern to those employed by those PEIs for several reasons, and thus had the potential to reduce their job satisfaction.

The first was the way in which employment decisions were perceived to be made, as discussed in Section 6.5.3.2. Those TNE academics employed on a casual basis by the PEIs, believed that appointments were not necessarily made in the first instance to the best teachers, rather to people who had been working with the PEI for some time, or to those who were prepared to become involved in extra-curricular and outreach activities, such as marketing and promotional events. As an example of the fragility of the casual contract, there also seemed to be an expectation that making life difficult for the PEI professional staff responsible for making the appointments would result in either fewer or no
appointments going forward. This may be a cause of decreased satisfaction with the job as a whole, though not necessarily with the work itself.

The other reason that emerged from the qualitative analysis as a possible influence on the TNE academics’ satisfaction, was the importance placed on student evaluations undertaken by the PEIs when making re-appointment decisions. One participant even suggested that bribing the students with chocolates had worked for her in gaining more positive student evaluations. Many participants reported the creation of additional teaching materials including summary notes, assignment and exam preparation notes to assist the students with completion of their assessments. While this seemed to be part of the job, the work associated with localising and modifying the content provided by the home campus was a cause of dissatisfaction. However, the achievement of good results in the student surveys does not result in promotion, or pay increases; TNE academics employed by PEIs believe the reward for doing a good job is simply to keep the job. Similarly, many believe there is no recognition or reward for good teaching from the foreign universities, as discussed in the next section.

Given the importance of this employment to many of the participants as a source of income, context factors, in this case, salary and job security, become more important than those factors more commonly associated with academic job satisfaction such as interaction with colleagues and students and control over their work environment.
7.4.2 Interaction with the Foreign University

Most of the participants in Study Two clearly did not see themselves as being part of the foreign university’s academic staff. There is a disconnect in that, in most cases, they are not employed directly by the foreign university, rather, by the PEI. Those employed by PEIs are well aware of their status as “freelancers” and understand that this results in them not having access to many of the benefits that accrue to the home campus academics that have been reported as being sources of satisfaction for tenured academics at the home campus, including research (e.g., Albert et al., 2016), paid leave, health insurance and superannuation. Added to this, and as discussed in the previous section, the quality of their work is not perceived by them to necessarily be the primary factor in employment decisions, nor do foreign universities necessarily reward high quality teaching. They are not part of the whole task (that being getting the students through their studies) thus leading to a lesser sense of Task Significance.

These findings are similar to those of Davis, Connor, Perrott, Perry and Topple (2007), who, in an Australian context, demonstrated that while casual academics enjoyed the teaching they undertook and their job satisfaction was quite high, there was a sense of not belonging. Further, Rothengatter and Hil (2013) suggest that the precarious nature of casual academics’ employment leads to them being marginalised from colleagues. For the TNE academic who is employed on a casual basis, in a different country from the providing university, and perhaps having to deal with a range of different home campus academics, it is not surprising there is little sense of relationship with the providing university.
7.5 Comparison with Home Campus Academics

In Section 6.6 the satisfaction of home campus and TNE academics was compared. The TNE academics showed higher degrees of satisfaction than home campus academics with regard to both their most recent TNE experience, and TNE in general. While there appeared to be less cause for satisfaction for the TNE academics than their home campus counterparts, for the TNE academics, this is the primary focus of their work. For the home campus academics however, involvement in TNE is work that, at least in part, takes them away from the activities that do result in satisfaction for them. TNE is primarily administrative in nature for the home campus academics, and it reduces the time they have for research as well as the opportunities for interaction with their colleagues and students. This finding requires further investigation.

7.6 Overview

This chapter has presented a discussion of the results of the second study from Chapter 6.

The key findings of Study Two suggested that TNE teaching staff appear to enjoy their work, for example, their interactions with students and their capacity to make a difference to their students’ lives, but this does not appear to be a major source of overall satisfaction. The participants’ primary concerns were rooted more deeply in factors such as: job security, salary, general working conditions, and fringe benefits. Given how employment and re-engagement decisions in parts of the sector were reported to have been managed, in particular appearing to be largely based on student satisfaction ratings, it is not surprising that much of the TNE academics’ work revolves around keeping the students happy.
Making themselves available to students outside of set class times, preparation of additional revision notes, and interpretation of “foreign” assessment item requirements, are all examples of what some TNE academics are doing in order to achieve favourable student satisfaction ratings. Additional activities that are not contributing to the achievement of satisfactory ratings then, such as having to amend or improve on teaching materials that may be sub-standard, or creation of assessment items, are causes of dissatisfaction.

The implications of the findings from both studies are discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 8 Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusion to the research described in this thesis. The study set out to better understand how the way in which TNE is delivered is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved in order to better inform universities’ approaches to the operationalisation of TNE. This understanding is important for several reasons. TNE is important to governments of both TNE providing and receiving countries. Universities benefit from involvement in TNE from a financial and reputational perspective, as do students for whom TNE provides access to education otherwise not available to them. Further, the satisfaction of academics is important for a range of reasons related to academic work, including its positive relationships with teaching quality, research productivity, attrition and student satisfaction. Several factors have been related to academics’ job satisfaction such as control over their work environment, quality of delivery and interaction with colleagues and students. In the context of this thesis, the positive engagement of academics with TNE is an issue if the risks inherent in TNE are to be successfully mitigated.

The primary objective of this thesis was to explore how the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics’ job satisfaction. This empirical investigation was informed by Hackman and Oldham’s (1975) Job Characteristics Model’s (JCM) theoretical framework.
The research explored this objective, and the associated research questions, in two separate studies. The first study focussed on the job satisfaction of the academics located at the home, or providing, campus. The second study focussed on the academics located at the TNE, or receiving, location.

In order to achieve its objective, the thesis set out to answer this research question:

RQ: How does the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics’ job satisfaction?

In order to answer this question, four secondary research questions were also investigated:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ2: How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

The research has provided some insights into these issues which are discussed in the following sections. The chapter commences with a review of the empirical findings, and then discusses the theoretical implications of the findings. It then presents a discussion of the implications these findings have for the practice of
The limitations of the research project are then discussed, and this is followed by suggestions for further research that arise from this research.

8.2 Empirical Findings

Two studies were conducted. The findings of the first study, which focussed on academics at the home campus, are presented in Chapter 4 and then discussed in Chapter 5. The findings of the second study, of which academics located at the TNE location were the focus, are presented in Chapter 6 and then discussed in Chapter 7. This section will synthesise the empirical findings to demonstrate the progress made toward answering the secondary research questions before linking them to the primary research question.

