

# Information Technologies, Individuals and Organizations<sup>1</sup>

PhD Seminar  
Course #9832A  
Fall 2021

---

<b>Professor</b>	Yasser Rahrovani
<b>Office</b>	Ivey 2309; (ext.: 84280)
<b>Email</b>	<a href="mailto:yrahrovani@ivey.ca">yrahrovani@ivey.ca</a>
<b>Course schedule</b>	Wednesday: 9:00-12:00
<b>Room</b>	Ivey School of Business
<b>Faculty assistant</b>	Grace Castaneda ( <a href="mailto:gcastaneda@ivey.ca">gcastaneda@ivey.ca</a> )

---

## Overview

This seminar is intended to generate an understanding of the topics related to the organizational and individual impacts of Information technologies (IT) in four sections: (1) Ontological, epistemological, and theoretical perspectives in IS research, (2) the impacts of IT on organizations (i.e., IT and organizational performance, intermediate variables, communication), (3) role of IT in innovation and disruption (i.e., disruptive innovation, digital innovation, digital platforms, and digital transformation), (4) impacts of IT on individuals and the work (IT and post-implementation adaptation and creative performance).

## Objectives

- Get familiar with the literature in the area of IT impact
- Critically assess different IS research papers
- Develop a roadmap for an IS research
- Get a sense of the elements of a top journal IS research

## Evaluation

Contributions to class discussions	<b>20%</b>
Session lead (choose a class from Session 4 to 12)	<b>10%</b>
Five reflection papers (choose from Session 3 to 12)	<b>30%</b>
Final paper	<b>40%</b>
• Extended abstract (5%)	
• Completed research paper (30%)	
• Paper presentation (5%)	

---

<sup>1</sup> The course syllabus borrows partially from that of Prof. Alain Pinsonneault, McGill University, who has kindly shared his syllabus with me.

If a student is absent for a class, s/he should send the instructor a summary of each paper and also a reflection paper (discussed below) on the entire papers of that session. More than 3 absences (4 and above) would lead to failing the course.

### **Pedagogical approach**

Students are required to participate in class discussions actively and to contribute by presenting their thoughts on different topics. As such, they are required to comprehend the content of each paper fully. This means that carefully reading all papers for each class and establishing links across papers is a must. Professor Lee Sproull and Professor Natalia Levina have an excellent short paragraph about [how to read a behavioural research paper](#) and what type of questions to ask yourself. We will use their guideline as a blueprint for many of the sessions.

### **Contribution in class**

Students are expected to engage in class discussions within and across articles. First, we will go through several of the following questions for each empirical paper. Therefore, students need to make sure that they have thought about the following questions for each paper before coming to class:

- *Introduction*: What is the structure of the introduction? What is the framing? What is the research question? Why is it important?
- *Literature review*: What is missed in the past literature (gaps)? Is the gap an important one? What is their literature review method? What is concluded from the literature review? How did the authors problematize past research?
- *Conceptual (or theoretical) foundation (or lens or background)*: If borrowed a theory, what is the justification? Is it an IS or a non-IS theory? What are the constructs? What are the conceptualizations and operationalizations of the constructs?
- *Hypothesis*: are they interesting? Are they important? Is there sound logic to support them?
- *Method*: Is the method choice fit the research question? Is it justified? Can you suggest any other method? If yes, would you change the research question?
- *Analysis and Results*: Do they make sense? Is there a conceptual jump? Have the authors presented the analysis details transparently? Is the result tightly coupled with the data collected and analyzed? How did they present the result?
- *Discussion and implication*: what is the structure of the discussion section? How did the authors connect their findings to the extant literature? What is consistent with the past literature? What is different? To what extent are they generalizing their theory? How many contributions do they emphasize in the discussion section?

Second, and after going through each paper, students are expected to integrate insights across all articles by synthesizing the main concepts and findings across the assigned articles and identifying contradictions or opportunities for further developments.

### **Reflection papers**

Students are expected to **choose 5 Sessions from Session 4 to 12** and write a *reflection paper* on assigned readings (**maximum 2-pages single space, font-size 12**). Reflection papers evaluate and integrate the core concepts across papers assigned in a week and propose avenues for future research in that domain. It is not a summary of the papers, as we have all read the papers. Reflection papers are written concept-centric, not

author-centric. They aim to *critically* and *constructively* analyze the assigned papers, for example, by exploring an issue or concept in greater depth, raising further "interesting" and "important" theoretical or empirical questions in the domain, comparing and contrasting approaches or findings across the readings, providing possible explanations for inconsistent findings, etc. Students should submit reaction papers on LEARN.

To write the reflection paper, students need to reflect on the entire reading list, integrate the concepts across papers, provide a thoughtful evaluation of the material read, raise a theoretical or empirical question (by comparing and contrasting conceptualizations, methodologies, approaches or findings across the readings), and finally propose an idea to fill that important gap identified in the framing.

Reflection papers back up their line of reasoning, and more importantly, come up with suggestions. For instance, if you think the conceptualizations are overlapping or confusing in the reading list, provide your justifications, offer your alternative conceptualization, and explain how yours is better in addressing the issues raised. Thus, a reflection paper does not only criticize, but constructively makes suggestions for improvement. Here are some examples, which you may include one or eliminate some parts. It is simply a hypothetical scenario. The following is one among several ways that one can choose to write a reflection paper.