The first of the secondary research questions asked was:

RQ1: How does the degree of control an academic has over the offering of a TNE unit impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

Control over unit creation and delivery was explored in terms of the creation and modification of the curriculum, and the design and marking of assessment.

From the perspective of the home campus academic, while no relationship between control and satisfaction was demonstrated in the quantitative analysis, assessment moderation and a lack of direct involvement in the unit delivery emerged from the qualitative analyses as causes for concern for the home campus academics.

From the perspective of TNE academics, there were less opportunities available for them to create content and assessment items. A negative relationship
between curriculum modification and their job satisfaction however, was demonstrated.

Moderation of assessment marking was seen as problematic from the perspectives of both the home campus and TNE academics.

The second research question was:

**RQ2:** How does the nature and degree of interaction with TNE students impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

For the home campus academics, interaction with TNE students was shown to be an important factor in their satisfaction, even when that interaction was virtual. This satisfaction arises for several reasons, including the experience of the positive impact the home campus academics have on the students, and recognition of the efforts made by the students, which both impact on the Task Significance dimension. Further, increased interaction with students results in increased opportunities for Feedback from them.

No relationship between interaction with students and satisfaction was demonstrated for the TNE academics, however, the qualitative analysis did suggest they enjoy working with TNE students, and, in a similar way to home campus academics, appreciate the positive impact their work has on students. The use of student evaluations in deciding future employment for those TNE academics employed on a casual basis, may be a factor that impacts on those academics’ satisfaction.

The third research question addressed was:
RQ3: How does the nature and degree of interaction with academics located at the other location impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?

Interaction between academics at the home campus and TNE locations had varying purposes, and the academics’ satisfaction in this regard was impacted largely by the purpose(s) of the interaction.

Study One demonstrated that the more contact there is between the home campus and TNE academics, the less satisfied the home campus academics are. The qualitative analysis suggests that when the relationship demonstrates an administrative perspective, it becomes work that interferes with the home campus academics’ capacity to undertake the activities that increase their satisfaction, such as research or collegial interaction with their students and colleagues. When interaction with TNE academics was focused more on teaching and students, the participants reported a more positive view.

No relationship was demonstrated between the satisfaction of the TNE academics and the interaction they have with academics at the home campus. The qualitative analyses suggest that the TNE academics’ perspective of the relationship, is based in the very pragmatic ideal of “getting the job done”.

The final secondary research question addressed was:

RQ4: What other factors related to participation in TNE impact on the satisfaction the academic gains from participation in TNE?
A number of factors related to participation in TNE, but not directly concerned with interaction or control, were identified in the project as having an impact on the satisfaction the academics.

From the perspective of home campus academics, the additional workload associated with TNE, and the scheduling or the timing of that workload appeared to have a negative impact on their satisfaction. Exacerbating this was the suggestion that the recognition in terms of workload, or remuneration for their work in TNE, was inadequate. The additional workload (and its timing) results in reduced opportunities for home campus academics to engage in research.

From the perspective of TNE located academics, issues associated with the employment process were at the fore; in particular, the role of students and their satisfaction as an important determinant in the decisions made by some of the private employers with regard to re-employment, rather than any other measure of teaching quality. In some cases, TNE academics felt they were being unfairly blamed for the poor design of a unit, or the poor quality of the supplied teaching materials, for which they had no direct control or responsibility. The other aspect of TNE that was of concern to some TNE academics, was the relationship with the home university, and in particular the lack of access to the conditions that are available to their colleagues on the home campus. There was also little or no recognition from the home campus of high quality teaching reported.

The above sections lead back to the main research question, which was:

RQ: How does the nature and degree of involvement with TNE influence academics’ job satisfaction?
Across the four secondary research questions, differences between the answers to the questions emerged. For home campus academics, satisfaction appears to be associated with those aspects of TNE that are “academic”: interaction with students, and collegial interaction with colleagues. Several aspects of their work, such as the provision (in contrast to development) of learning and teaching materials, and supervisory interaction with colleagues, have less of an academic focus in the TNE context than would normally be the case. These have either no impact, or in the case of interaction with TNE academics, a negative impact, on home campus academics’ satisfaction.

For the TNE academics, in particular those employed on a casual basis, conditions of employment appeared to be the main factors affecting their job satisfaction, in particular those processes associated with their ongoing teaching appointments and re-employment.

8.3 Theoretical Contributions

The research described in this thesis adds significantly to the existing research on both academic job satisfaction and TNE. It explored academic job satisfaction in the context of TNE teaching from the perspectives of academics at the home campus and TNE locations. It has demonstrated that satisfaction to be gained from teaching in TNE is fundamentally different in several respects to what could be considered to be the “normal” model of university teaching.

While the extant research suggests that the major factors that result in job satisfaction for academics are control over their working situation (Bellamy et al., 2003) and interaction with students and colleagues (Bentley, Coates, Dobson,
Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2013b), the research described in this thesis suggests that these factors may not be equally applicable in the context of TNE delivery.

From the perspective of home campus academics, this research confirmed previous studies that showed interaction with students was a source of job satisfaction. However, having control over curriculum and assessment in the context of TNE was not shown to be a source of job satisfaction. Further, increased interaction with TNE colleagues was shown to result in lower satisfaction for home campus academics, particularly when the interaction was focused on administrative matters. While not necessarily suggesting control or interaction with colleagues are not sources of job satisfaction for academics more generally, the thesis has demonstrated that this is not necessarily the case in TNE.

For TNE academics, the capacity to exercise control over the curriculum was not shown to be a source of satisfaction; indeed, when they were in a position to modify the curriculum, it resulted in less satisfaction. Interaction with colleagues was also shown not to be a source of satisfaction, nor was interaction with students. The primary concerns of most TNE academics related to employment conditions.

The JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1976) was used as the framework through which academics’ job satisfaction was viewed. This is the first time this theory has been applied in the context of TNE and academics’ job satisfaction. As discussed in Section 2.3.1, the Motivating Potential Score (MPS), which measures the motivating potential of a job (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), suggests that an
increase in one or more of the job dimensions will result in an increase in the motivating potential of the job.

Many of the factors discussed in the literature as having a positive impact on academics' job satisfaction can be related to one or more of the JCM's critical psychological states. Academics' capacity to receive feedback from students and colleagues on their performance, and the impact academics have on the lives and work of those people, are represented in the Feedback and Task Significance dimensions of the JCM. The Autonomy and Task Identity dimensions are expressed in the control over the conduct and delivery of their units. The Skill Variety dimension is related to the range of interactions and involvement the academic has with the delivery and management of their units.

However, in the case of academics involved in TNE, other factors may also be important. As suggested in later iterations of the JCM (Hackman & Oldham, 1980), the context in which work takes place is important and can moderate the motivating potential of the job itself. This is evidenced when the job dimensions are considered in light of the findings of this thesis, in particular, Autonomy, Skill Variety and Feedback.

The JCM suggests, for example, that a higher level of Autonomy leads to higher motivation and is therefore a desirable feature of a job that should be considered in job design. However, this was not necessarily the case in this research where some TNE academics reported an unwillingness to create and set assessments because it would result in additional, possibly unrewarded, work. Similarly, the need to modify supplied teaching materials, while increasing the TNE academics' autonomy, caused a reduction in satisfaction. While home campus academics
were largely responsible for creation of curricula, assessment items and content, there was no associated increase in satisfaction, again because of a perception of lack of reward. This may also be explained by the disconnection from TNE teaching that some of the home campus academics reported. When viewed in terms of the Task Identity dimension, teaching in TNE was not perceived as being part of the identifiable whole of the task that would be characteristic of on-campus teaching.

The JCM also suggests that a higher degree of skill variety should result in desirable outcomes. In the context of TNE, however, this does not seem to be the case. For both home campus and TNE academics, teaching in TNE requires the deployment of a variety of skills and talents. Moderating this for home campus academics however, is the large number of administrative tasks associated with TNE for which they may not be suitably remunerated, or which may reduce the amount of time they can allocate to aspects of their job that cause satisfaction.

Feedback is another problematic aspect of TNE work. While interaction with colleagues at the other location is a source of feedback and should result in an increase in satisfaction, it was shown to decrease satisfaction for home campus academics, particularly when the focus of the interaction was the administrative aspects of the job. From the TNE academics’ perspective, interaction with home campus academics was shown to be firmly task-oriented in its focus, and not a source of satisfaction.

Interaction with students was shown to be a source of satisfaction for home campus academics even when it was not face-to-face. TNE academics seem to value their interaction with students, and this was perhaps because they were
aware of the impact their work had on the students as per the Task Significance dimension. However, the interaction with students was not a source of satisfaction for them. This was possibly because the time the TNE academics, particularly those referred to as “taxi-cab professors” (May et al., 2013 p.6), had to interact with students was limited because of the need to get to the next appointment, or the next class.

8.4 Implications for Practice

The primary objective of the research described in this thesis is to better understand how the way in which TNE is operationalised is related to the satisfaction of the academics involved, in order to better inform universities’ approaches to TNE delivery. This section outlines some practical implications of the research that could assist universities with their approaches to TNE delivery.

One of the core findings of this thesis was that home campus academics’ job satisfaction is enhanced where there is more interaction with TNE students, particularly where there is some opportunity for in-country interaction. It is important therefore, that universities encourage this interaction. Provision of reliable and high-quality teleconferencing facilities at both the home campus and the TNE location would assist in this regard. Similarly, annual visits to the TNE campus would enhance the satisfaction of the home campus academics in relation to their interaction with, and general understanding of, the student cohorts. Reducing the role of academics in TNE to being providers of learning and teaching materials, would seem to be counter-productive in that it results in a less satisfied workforce.
The findings of the research suggest that it is important to allow home campus academics to have a greater degree of interaction with TNE academics that is collegial rather than supervisory in nature. An example of this type of interaction could be the collaborative development of assessment items to include local content, or discussion related to appropriate pedagogical approaches given the nature of the particular TNE student cohort. While this may be more easily achieved when there is a branch campus, interactions of this sort may be potentially problematic when the TNE agreement is based on a franchising model, or the TNE academics are employed on a casual basis. Regardless, good quality relationships between home campus and TNE academics have been demonstrated in previous research to be essential for the success of TNE (Pyvis, 2011), and so it is important to adopt strategies to encourage stability of tenure in the teaching staff on both the sending and receiving sides in order to encourage the development of these collegial relationships and mitigate the uncertainty that exists around continued employment. Further encouragement of the development of collegial relationships could include subsidies for collaborative research between home campus academics and their TNE colleagues, or for visits of TNE academics to the home campus.

Other ways in which the relationship between the home and TNE location academics can be enhanced could include the provision of explicit incentives for home campus academics who can provide high quality curricula and materials that do not require extensive modification to become more understandable for, and relevant to, the TNE students; an important aspect of this would be the increased inclusion of TNE academics in the course design process. As suggested
above, this can be problematic, particularly where there is less security or tenure of employment for the TNE academics employed on a casual basis. However, there are a number of ways in which universities could be working toward developing and maintaining a more stable TNE academic workforce in an environment where the workforce can be quite mobile. Development of practices that increase feelings of job security may be useful in this regard, and could include explicit adjunct appointments of TNE academics to the university staff. Provision of regular, and paid, opportunities for professional development by the university for the TNE academics would also help. Similarly, there appeared to be little interaction between TNE academics, and while the reasons for this were not explicitly explored, the portfolio nature of the casual TNE academics’ employment would certainly mitigate against the development of relationships with colleagues who are very rarely in the same location at the same time. To foster this collegiality, paid participation in activities such as team-building, or curriculum development workshops for academics in cognate disciplines could be developed and encouraged.

The processes associated with initial and ongoing appointment of TNE academics who are employed on a casual basis was a cause of great concern for those academics. Again, while needing to be cognisant of the varying agreements that exist in this context, the role of the university in the appointment process could be greater, in that it could include increased input of the home campus academics, particularly in circumstances where student surveys are currently seen by casually-employed TNE academics to be the most important factor in these decisions.
There appears to be little recognition of excellence in TNE teaching for either home campus or TNE academics. Methods for assessing and rewarding teaching excellence in this context need to be investigated and developed in order to recognise excellence and to reward it financially or with improved job security for the TNE academics, and to be used in promotion for home campus academics.

There are aspects of TNE that are not viewed positively by home campus academics, arising from features of the work that are mundane, routine, unchallenging, and that reduce the academic’s sense of ownership and control over the TNE delivery process. Similarly, TNE is seen by them as being an additional impost in terms of workload and work scheduling. Work in the TNE context must be adequately recognised in academic workloads for home campus academics and not viewed as a “marginal activity” with little or no impact on actual workload. For instance, planning of TNE academic calendars must be made with a degree of understanding as to how this impacts on the individual academic, particularly in terms of workload peaks and spread across the year. Similarly, allocation of TNE coordination and teaching duties must acknowledge that academics require time when they are not required to be teaching or responsible for the conduct of a unit, in order to fulfil the other aspects of their role.