- i. Papers A and B looked at the process of the phenomenon X; the other three looked at the antecedents of X (may not include all papers in framing)
- ii. All these papers share the assumption of that there is a positive relationship between X and Y
- iii. However, I propose a negative relationship between X and Y in the C context for two reasons: Reason A; Reason B
- iv. Ignoring the possibility of the negative relationship between X and Y in the C context can have negative consequences: effect 1, effect 2
- v. Proposing a model of the phenomeon X in the C context (e.g., its mechanisms and how are they different from the mechanisms discussed in the reading list)

When writing a reflection paper, assume that everyone has read the papers, knows their methods and results of the reading list (i.e., no summary). Feel free to map them schematically, which is always helpful (not be counted in the word count).

Reflection papers need to be submitted to the professor **no later than 12pm on Tuesday**, and will not be marked if submitted after the deadline.

### **Final paper: a research proposal**

Students need to write and submit a **ten-page** research proposal (times new roman, single-space, 12 font size, references excluded) on a topic related to the course content. The topic needs to be discussed with the professor for approval **no later than Session 7**. You need to send me an extended abstract (description of an IS topic, an interesting and important research gap, and potential contribution) **48 hours before the start of session 7**. After approval, the deadline for the first draft of the paper is anytime **before Session 12**. The papers will be **presented on Session 13** to receive feedback from peers as well as the professor. **The final paper is due December 25<sup>th</sup>**. After the course, the paper is supposed to be submitted to one of the known Management or IS conferences, particularly ICIS (deadline in May), AMCIS (deadline in March), AoM (deadline in Jan), or ECIS (deadline in Nov).

The final paper chooses a domain within IS research and formulates an interesting and important research question. The paper needs a concept-centric literature review section that summarizes past research, problematizes it, and connects the research question to the problematization. Before developing a research model and hypotheses, the paper needs to lay down the conceptual foundation necessary for hypothesis development either from IS research or other disciplines. After deductively developing hypotheses based on the past literature and creative theorization with sound logic, the paper presents a short method section with possible data collection venues to address research questions. Finally, the paper should discuss the potential implications of the research.

### **Plagiarism and Academic Integrity**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at [grad.uwo.ca/administration/regulations/13.html](http://grad.uwo.ca/administration/regulations/13.html)

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism-detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

### **Health and Wellness**

Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Health and Wellness at Western University <https://www.uwo.ca/health/psych/index.html> for a complete list of options about how to obtain help. Additionally, students seeking help regarding mental health concerns are advised to speak to someone they feel comfortable confiding in, such as their faculty supervisor, their program director (graduate chair), program coordinator or other relevant administrators in their unit.

As part of a successful graduate student experience at Western, we encourage students to make their health and wellness a priority. Western provides several on campus health-related services to help you achieve optimum health and engage in healthy living while pursuing your graduate degree. See <https://www.uwo.ca/health>.

### **Accessible Education Western (AEW)**

Western is committed to achieving barrier-free accessibility for all its members, including graduate students. As part of this commitment, Western provides a variety of services devoted to promoting, advocating, and accommodating persons with disabilities in their respective graduate program.

Graduate students with disabilities (for example, chronic illnesses, mental health conditions, mobility impairments) are strongly encouraged to register with Accessible Education Western (AEW), a confidential service designed to support graduate and undergraduate students through their academic program. With the appropriate documentation, the student will work with both AEW and their graduate programs (normally their Graduate Chair and/or Course instructor) to ensure that appropriate academic accommodations to program requirements are arranged. These accommodations include individual counselling, alternative formatted literature, accessible campus transportation, learning strategy instruction, writing exams and assistive technology instruction.

**A final welcome and request of students**

I equally welcome individuals of all visible and nonvisible differences. I consider this classroom to be a place where you will be treated with respect. All members of this class are expected to contribute to a respectful, welcoming and inclusive environment for every other member of the class.

## Ontological, Epistemological, and Theoretical Perspectives

### Session 1: Theory and IS Research

1. Burrell, G. and G. Morgan (1979). *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. Chapters 1-3 London, Heinemann.
2. Orlikowski, W.J. and Baroudi, J.J. "Studying Information Technology in Organizations: Research Approaches and Assumptions," *Information Systems Research*, 2, 1, 1991: 1-28. (skim)
3. Davis, M. 1971 "That's Interesting," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 1971 (1), pp. 309-344 (skim)
4. Tihanyi, L. 2020. "From 'That's Interesting' to 'That's Important,'" *Academy of Management Journal* (63:2), Academy of Management, pp. 329–331.
5. Gregor, S., "The Nature of Theory in Information Systems," *MIS Quarterly*, 30, 3 (2006), 611-642.