### 8.5 Limitations of the Research

Several limitations of the research are apparent and should be addressed in future studies that build on this research.
Study One addressed the research questions from the perspective of home campus academics involved in TNE. The cohort for the study was limited to academics in the information technology discipline. While the qualitative analyses may have helped to mitigate some of the issues associated with the relatively small sample size, the small sample meant that differences between, for example, those academics who had face-to-face interaction with TNE students and those who didn’t were not able to be explored in sufficient detail to fully understand the relationships. It is also possible that the respondents to the online questionnaire were only those academics who felt strongly about their involvement in TNE and some findings may have been affected by this.

Similarly, the sample for the second study was limited to TNE academics in Singapore and was drawn from institutions that taught curricula sourced from Australian universities. There was no explicit differentiation made in the questionnaire between TNE academics employed casually by PEIs, and those employed on a full or part-time basis at branch campuses. Further, no differentiation was made between academics from the home campus moving, or being seconded, to the branch campus, and the branch campus employees who were employed locally. The sample is also acknowledged as too small to be able to explore the differences these modes of employment may have had on the academics’ job satisfaction.

8.6 Recommendations for Future Research
This thesis provides a basis on which to further study academics’ job satisfaction in the context of TNE. The findings relevant to each of the four research
questions explored in the thesis suggest areas for further research which are articulated in this section.

The findings of the first study with regard to academics’ interactions with students being implicated in their satisfaction were in line with extant research. However, further and more explicit examination of the nature of those interactions would be useful in a number of contexts. A comparison between academics’ satisfaction with the interactions they have with TNE students and those with their on-campus students may assist with understanding how the various TNE delivery methods impact on academics’ satisfaction. Broadening the sample population to other disciplines will help to determine if the outcomes of Study One are unique to information technology academics. Given the global nature of TNE, broadening the study to academics in other TNE providing and receiving countries will determine if these findings are applicable to academics in higher education systems other than Australia and Singapore.

The research demonstrated that TNE academics did not gain satisfaction from interaction with students and academic colleagues. While the small sample size and possibly the questionnaire design made it difficult to differentiate meaningfully between the academics employed casually and those employed full-time at branch campuses, these factors need to be explored in more depth in order to determine if this finding is an artefact of TNE employment practices, or if it applies equally to those academics employed directly by a university or its local campus. As the study was focused on Singapore, it is also unclear as to whether these findings would be equally applicable in other countries. Further exploration of this phenomenon would require the support of both the foreign
universities and the various organisations employing academics in the TNE location in order to access a larger number of research participants.

The use of the JCM as a framework within which to better understand the satisfaction of academics involved in TNE was useful, particularly in that it offered plausible explanations of the findings about academics’ job satisfaction. Agreeing with later incarnations of the JCM (e.g., Hackman & Oldham, 1980), this research strongly suggests that context factors have a moderating effect on academics’ job satisfaction and need to be taken into account when exploring academics’ job satisfaction. As such, further exploration of how these context factors impact on academics’ involvement in TNE is warranted.

8.7 Overview

In answering the research questions posed in this thesis, the research findings suggest that the existing understanding of academic job satisfaction does not necessarily apply in all aspects of TNE. Those aspects of academic work that have been shown to be important factors in academics’ satisfaction, such as control over their work situation and interaction with students and colleagues, are not necessarily as important in the TNE context. Strategies to ensure engaged participation of academics in TNE must understand these differences.

For home campus academics, TNE is seen as less an academic than an administrative set of tasks, and while interaction with TNE students was shown to have a positive impact on satisfaction, the impact of interaction with TNE colleagues was negative.
For TNE academics, particularly those employed on a casual basis by the private providers, hygiene factors such as employment conditions were more important than existing theories of academic job satisfaction suggest.

The thesis has made several suggestions as to how universities improve the satisfaction of academics with TNE. The most important of these are the need to encourage and facilitate consistency in the workforce on both sides of the partnership in order to foster collegial working relationships, and the need for there to be some meaningful interaction between home campus academics and TNE students. It is through these actions that universities can create an atmosphere in which TNE can be a satisfying activity for academics, resulting in a more engaged academic workforce and more successful TNE operations.
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Appendix B: Email to Associate Deans Learning and Teaching
Dear XXX,

I've contacted you as you are listed on the ARNEIA web site as an Associate Dean Teaching and Learning in an ICT Faculty (http://arneia.edu.au/contact/64)

Please find below an invitation to participate in a research project investigating the relationship between Information Technology Academic job satisfaction and participation in Transnational Education (TNE). If your School/Department is involved with TNE, it would be much appreciated if you could pass this invitation on to your colleagues who have TNE teaching responsibilities. Please feel free to participate yourself if you are involved in TNE! If there is someone in your School/Department who would be more appropriate for me to contact, I would be grateful if you could let me know their details.

Thanks for your time.

Kind regards,

Danny Toohey
School of Information Technology
Murdoch University
Tel: 08 9360 2800
Email: d.toohey@murdoch.edu.au

Dear Information Technology Academic,

We invite you to participate in a research study looking at the relationship between the degree and nature of an academic's participation in Transnational Education (TNE) and their satisfaction with that aspect of their working life. This study is part of my Masters Degree in Information Technology, supervised by Associate Professor Tanya McGill and Dr Lucy Jarzabkowski at Murdoch University.

Participation in TNE is becoming a more significant part of the Information Technology (IT) Academic's life. However, the degree and nature of participation in the delivery of TNE will depend on the model of delivery adopted by the University or Department. The primary aim of this research is to investigate the impact the degree and nature of participation in TNE has on the satisfaction the academic gains from their involvement in TNE.

We would really appreciate it if you could find the time to answer some questions about your TNE experiences. You will find the questions we would like to ask you at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/7Q7ORJF. It should take no more than 30 minutes to answer them. We are also hoping to record interviews with some participants via Skype to clarify and discuss some of the answers. You will be asked in the questionnaire if you are interested in doing this.

In approximately six months we will publish a summary of our findings on our website http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/~S970782C/. You can provide your email address in the survey if you would like to be notified when this has happened.

All information provided in this survey, or the interview, should you agree to participate, will be treated as confidential, and no information that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Should you change your mind and decide to withdraw while completing the survey, simply close your browser and you will automatically exit the survey. Note, though, that once you click the 'submit' button at the end of the survey your responses will be uploaded and it will not be possible to withdraw or amend them because we cannot tie responses to you as an individual.
If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Danny Toohey on 0427 728242 or d.toohey@murdoch.edu.au or my supervisor, Associate Professor Tanya McGill, on ph. 9360 2798 or t.mcgill@murdoch.edu.au. My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have about this study.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely

Danny Toohey

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2012/026). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University’s Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677 or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix C: Follow up Email to Academics
Dear *****,

I have emailed you as you have been identified as an academic in Information Technology (IT) or a related field, and you may be involved in Transnational Education (TNE). TNE occurs when students are physically located and attend classes in a different country from the providing institution. They are enrolled either at a remote campus of the institution or at a third-party provider. If you do not have any involvement with TNE, or have already been invited to participate in this study, then I apologise.

I invite you to participate in a research study looking at the relationship between the degree and nature of an academic's participation in TNE and their satisfaction with that aspect of their working life. This study is part of my Masters Degree in Information Technology, supervised by Associate Professor Tanya McGill and Dr Lucy Jarzabkowski at Murdoch University.

Participation in TNE is becoming a more significant part of the IT Academic's life. However, the degree and nature of participation in the delivery of TNE will depend on the model of delivery adopted by the University or Department. The primary aim of this research is to investigate the impact the degree and nature of participation in TNE has on the satisfaction the academic gains from their involvement in TNE. I would really appreciate it if you could find the time to answer some questions about your TNE experiences. You will find the questionnaire at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/7Q7QRJF. It should take no more than 30 minutes to complete. I am also hoping to record interviews with some participants via Skype to clarify and discuss some of the answers. You will be asked in the questionnaire if you are interested in doing this.

In approximately six months a summary of the findings will be published at http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/dtoohey. You can provide your email address in the survey if you would like to be notified when this has happened.

All information provided in this survey, or the interview, should you agree to participate, will be treated as confidential, and no information that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Should you change your mind and decide to withdraw while completing the survey, simply close your browser and you will automatically exit the survey. Note, though, that once you click the 'submit' button at the end of the survey your responses will be uploaded and it will not be possible to withdraw or amend them because we cannot tie responses to you as an individual.

If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Danny Toohey on 0427 728242 or d.toohey@murdoch.edu.au or my supervisor, Associate Professor Tanya McGill, on ph. 9360 2798 or t.mcgill@murdoch.edu.au. My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have about this study.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Kind regards,
Danny Toohey

School of Information Technology

Murdoch University

Telephone: +618 9360 2800

Email: dtoohey@murdoch.edu.au
Appendix D: Questionnaire Study One
Transnational Education and Academic Job Satisfaction

The Impact of Transnational Education (TNE) Delivery mode on Academic Staff Satisfaction

Participation in Transnational Education (TNE) has become a more significant part of the Information Technology (IT) Academic's life. However, the degree and nature of the academic's participation in the delivery of TNE will depend on the model of delivery adopted by the University or Department. The primary aim of this research is to investigate the impact the degree and nature of participation in TNE has on the satisfaction the academic gains from their involvement in TNE.

As an IT Academic, we hope that you can help us by answering a short survey. All information provided in this study will be treated as confidential, and no information that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research.

If, after reading the information above, you agree to continue with the survey, choose 'yes' from the options below and proceed. Should you change your mind at any time and decide to withdraw, simply close your browser and you will automatically exit the survey. Note, though, that once you click the 'submit' button at the end of the survey your responses will be uploaded and it will not be possible to withdraw or amend them because we cannot tie responses to you as an individual.

We are also hoping to record interviews with some participants via Skype to discuss and explore some of the answers in more detail than is possible in a questionnaire. This should take no longer than 45 minutes. If you would be willing to participate in an interview, please provide your email address at the end of the questionnaire.

At the completion of the research, the findings of the project will be published at the following website: http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/dtochey. If you would like to be notified when this has happened, please provide your email address below.

If you want more information before you decide whether or not to participate, email Danny Tochey at dtochey@murdoch.edu.au

If you do not agree to proceed with the survey, please choose 'no' from the options below or simply close this window to leave the survey.

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Permit no. 2012/029). If you have any reservations or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University's Research Ethics Office (Tel: 08 9350 6077) or email ethics@murdoch.edu.au. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the
1. Do you wish to proceed with this survey?
   - Yes
   - No

2. If you would like to be notified when the results of this survey are available, please leave your email address below: [ ]
3. How long (in years) have you been teaching transnationally?

[ ]

4. How many transnational unit/course offerings have you taught or been responsible for in the last year?

[ ]

5. Please list the countries in which you have taught, or where units/courses that you are responsible for have been offered.

[ ]

6. Which category below includes your age?

[ ] 20-29

[ ] 30-39

[ ] 40-49

[ ] 50-60

[ ] 60 or older

Other (please specify)

[ ]
Please answer the following questions as they apply to the content of your most recent transnational unit/course offering. If you had multiple offerings in the last teaching period, answer about the offering that you see as being most typical.

7. What content (apart from assessment) did you create for the transnational offering?
   - Learning Objectives
   - Topic Objectives
   - Topic Lecture Slides
   - Tutorial/Laboratory Exercises
   - Other (please specify)

8. If the content supplied by you is modified by the teaching staff at the transnational location, how does the modification happen?
9. What involvement do you have with the physical delivery (i.e., face-to-face contact with the students) of the unit/course content? (Please select those that apply)

☐ None
☐ Lectures
☐ Tutorial/Laboratory sessions

Other (please specify)
Transnational Education and Academic Job Satisfaction

Please answer the following questions as they apply to the assessment in your most recent transnational unit/course offering, including (but not limited to) assignments, laboratory exercises, tutorial participation and examinations. If you had multiple offerings in the last teaching period, answer about the offering that you see as being most typical.

10. What degree of responsibility do you have for the creation of the Assessment Items in the unit/course?

   - I create all of the assessment items for the course
   - I create the assessment items for the course in cooperation with the teaching staff at the transnational location
   - I approve assessment items created by the teaching staff at the transnational location
   - I have no involvement in the creation of the Assessment Items used in the course

11. Where the local staff have any involvement in the creation of the Assessment Items, what is the nature of that involvement?

   [Blank space for answer]
12. Which of the following statements best describes your involvement in the marking of the Assessment items?

- [ ] I mark all of the assessment items
- [ ] I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use
- [ ] I provide a marking guide for the staff at the transnational location to use and then moderate their marking
- [ ] I mark some items and moderate the marking of others
- [ ] I do not have any involvement with the marking of the assessment items

Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)
Transnational Education and Academic Job Satisfaction

These questions refer to the degree and nature of the interaction you have had with your transnational students and teaching staff in your most recent teaching period.