#### Further useful links

- How to theorize: <http://www.analytictech.com/mb313/howto.htm>
- Theories used in IS research: [https://is.theorizeit.org/wiki/Main\\_Page](https://is.theorizeit.org/wiki/Main_Page)
- Construct measures: <https://inn.theorizeit.org/>

#### Further readings:

- Weick, K.E. "What theory is not, theorizing is," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1995, 40(3), 385-390.
- Sutton, R.I., Staw, B.M., "What Theory is Not," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 3 (1995), 371-384.
- Weber, R., "Theoretically Speaking," Editor's comments, *MIS Quarterly*, 27, 3 (2003), iii-xi.
- Mohr, L. B. 1982. "Approaches to Explanation: Variance Theory and Process Theory," in *Explaining Organizational Behavior*, Jossey-Bass, pp. 35–70.
- Whetten, D. A. 1989. "What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution," *Academy of Management Review* (14:4), pp. 490–495.
- Alvesson, M., and Kärreman, D. 2007. "Constructing Mystery: Empirical Matters in Theory Development," *Academy of Management Review* (32:4), pp. 1265–1281.
- Van Maanen, J., Sørensen, J. B., and Mitchell, T. R. 2007. "The Interplay between Theory and Method," *Academy of Management Review* (32:4), pp. 1145–1154.
- Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., and Van De Ven, A. H. 2013. "Process Studies of Change in Organization and Management: Unveiling Temporality, Activity, and Flow," *Academy of Management Journal* (56:1), pp. 1–13.
- Grover, V., and Lyytinen, K. 2015. "New State of Play in Information Systems Research: The Push to the Edges," *MIS Quarterly* (39:2), pp. 271-A5.
- Rivard, S. 2014. "The Ions of Theory Construction," *MIS Quarterly*, pp. iii–xiv.

### Session 2: Epistemological Foundations of IT Research

1. Winner, L. "Engines of Changes," *Autonomous Technology: Technics out of Control as a Theme in Political Thought*, MIT Press, Boston, MA, chapter 2, 1977.

2. Pinch, T.J. and Bijker, W.E. "The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts," in W.E. Bijker, T. Hughes and T. Pinch (Eds.), *The Social Construction of Technological Systems*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1987: 17-50.
3. Orlikowski, W.J. "Using Technology and Constituting Structures: A Practice Lens for Studying Technology in Organizations," *Organization Science*, 11, 4, 2000: 404–428.
4. Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. Galliers, R.D., Henfridsson, O., Newell, S., Vidgen, R., 'The Sociomateriality of Information Systems: Current Status, Future Directions,' *MISQ*, 38 (3), 2014, 809-830.
5. Baskerville, R.L., Myers, M.D., and Yoo, Y., "Digital First: The Ontological Reversal and New Challenges for Information Systems Research," *MIS Quarterly*, 44 (2), 2020, pp. 509-523.

#### Further reading

- Giddens, A. "Elements of the Theory of Structuration", *The Constitution of Society*, University of California Press, chapter 1, 1984.
- Weick, K.E. "Technology as Equivoque: Sensemaking in New Technologies," *Technology and Organizations*, P.S. Goodman, L.S. Sproull et al. (Ed.), Jossey-Bass, SF, CA, 1-44, 1990.
- Goodman, P.S., T.L. Griffith and D.B. Fenner, "Understanding Technology and the Individual in an Organizational Context," *Technology and Organizations*, P.S. Goodman, L.S. Sproull et al. (Ed.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco: CA, 45-86, 1990.
- Markus, L. and D. Robey. "Information Technology and Organizational Change: Causal Structure in Theory and Research," *Management Science*, 34 (5), 1988, 583-598.
- Orlikowski, W.J. "The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations," *Organization Science*, 3 (3), 1992, 398-427.
- Robey, D. and M.C. Boudreau, "Accounting for the Contradictory Organizational Consequences of Information Technology: Theoretical Directions and Methodological Implications," *Information Systems Research*, 10 (2), 1999, 167-185.
- Jones, M.R. and Karsten, H., "Giddens' Structuration Theory and Information Systems Research," *MISQ* 32 (1), 2008, pp. 127-157.

#### Further reading on IT Features, Affordances, and Spirit

1. Orlikowski, W., and S. Iacono, "Desperately Seeking "IT" in IT Research: A Call to Theorizing the IT Artifact," *Information Systems Research*, 12 (2), 2001, 121-134.
2. DeSanctis, G., and Poole, M. S. 1994. "Capturing the Complexity in Advanced Technology Use," *Organization Science* (5:2), pp. 121–147.
3. Markus, M. L., and Silver, M. S. 2008. "A Foundation for the Study of IT Effects," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (9:10), pp. 609–632.
4. Leonardi, P. M. 2013. "When Does Technology Use Enable Network Change in Organizations? A Comparative Study of Feature Use and Shared Affordances," *MIS Quarterly*, JSTOR, pp. 749–775.
5. Cheikh-Ammar, M. 2018. "The IT Artifact and Its Spirit: A Nexus of Human Values, Affordances, Symbolic Expressions, and IT Features," *European Journal of Information Systems*, pp. 1–17.
6. Griffith, T.L. "Technology Features as Triggers for Sensemaking," *Academy of Management Review*, (24:3), 1999, pp. 472-488.
7. Volkoff, O., and Strong, D. M. 2018. "Affordance Theory and How to Use It in IS Research," *The Routledge Companion to Management Information System*. New York: Routledge.



8. Leonardi, P. M., and Vaast, E. 2017. "Social Media and Their Affordances for Organizing: A Review and Agenda for Research," *Academy of Management Annals* (11:1), pp. 150–188.
9. Vaast, E., and Kaganer, E. 2013. "Social Media Affordances and Governance in the Workplace: An Examination of Organizational Policies," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (19:1), pp. 78–101.

## **The Impacts of IT on Organizations**

### **Session 3: IT and Organizational Performance**

1. Hitt, L. and E. Brynjolfsson. "Productivity, Business Profitability, and Consumer Surplus: Three Different Measures of Information Technology Value," *MISQ*, 20 (2), 1996, 121-142.
2. Grover, V. and P. Ramanlal, "Six Myths of Information and Markets: Information Technology Networks, Electronic Commerce, and the Battle for Consumer Surplus," *MISQ*, 23 (4), 1999, 533-542.
3. Chae, H.C., Koh, C.E., and Prybutok, V.R., 'Information Technology Capability and Firm Performance: Contradictory Findings and Their Possible Causes', *MISQ*, 38 (1), 2014, 305-326.
4. Gerow, J.E., Grover, V., Tatcher, J., and Roth, P.L., 'Looking Toward the Future of IT-Business Strategic Alignment Through the Past: A Meta-Analysis,' *MIS Quarterly*, 38 (4), 2014, 1159-1185.

#### Further reading

- McLaren, T.S., Head, M.M., Yuan, Y., and Chan, Y.E., 'A Multilevel Model for Measuring Fit Between a Firm's Competitive Strategies and Information Systems Capabilities,' *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (4), 2011, pp. 909-929.
- Im, K.S., D.E. Dow, and V. Grover, "A Reexamination of IT Investment and the Market Value of the Firm—An Event Study Methodology," *ISR*, 12 (1), 2001, 103-117.
- Liang, H., Wang, N., Zue, Y., and Ge, S., 'Unraveling the Alignment Paradox: How Does Business –IT Alignment Shape Organizational Agility,' *Information Systems Research*, 28 (4), 2017, 863-879.
- Aral, S. and Weill, P., "IT Assets, Organizational Capabilities, and Firm Performance: How Resource Allocations and Organizational Differences Explain Performance Variation," *Organization Science*, 18 (5), 2008, pp. 763-780.
- Bharadwaj, S., Bharadwaj, A., and Bendoly, E., "The Performance Effects of Complementarities Between Information Systems, Marketing, Manufacturing, and Supply Chain Processes," *ISR*, 18 (4), 2007, pp. 437-453.
- Brynjolfsson, E. "The Contribution of Information Technology to Consumer Welfare," *Information Systems Research*, 7 (3), 1996, 281-300.
- Brynjolfsson, E. and L. Hitt. "Is Information Systems Spending Productive? New Evidence and New Results," *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Information Systems*, Orlando, Florida, December 1993, 47-64.
- Devaraj, S. and R. Kohli, 'Performance Impacts of Information Technology: Is Actual Usage the Missing Link?' *Management Science*, 49 (3), 2003, 273-289.



- Dewan, S. and Ren, F., “Risk and Return of IT Initiatives: Evidence from Electronic Commerce Announcements,” *ISR*, 18 (4), 2007, pp. 370-394.
- Kauffmann, J.R. and P. Weill. "An Evaluative Framework for Research on the Performance Effects of Information Technology Investment," *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Information Systems*, 1989, 377-388.

#### **Session 4: IT and Intermediate Performance Measures**

##### Agility, Alignment, Capabilities

1. Chan, Y. E., Huff, S. L., Barclay, D. W., and Copeland, D. G. 1997. “Business Strategic Orientation, Information Systems Strategic Orientation, and Strategic Alignment,” *Information Systems Research* (8:2), pp. 125–150.
2. Tallon, P., and Pinsonneault, A., “Competing Perspectives on the Link between Strategic IT Alignment and Organizational Agility: Insights from a Mediation Model” *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (2), 2011, pp. 463-486.
3. Lee, O-K., Sambamurthy, V., Lim, K.H., and Wei, K.K., ‘How Does IT Ambidexterity Impact Organizational Agility?,’ *Information Systems Research*, 26 (2), 2015, 398-417.

##### Innovation

4. Joshi, K.D., Chi, L., Datta, A., Han, S., ‘Changing the Competitive Landscape: Continuous Innovation Through IT-Enabled Knowledge Capabilities,’ *Information Systems Research*, 21 (3), 2010, pp. 472-495.
5. Swanson, E. B., and Ramiller, N. C. 2004. “Innovating Mindfully with Information Technology,” *MIS Quarterly* (28:4), pp. 553–583.