13. Typically, how often would you have some interaction with individual transnational students during a typical teaching period?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Fortnightly
   - Monthly
   - Once or twice during the teaching period
   - None of all

14. What is the nature of the interaction you have with transnational students?

15. Typically, how often would you have some interaction with individual teaching staff at the transnational location during a typical teaching period?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Fortnightly
   - Monthly
   - Once or twice during the teaching period
   - None of all
16. What is the nature of the interaction you have with the transnational teaching staff?
Transnational Education and Academic Job Satisfaction

In the context of your most recent transnational teaching experience, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements:
### 17. I am satisfied...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the support in designing and running my transnational unit/course provided to me by the University</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that my transnational students are receiving an equivalent experience of my unit/course to my local students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of control I have over the conduct of my unit/course transnationally</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which my transnational students communicate with me regarding their unit/course matters</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of enthusiasm my transnational students demonstrate toward their studies when compared with my local students</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of feedback I am able to provide to my transnational students on their performance in the unit/course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which the transnational teaching staff communicate with me regarding unit/course matters</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of enthusiasm the local teaching staff demonstrate toward the unit/course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the transnational staff are adequately qualified to teach my unit/course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of support I need to provide to the transnational teaching staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the context of transnational teaching in general, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements:

119. Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in my transnational unit/course as being &quot;my&quot; students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next transnational unit/course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the &quot;reward&quot; I receive for teaching my transnational unit/course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching transnational unit/course has provided me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more satisfied with transnational teaching than other forms of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with transnational teaching because it provides me with an opportunity to reach students who would otherwise not have the opportunity to take my unit/course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please answer this final set of questions about your attitude toward different aspects of transnational education.

19. What aspects of transnational teaching do you find satisfying?


20. What aspects of transnational teaching do you find dissatisfying?


21. What do you see in transnational teaching as being of benefit to you?


22. What impact does transnational teaching have on your "normal" work?

23. Do you receive additional financial payment for your transnational teaching? If so, do you think that this payment adequately compensates you for your time and effort?
24. Thank you very much for participating in this study. If you are willing to participate in an interview, please provide your email address below.


Thank you.
Appendix E: Email to Principals/Deans at Australian University Campuses in Singapore
Dear Professor ***,

I am an academic in the Information Technology discipline at Murdoch University in Perth. I am currently undertaking a research study as part of a PhD project examining how the mode of delivery of TNE courses impacts on the job satisfaction of the academics involved. The first part of the study examined this from the perspective of the “home campus” academics; I am now extending the study to include those academics working at TNE campuses.

This part of the project will require me to make email contact with academics in Singapore who are teaching into courses sourced from Australian universities. I will be inviting them to participate anonymously in an online survey, and, potentially, an interview. No information that will be able to identify either the participant or the institution where they are working will be published.

My supervisor and Murdoch University Singapore Dean, Associate Professor Peter Waring, has suggested that I contact you in order to discuss whether you would be agreeable with me contacting these academics at *Australian University Campus in* Singapore directly by email. I have searched the *Australian University Campus in Singapore* web site and it lists the sessional and lecturing staff at the Singapore campus along with their email addresses.

I will, of course, make the findings from this project available to you and the academics who participate in the survey. The study has Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee approval (2015/105) and I am more than happy to discuss the project with you at more length.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Danny Toohey
School of Engineering and Information Technology
Murdoch University
dtoohey@murdoch.edu.au
Tel: +618 9360 2800
Appendix F: Questionnaire Study Two
Transnational Education and Academic Job Satisfaction Local Staff

1. The Impact of Transnational Education (TNE) Delivery mode on Academic Staff Satisfaction

Transnational Education (TNE)

Many foreign universities offer courses that are taught locally. The way that these courses are run depends on the model of delivery adopted by the home university or department. The primary aim of this research is to investigate how the differences in the way these foreign courses are offered impacts on the satisfaction of the academics who are responsible for the teaching.

About this Survey
As an academic teaching courses sourced from foreign universities, we hope that you can help us by answering a short survey. All information provided in this study will be treated as confidential, and no information that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research.

If, after reading the information above, you agree to continue with the survey, choose ‘yes’ from the options below and proceed. Should you change your mind at any time and decide to withdraw, simply close your browser and you will automatically exit the survey. Note, though, that once you click the ‘submit’ button at the end of the survey your responses will be uploaded and it will not be possible to withdraw or amend them because we cannot tie responses to you as an individual.

As a thank you for participating in this survey, we would like to offer you two free passes to the movies. In order to facilitate this, you will be requested to provide your email address in the survey. Please note that this information will remain completely confidential and will not be linked with any of your survey answers.

Follow-up Interviews
We are also hoping to record interviews with some participants either face-to-face or via Skype to discuss and explore some of the answers in more detail than is possible in a questionnaire. This should take no longer than 45 minutes. If you would be willing to participate in an interview, please provide your email address at the end of the questionnaire.

Survey Results
At the completion of the research, the findings of the project will be published at the following web site: http://www.it.murdoch.edu.au/dtoohy If you would like to be notified when this has happened, please provide your email address below.
More Information
If you want more information before you decide whether or not to participate, please feel free to email either Associate Professor Tanya McGill at tmcgill@murdoch.edu.au or Danny Toohey at dtoohey@murdoch.edu.au

If you do not agree to proceed with the survey, please choose 'no' from the options below or simply close this window to leave the survey.

Ethics Approval
This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Permit no. 2015/105). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University's Research Ethics Office (Tel. 08 9360 6677) or email ethics@murdoch.edu.au. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.

* 1. Do you wish to proceed with this survey?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. If you would like to be notified when the results of this survey are available, please leave your email address below.

3. If you would like to receive 2 movie tickets in appreciation of completing this survey, please leave your email address below.
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2. Teaching Modules from Foreign Universities

The questions on this page are asking about your history of teaching for foreign universities, at any institution, in any role.

4. Which category below includes your age?
   - 20-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 or older
   - Other (please specify)

5. Which of the following best describes the field in which you do most of your teaching?
   - Education
   - Humanities and Social Sciences
   - Mass Communications
   - Business and Administration
   - Law
   - Natural, Physical, Chemical and Mathematical Sciences
   - Health Sciences
   - Information Technology
   - Architecture
   - Engineering
   - Other (please specify)

6. How long (in years) have you been teaching for foreign universities?
7. How many modules from foreign universities have you taught in the last year?

8. Please select the countries from which the modules you have taught are sourced (select all that apply).
   - Australia
   - United Kingdom
   - USA
   - Other (please specify)

9. In the last year, how many hours per week on average were you teaching for foreign universities?
   - < 5 hours per week
   - 5 - 10 hours per week
   - 10 - 15 hours per week
   - 15 - 20 hours per week
   - > 20 hours per week
3. Module Content and Delivery

Please answer the following questions as they apply to the content (apart from assessment) of your most recent offering of a module from a foreign university. If you had multiple offerings in the last teaching period, answer about the offering that you see as being most typical.