##### Further reading

- Lu, Y, and Ramamurthy, K., ‘Understanding the Link Between Information Technology Capability and Organizational Agility: An Empirical Examination,’ *MIS Quarterly*, 35 (4), 2011, pp. 931-954.
- Lee, O-K., Sambamurthy, V., Lim, K.H., and Wei, K.K., ‘How Does IT Ambidexterity Impact Organizational Agility?,’ *Information Systems Research*, 26 (2), 2015, 398-417.
- Park, The Role of Business Intelligence and Communication Technologies in Organizational Agility: A Configurational Approach,’ *Journal of the AIS*, 18 (9), 2017, 648-686. Liang, H., Wang, N., Zue, Y., and Ge, S., ‘Unraveling the Alignment Paradox: How Does Business –IT Alignment Shape Organizational Agility,’ *Information Systems Research*, 28 (4), 2017, 863-879.
- Oh, W. and Pinsonneault, A., ‘On the Assessment of the Strategic Value of Information Technologies: Conceptual and Analytical Approaches,’ *MIS Quarterly*, 31 (2), 2007, pp. 239-265.
- Sabherwal, R. and Jeyaraj, A., ‘Information Technology Impacts on Firm Performance: An Extension of Kohli and Devaraj (2003),’ *MIS Quarterly*, 39 (4), 2015, 809-836.
- Steelman, Z.R., Havakhor, T., Sabherwal, R., and Sabherwal, S., ‘Performance Consequences of Information Technology Investments: Implications of Emphasizing New or Current Information Technologies,’ *Information Systems Research*, 30 (1), 2019, pp. 204-218.

- Boland, R. J., Jr., Lyytinen, K., and Yoo, Y. 2007. “Wakes of Innovation in Project Networks: The Case of Digital 3-D Representations in Architecture, Engineering, and Construction,” *Organization Science* (18:4), pp. 631–647.
- Grover, V., Fiedler, K., and Teng, J. 1997. “Empirical Evidence on Swanson’s Tri-Core Model of Information Systems Innovation,” *Information Systems Research* (8:3), pp. 273–287.

### **Session 5: IT and Organizational Communication**

1. Dennis, A. R., Fuller, R.M., and Valacich, J., “Media, Tasks, and Communication Processes: A Theory of Media Synchronicity,” *MISQ*, 32 (3), 2008, 575-600.
2. Addas, S. and Pinsonneault, A., ‘E-Mail Interruptions and Individual Performance: Is There a Silver Lining?’ *MIS Quarterly*, 42 (2), 2018, 381-405.
3. Ragu-Nathan, T.S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B.S., and Q. Tu, “The Consequences of Technostress for End Users in Organizations: Conceptual Development and Empirical Validation,” *ISR*, 19 (4), 2008, 417-433.
4. Leonardi, P. M. 2014. “Social Media, Knowledge Sharing, and Innovation: Toward a Theory of Communication Visibility,” *Information Systems Research* (25:4), pp. 796–816.
5. Leonardi, P. M. 2015. “Ambient Awareness and Knowledge Acquisition: Using Social Media to Learn ‘Who Knows What’ and ‘Who Knows Whom,’” *MIS Quarterly* (39:4), pp. 747–762.

#### Further reading

- Leonardi, P. M., and Vaast, E. 2017. “Social Media and Their Affordances for Organizing: A Review and Agenda for Research,” *Academy of Management Annals* (11:1), pp. 150–188.
- Leonardi, P. M. 2018. “Social Media and the Development of Shared Cognition: The Roles of Network Expansion, Content Integration, and Triggered Recalling,” *Organization Science* (29:4), pp. 547–568.
- Treem, J. W., and Leonardi, P. M. 2013. “Social Media Use in Organizations: Exploring the Affordances of Visibility, Editability, Persistence, and Association,” *Annals of the International Communication Association* (36:1), pp. 143–189.
- Leidner, D. E., Gonzalez, E., and Koch, H. 2018. “An Affordance Perspective of Enterprise Social Media and Organizational Socialization,” *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* (27:2), pp. 117–138.
- Baptista, J., Wilson, A. D., Galliers, R. D., and Bynghall, S. 2017. “Social Media and the Emergence of Reflexiveness as a New Capability for Open Strategy,” *Long Range Planning* (50:3), pp. 322–336.
- Kane, G. C. 2015. “Enterprise Social Media: Current Capabilities and Future Possibilities,” *MIS Quarterly Executive* (14:1), pp. 1–16.
- Gibbs, J. L., Rozaidi, N. A., and Eisenberg, J. 2013. “Overcoming the ‘Ideology of Openness’: Probing the Affordances of Social Media for Organizational Knowledge Sharing,” *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* (19:1), pp. 102–120.

## **IT, Control, and Governance**

### **Session 6: IS control**

1. Kirsch, L. J. 1997. "Portfolios of Control Modes and IS Project Management," *Information Systems Research* (8), pp. 215–239.
2. Kirsch, L. J. 2004. "Deploying Common Systems Globally: The Dynamics of Control," *Information Systems Research* (15:4), pp. 374–395.
3. Pagani, M. 2013. "Digital Business Strategy and Value Creation: Framing the Dynamic Cycle of Control Points," *MIS Quarterly* (37:2), pp. 617–632.
4. Xue, Y., Liang, H., and Boulton, W. 2008. "Information Technology Governance in Information Technology Investment Decision Processes: The Impact of Investment Characteristics, External Environment, and Internal Context," *MIS Quarterly* (32:1), pp. 67–96.