10. What content (apart from assessment) did you have to create for the module? (Please select all that apply)

- Learning Objectives
- Topic Objectives
- Topic Lecture Slides
- Tutorial/Laboratory Exercises
- None
- Other (please specify)
11. What involvement did you have with the delivery of the module content? (Please select all that apply)

☐ Lectures
☐ Tutorial/Laboratory sessions
☐ Workshops
☐ Facilitated online learning

Other (please specify)

12. Do you modify the module content supplied by the foreign university?

☐ Yes
☐ No
4. Module Content and Delivery

Please answer the following questions as they apply to the content (apart from assessment) of your most recent offering of a module from a foreign university. If you had multiple offerings in the last teaching period, answer about the offering that you see as being most typical.

13. In what way do you modify the content? (Please select all that apply)

- □ Add local case studies
- □ Modify content to reflect the local conditions
- □ Modify lab worksheets to reflect local conditions (e.g., login instructions)
- □ Modify calendar to account for local public holidays

Other (please specify):

14. What is the process for modification of the module content? (Please select all that apply)

- □ I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and the coordinator makes the changes
- □ I discuss the changes I would like to make with the module coordinator, and make the changes myself
- □ I make the changes without reference to the module coordinator

Other (please specify):
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5. Assessment Creation and Marking

Please answer the following questions as they apply to the assessment in your most recent offering of a module sourced from a foreign university, including (but not limited to) assignments, laboratory exercises, tutorial participation and examinations. If you had multiple offerings in the last teaching period, answer about the offering that you see as being most typical.

15. What degree of responsibility do you have for the creation of the Assessment items in the module?

- [ ] I create all of the assessment items for the module
- [ ] I create the assessment items for the module in cooperation with the teaching staff at the foreign university
- [ ] Assessment items created by me are approved by the teaching staff at the foreign university
- [ ] I have no involvement in the creation of the Assessment items used in the module

Other (please specify)

16. Where you have involvement in the creation of assessment items, what is the nature of that involvement?

- [ ] Modification of those items for cultural reasons
- [ ] Modification to allow for differences in the teaching environment
- [ ] Input into exam/assignment questions

Other (please specify)
17. Which of the following statements best describes your involvement in the marking of the Assessment Items? Moderation refers to the process of the staff at the foreign university checking and comparing the marking between markers.

- I mark all of the assessment items using my own marking guide
- I mark the assessment items using a marking guide provided for me by the staff at the foreign university
- I mark the assessment items using a marking guide provided for me by the staff at the foreign university and the marking is then moderated by the foreign university staff
- Some items are marked by the home campus staff, I mark the others and that marking is moderated
- I do not have any involvement with the marking of the assessment items

Other (please specify):

18. Which assessment items do you mark?

- Examinations
- Assignments
- Laboratory/workshop submissions

Other (please specify):
6. Interaction with Students

These questions refer to the degree and nature of the teaching-related interaction you had with your students outside of the normal lecture/tutorial/lab time during the most recent teaching period in which you taught for a foreign university. This might include answering queries from students about assignments, or offering additional help with lab or tutorial exercises.

19. During the most recent teaching period, did you have any teaching-related interaction with your students outside of the scheduled class time?

☐ Yes
☐ No

20. How did this teaching-related interaction with the students outside of class take place? (Please select all that apply)

☐ Face to face
☐ Email
☐ Online forums
☐ Social media
☐ Learning Management System

☐ Other (please specify)
21. How much time did you spend on this teaching-related interaction in a typical week?

- [ ] Less than one hour per week
- [ ] 1-5 hours per week
- [ ] 5-10 hours per week
- [ ] More than 10 hours per week

Other (please specify)

[ ]
7. Interaction with Home Campus Staff

These questions refer to the degree and nature of the interaction you have had with the staff at the home campus during the most recent teaching period in which you were teaching for a foreign university.

22. Do you have any interaction with the home campus teaching staff?
   - Yes
   - No

23. How often did you typically interact with the home campus teaching staff?
   - Daily
   - Weekly
   - Fortnightly
   - Monthly
   - Once or twice during the teaching period

Other (please specify)
24. How did you communicate with the home campus teaching staff? (Please select all that apply)

- Face-to-face
- Email
- Skype/telephone
- Social media
- Other (please specify) [ ]

25. What things did you communicate with the home campus teaching staff about? (Please select all that apply)

- Clarification of content
- Clarification of assessment items
- Extensions for student submission dates
- Moderation of assessment marking
- Marking of assessment items
- Deadlines for completion of marking
- Other (please specify) [ ]
8. Satisfaction with recent teaching experience

In the context of your most recent experience of teaching a module from a foreign university, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements:
### Q26. I am satisfied...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with the support in running the modules provided to me by the University</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that my students are receiving an equivalent experience of the module to the students at the home campus</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of control I have over the conduct of the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which the students communicate with me regarding the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree of enthusiasm my students demonstrate toward their studies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of feedback I am able to provide to the students on their performance in the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the degree to which the home campus teaching staff communicate with me regarding the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the support the home campus teaching staff demonstrate toward the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that I am adequately qualified to teach my unit/course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of feedback provided to me by the home campus teaching staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that I can confidently approach the home campus teaching staff with any issues I might have with the module</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the level of respect afforded to me by the home campus teaching staff</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. General satisfaction with teaching modules from foreign universities

In the context of teaching foreign sourced modules in general, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement with each of the following statements:

27. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I regard the students studying in the modules as being “my” students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to teaching my next module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the financial reward I receive for teaching the modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied that I receive adequate recognition/rewards for my teaching from the foreign university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I am an important part of the foreign university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the professional development opportunities that teaching foreign sourced modules has provided me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am more interested in teaching foreign sourced modules than local institutions' modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 10. Job characteristics

28. How accurate are the statements below with respect to teaching modules sourced from foreign universities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very inaccurate</th>
<th>Mostly inaccurate</th>
<th>Slightly inaccurate</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Slightly accurate</th>
<th>Mostly accurate</th>
<th>Very accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It requires me to do many different things that make use of a variety of my skills and talents.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It involves me from the start to the finish of the students' learning experience.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has a significant impact and important effect on the students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me complete responsibility for deciding how the module is delivered.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes use of my skills, training and knowledge.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides me the opportunity to completely finish the pace of work I begin.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is simple and repetitive.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is set up such that I get almost constant feedback about how well I am doing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not really that significant in the broader scheme of things.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very inaccurate</td>
<td>Mostly inaccurate</td>
<td>Slightly inaccurate</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Slightly accurate</td>
<td>Mostly accurate</td>
<td>Very accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I teach and work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is arranged in such a way that I do not have the opportunity to be involved in the teaching from beginning to end</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a job where a lot of people can be affected by how well I do the work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgement in my teaching</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provides very few clues as to whether or not I am performing well</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. General Questions

Please answer this final set of questions about your attitude toward different aspects of teaching foreign sourced modules.