### Further readings

- Agarwal, R., and Sambamurthy, V. 2002. "Principles and Models for Organizing the IT Function," *MIS Quarterly Executive* (1:1), pp. 1–16.
- Henderson, J. C., and Lee, S. 1992. "Managing I/S Design Teams: A Control Theories Perspective," *Management Science* (38:6), pp. 757–777.
- Weill, P., and Ross, J. 2005. "A Matrixed Approach to Designing IT Governance," *MIT Sloan Management Review* (46:2), pp. 26–34.
- Eaton, B., Elaluf-Calderwood, S., Sørensen, C., and Yoo, Y. 2015. "Distributed Tuning of Boundary Resources: The Case of Apple's IOS Service System," *MIS Quarterly* (39:1), pp. 217–244.
- Sandberg, J., Holmström, J., and Lyytinen, K. 2020. "Digitization and Phase Transitions in Platform Organizing Logics: Evidence from the Process Automation Industry," *MIS Quarterly* (44:1), pp. 129–153. (<https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2020/14520>).
- Song, P., Xue, L., Rai, A., and Zhang, C. 2018. "The Ecosystem of Software Platform: A Study of Asymmetric Cross-Side Network Effects and Platform Governance," *MIS Quarterly* (42:1), pp. 121-A6.

### **Session 7: Digital platform governance**

1. Tiwana, A., Konsynski B., and Ashley A. Bush. 2010. "Platform Evolution: Coevolution of Platform Architecture, Governance, and Environmental Dynamics." *Information Systems Research* 21 (4): 675–87.
2. Ghazawneh, A., & Henfridsson O. 2013. "Balancing Platform Control and External Contribution in Third-Party Development: The Boundary Resources Model." *Information Systems Journal* 23 (2): 173–92.
3. Wareham, J., Fox, P. B., and Cano Giner, J. L. 2014. "Technology Ecosystem Governance," *Organization Science* (25:4), pp. 1195–1215.
4. Rahrovani, Y. 2020. "Platform Drifting: When Work Digitalization Hijacks Its Spirit." *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, Strategic Perspectives on Digital Work and Organizational Transformation*, 29 (2): article 101615.

## Further readings

- Rahman, H. A., and Valentine, M. A. 2021. “How Managers Maintain Control Through Collaborative Repair: Evidence from Platform-Mediated ‘Gigs,’” *Organization Science, Orsc.2021.1428*.
- de Reuver, M., Sørensen, C., and Basole, R. C. 2018. “The Digital Platform: A Research Agenda,” *Journal of Information Technology* (33:2), pp. 124–135.
- Huber, T. L., Kude, T., and Dibbern, J. 2017. “Governance Practices in Platform Ecosystems: Navigating Tensions Between Cocreated Value and Governance Costs,” *Information Systems Research*.
- Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M., and Jiang, X. 2017. “Platform Ecosystems: How Developers Invert the Firm,” *MIS Quarterly* (41:1), pp. 255-A4.
- Tiwana, A. 2018. “Platform Synergy: Architectural Origins and Competitive Consequences,” *Information Systems Research*.
- Tiwana, A. 2015. “Evolutionary Competition in Platform Ecosystems,” *Information Systems Research* (26:2), pp. 266–281.
- Rietveld, J., and Schilling, M. A. 2021. “Platform Competition: A Systematic and Interdisciplinary Review of the Literature,” *Journal of Management*, SAGE Publications Inc.
- Kretschmer, T., Leiponen, A., Schilling, M., and Vasudeva, G. 2021. “Platform Ecosystems as Meta-Organizations: Implications for Platform Strategies,” *Strategic Management Journal* (n/a:n/a), pp. 1–20.
- Baldwin, C. Y., and Woodard, C. J. 2009. “The Architecture of Platforms: A Unified View,” *Platforms, Markets and Innovation* (32), Edward Elgar Cheltenham.
- Suarez, F. F. 2005. “Network Effects Revisited: The Role of Strong Ties in Technology Selection,” *Academy of Management Journal* (48:4), *Academy of Management*, pp. 710–720.

## IT, Innovation, and Disruption

### Session 8: Technology and Disruptive Innovation

1. *Demand-side disruption*: Christensen, C. M., Raynor, M., and McDonald, R. 2015. “What Is Disruptive Innovation?,” *Harvard Business Review* (93:12), pp. 44–53.
2. *Supply-side disruption*: Henderson R, Clark KB. 1990. Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 9-30.
3. *User-driven innovation*: Bogers, M., Afuah, A., and Bastian, B. 2010. “Users as Innovators: A Review, Critique, and Future Research Directions,” *Journal of Management* (36:4), pp. 857–875.
4. *Designer-driven innovation*: Verganti, R. 2008. “Design, Meanings, and Radical Innovation: A Metamodel and a Research Agenda\*,” *Journal of Product Innovation Management* (25:5), pp. 436–456.

## Further reading

- Hargadon, A. B., and Douglas, Y. 2001. “When Innovations Meet Institutions: Edison and the Design of the Electric Light,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* (46:3), pp. 476–501.
- Morrison, P. D., Roberts, J. H., and von Hippel, E. 2000. “Determinants of User Innovation and Innovation Sharing in a Local Market.,” *Management Science* (46:12), p. 1513.
- West, J., and Bogers, M. 2014. “Leveraging External Sources of Innovation: A Review of Research on Open Innovation,” *Journal of Product Innovation Management* (31:4), pp. 814–831.

### **Session 9: Digital innovation**

1. Zammuto, R. F., Griffith, T. L., Majchrzak, A., Dougherty, D. J., and Faraj, S. 2007. “Information Technology and the Changing Fabric of Organization,” *Organization Science* (18:5), pp. 749–762.
2. Yoo, Y., Henfridsson, O., and Lyytinen, K. 2010. “The New Organizing Logic of Digital Innovation: An Agenda for Information Systems Research,” *Information Systems Research* (21:4), pp. 724–735.
3. Huang, J., Henfridsson, O., Liu, M.J., and Newell, S., ‘Growing on Steroids: Rapidly Scaling the User Base of Digital Ventures Through Digital Innovation,’ *MIS Quarterly*, 41 (1), 2017, 301-314.
4. Nambisan, S. Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., and Song, M., ‘Digital Innovation Management: Reinventing Innovation Management Research in a Digital World,’ *MIS Quarterly*, 41 (1), 2017, 223-238.
5. Lyytinen, K., Yoo, Y., and Boland Jr., R. J. 2016. “Digital Product Innovation within Four Classes of Innovation Networks,” *Information Systems Journal* (26:1), pp. 47–75.

### Further readings

- Tilson, D., Lyytinen, K., and Sørensen, C. 2010. “Research Commentary—Digital Infrastructures: The Missing IS Research Agenda,” *Information Systems Research* (21:4), pp. 748–759.
- Gregory, R. W., Kaganer, E., Henfridsson, O., and Ruch, T. J. 2018. “IT Consumerization and the Transformation of IT Governance,” *MIS Quarterly* (42:4), pp. 1225–1253.
- Kohli, R., and Melville, N. P. 2019. “Digital Innovation: A Review and Synthesis,” *Information Systems Journal* (29:1), pp. 200–223.
- Henfridsson, O., Nandhakumar, J., Scarbrough, H., and Panourgias, N. 2018. “Recombination in the Open-Ended Value Landscape of Digital Innovation,” *Information and Organization* (28:2), pp. 89–100.
- Svahn, F., Mathiassen, L., and Lindgren, R. 2017. “Embracing Digital Innovation in Incumbent Firms: How Volvo Cars Managed Competing Concerns,” *MIS Quarterly* (41:1), pp. 239–254.
- Yoo, Y., Lyytinen, K. J., Boland, R. J., and Berente, N. 2010. “The Next Wave of Digital Innovation: Opportunities and Challenges: A Report on the Research Workshop ‘Digital Challenges in Innovation Research,’” SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1622170, SSRN Scholarly Paper, Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, June 8.

## **IT, Individuals and Work**

### **Session 10: IT, Post-Implementation Adaptation**

1. Balal, H. and Venkatesh, V., 'Adaptation to Information Technology: A Holistic Nomological Network from Implementation to Job Outcomes,' *Management Science*, 62 (1), 2016, pp. 156-179.
2. Beaudry, A. and A. Pinsonneault, "Understanding User Responses to IT: A User Adaptation Coping Acts Model," *MIS Quarterly* (29:3), September 2005, pp. 493-524.
3. Farima Bagayogo, F., Lapointe, L., and Bassellier, G. 2014. "Enhanced Use of IT: A New Perspective on Post-Adoption," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (15:7), pp. 361-387.
4. Sun, H. 2012. "Understanding User Revisions When Using Information System Features: Adaptive System Use and Triggers," *MIS Quarterly* (36:2), pp. 453-478.
5. Barki, H., Titah, R., and Boffo, C. 2007. "Information System Use-Related Activity: An Expanded Behavioral Conceptualization of Information System Use," *Information Systems Research* (18:2), pp. 173-192.

#### Further reading

- Bhattacharjee, A. and G. Premkumar, "Understanding Changes in Belief and Attitude Toward Information Technology Usage: A Theoretical Model and Longitudinal Test," *MIS Quarterly*, 28, 2 (2004), 229-254.
- Jasperson, J., P.E. Carter and R.W. Zmud, "A Comprehensive Conceptualization of Post-Adoptive Behaviors Associated with Information Technology Enabled Work Systems," *MIS Quarterly*, 29, 3 (2005), 525-557.
- Beaudry, A. and A. Pinsonneault, "The Other Side of Acceptance: A Study of the Direct and Indirect Effects of Emotions on IT Use," *MIS Quarterly*, 34 (4), 2010, pp. 689-710.
- Liang, H., Xue, Y., Pinsonneault, A., and Wu, A., "What Users Do Besides Problem-Focused Coping in the IT Security Context: An Emotion-Focused Coping Perspective," *MIS Quarterly*, 43 (2) 2019, pp. 373-394.
- Stein, M-K., Newell, S., Wagner, E.L., and Galliers, R.D., 'Coping with Information Technology: Mixed Emotions, Vacillation, and Nonconforming Use Patterns,' *MIS Quarterly*, 39 (2), 2015, 367-392.
- Lapointe, L., and Rivard, S. "A Multilevel Model of Resistance to Information Technology Implementation," *MIS Quarterly* (29:3), 2005, pp. 461-491.
- Limayem, M., Gabriele-Hirt, S. and Cheung, C.M.K. "How Habit Limits the Predictive Power of Intention: The Case of Information Systems Continuance", *MIS Quarterly* (31:4), December 2007, pp. 705-737.