29. What aspects of this kind of teaching do you find satisfying?

30. What aspects of this kind of teaching do you find dissatisfying?

31. What do you see in this kind of teaching as being of benefit to you?
32. What impact does this type of teaching have on your "normal" work?
33. Thank you very much for participating in this study. If you are willing to participate in an interview, please provide your email address below and you will be contacted as soon as possible.
Appendix G: Generic Interview Outline Study One
Generic Interview Outline Study One

1. Information Sheet
   a. Provide interviewee with copy of information letter and invite them to familiarise themselves with the project
   b. Need to confirm consent
      i. Having read the information provided to you in the Questionnaire, you indicated that you were willing to participate in this Interview.
      ii. Can you confirm that this is still the case and that you consent to participate in this interview to discuss and explore some of the answers you gave in the questionnaire, and that you consent to this interview being recorded?

2. Confirmation/exploration of how TNE is conducted at the participants’ university
   a. Responsibility for content creation/modification
   b. Responsibility for assessment creation/modification/marking
   c. Moderation
   d. Workload allocation

3. Issues from the questionnaire
   a. Interaction with Students
   b. Interaction with Staff

4. Control over delivery

5. Calendar Synchronisation

6. If you were able to design how TNE is run at your university, what would you do to change it?

7. Other
Appendix H: Generic Interview Outline Study Two
Generic Interview Outline – Study 02

1. Information Sheet
   a. Provide interviewee with copy of information letter and invite them to familiarise themselves with the project
   b. Need to confirm
      i. Has read the participant information sheet, and that any questions you might have, have been satisfactorily addressed
      ii. Understand there is no need to answer questions that you do not want to, and that you can withdraw your consent to be interviewed at any time
      iii. No data that could identify you, or the institution at which you work will be used in any publications arising from this data
      iv. No data will be released to a third party unless required to do so by law
      v. Agree for the interview to be recorded (and subsequently transcribed for analysis).
   c. Sign the consent form.

2. Confirmation of the interviewee's role:
   a. Discipline
      i. What types of modules do you teach?
   b. Number of modules
      i. Have you been teaching those for quite some time?
   c. Hours per week
      i. Include prep time or just F2F?
   d. Content
      i. Create/Modify
   e. Assessment
      i. Create, modify, mark
   f. Interaction with students
      i. What was it about?
      ii. Do you think it helps?
   g. Interaction with teaching staff
      i. Do you think it helps?

3. Issues from the Satisfaction survey

4. Interaction with Students
   a. Many respondents reported they found their interaction with students to be a major cause of satisfaction.
      i. Is that the case for you? Why?

5. Interaction with Staff
   a. How do you find your interaction with the staff from the foreign university?
      i. Why?

6. Control over delivery
   a. Delivery
b. Assessment

7. Working conditions
   a. Many of the respondents suggested they were concerned at the lack of job security associated with teaching for foreign uni’s. What is your experience of this?
      i. What would you do to change this (if you think change is needed)?

8. If you were able to design your own workplace, what would you do to change the way you worked?
Appendix I: Information Letter Study Two
Academic Job Satisfaction and Transnational Education

Dear Colleague,

We invite you to participate in a research study looking at the relationship between an academic’s participation in Transnational Education (TNE) and their job satisfaction. This study is part of a PhD project, supervised by Associate Professors Tanya McGill and Peter Waring and Dr Lucy Jarzabkowski at Murdoch University.

Participation in Transnational Education (TNE) is becoming a more significant part of an academic’s life. However, there are many models of TNE and the degree and nature of academic participation in the delivery of TNE varies accordingly. The primary aim of this research is to investigate what impact this variation has on the satisfaction the academic gains from their involvement in TNE.

We would really appreciate it if you could find the time to answer some questions about your TNE experiences. You will find the questions we would like to ask you at https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/57Q8QBF. It should take no more than 30 minutes to answer them. We are also hoping to record interviews with some participants either face-to-face or via Skype, to clarify and discuss some of the answers. You will be asked in the questionnaire if you are interested in doing this.

In approximately six months we will publish a summary of our findings on our web site (www.it.murdoch.edu.au/dtoohey/). You can provide your email address if you would like to be notified when this has happened.

All information provided in this survey, or the interview, should you agree to participate, will be treated as confidential, and no information that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Should you change your mind and decide to withdraw while completing the survey, simply close your browser and you will automatically exit the survey. Note, though, that once you click the ‘submit’ button at the end of the survey your responses will be uploaded and it will not be possible to withdraw or amend them because we cannot separately identify your responses.

As a token of appreciation for participating in this survey, we would like to offer you two free passes to the movies. In order to facilitate this, you will be requested to provide some contact details in the survey. Please note that your name and contact information will remain completely confidential and will not be linked with any of your survey answers.

If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Danny Toohey on +61 4 2772 8242 or my supervisor, Associate Professor Tanya McGill, on ph. +618 9360 2798. My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have about this study.

Thank you for your assistance with this research project.

Sincerely,

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval 2015/105). If you have any reservation or complaint about the ethical conduct of this research, and wish to talk with an independent person, you may contact Murdoch University's Research Ethics Office (Tel. +618 9360 6677 or e-mail ethics@murdoch.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix J: Interview Consent Form Study Two
Consent Form

Interview

Academic Job Satisfaction and Transnational Education

I have read the participant information sheet, which explains the nature of the research and the possible risks. The information has been explained to me and all my questions have been satisfactorily answered. I have been given a copy of the information sheet to keep.

I am happy to be interviewed as part of this research. I understand that I do not have to answer particular questions if I do not want to and that I can withdraw at any time without needing to give a reason and without consequences to myself.

I agree that research data from the results of the study may be published provided my name or any identifying data is not used. I have also been informed that I may not receive any direct benefits from participating in this study.

I understand that all information provided by me will be treated as confidential and will not be released by the researcher to a third party unless required to do so by law.

☐ I agree to be audio recorded during the interview.

Participant’s Name: ____________________

Signature of Participant: _________________ Date: ……/……/……
I confirm that I have provided the Information Letter concerning this study to the above participant; I have explained the study and have answered all questions asked of me.

Signature of Researcher: ______________________ Date: ....../....../......
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