### **Session 11: IT, Innovation, and Creative Performance**

1. Ahuja, M. K., and Thatcher, J. B. 2005. "Moving Beyond Intentions and Toward the Theory of Trying: Effects of Work Environment and Gender on Post-Adoption Information Technology Use," *MIS Quarterly* (29:3), pp. 427-459.



2. Huang, X., Hsieh, J. P.-A., and He, W. 2014. “Expertise dissimilarity and creativity: The contingent roles of tacit and explicit knowledge sharing.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* (99:5), pp. 816–830.
3. Nevo, S., Nevo, D., & Pinsonneault, A. (2016). A Temporally Situated Self-Agency Theory of Information Technology Reinvention. *MIS Quarterly*, 40(1), 157–186.
4. Rahrovani, Y., & Pinsonneault, A. 2020. “Innovative IT Use and Innovating with IT: A Study of the Motivational Antecedents of Two Different Types of Innovative Behaviors.” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 21 (4)

#### Further reading

1. Althuizen, N., and Reichel, A., ‘The Effects of IT-Enabled Cognitive Stimulation Tools on Creative Problem Solving: A Dual Pathway to Creativity,’ *Journal of MIS*, 33 (1), 2016, 11-44.
2. Li, X., Hsieh, J. P.-A., and Rai, A. 2013. “Motivational Differences Across Post-Acceptance Information System Usage Behaviors: An Investigation in the Business Intelligence Systems Context,” *Information Systems Research* (24:3), pp. 659–682.
3. Bhagwatwar, A., Massey, A., and Dennis, A., ‘Contextual Priming and the Design of 3D Virtual Environments to Improve Group Ideation,’ *Information Systems Research*, 29 (1), 2018, pp. 169-185.
4. Sun, H. (2012). Understanding User Revisions When Using Information System Features: Adaptive System Use and Triggers. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(2), 453–478.
5. Ortiz de Guinea, A., and Webster, J. 2013. “An Investigation of Information Systems Use Patterns: Technological Events as Triggers, the Effect of Time, and Consequences for Performance,” *MIS Quarterly* (37:4), pp. 1165-A6.
6. Desouza, K. C., Awazu, Y., & Ramaprasad, A. (2007). Modifications and Innovations to Technology Artifacts. *Technovation*, 27(4), 204–220.
7. Baer, M. (2012). Putting Creativity to Work: The Implementation of Creative Ideas in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1102–1119.
8. Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333.

## Digital Transformation

### Session 12: Digital transformation

1. Markus, M.L. and D. Robey. 1988. Information technology and organizational change: Causal structure in theory and research. *Management Science* 34: 583-598.
2. Besson, P., and Rowe, F. 2012. “Strategizing Information Systems-Enabled Organizational Transformation: A Transdisciplinary Review and New Directions,” *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* (21:2), pp. 103–124.
3. Vial, G. 2019. “Understanding Digital Transformation: A Review and a Research Agenda,” *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*.



4. Markus, M. L., and Rowe, F. 2021. "Guest Editorial: Theories of Digital Transformation: A Progress Report," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (22:2), pp. 273–280.
5. Baptista, J., Stein, M.-K., Klein, S., Watson-Manheim, M. B., and Lee, J. 2020. "Digital Work and Organisational Transformation: Emergent Digital/Human Work Configurations in Modern Organisations," *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* (29:2), *Strategic Perspectives on Digital Work and Organizational Transformation*, p. 101618.

#### Further readings

- Drechsler, K., Gregory, R., Wagner, H.-T., and Tumbas, S. 2020. "At the Crossroads between Digital Innovation and Digital Transformation," *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* (47), pp. 521–538.
- Orlikowski, W. J. "Improvising Organizational Transformation Over Time: A Situated Change Perspective," *Information Systems Research* (7), 1996, pp. 63-92.
- Barley, S.R. "Technology as an Occasion for Structuring - Evidence from Observations of Ct Scanners and the Social-Order of Radiology Departments," *Administrative Science Quarterly* (31:1), Mar 1986, pp 78-108.
- Leonardi, P. M., & Barley, S. R. (2008). Materiality and Change: Challenges to Building Better Theory About Technology and Organizing. *Information and Organization*, 18(3), 159-17

#### **Session 13: Synthesis and presentations**

1. *Writing a literature review*: Webster, J. and R. T. Watson, 'Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review,' *MIS Quarterly*, 26 (2), 2002, xiii-xxiii.
2. *Multi-method literature review* [just skim the method]: Moeini, M., Rahrovani, Y. & Chan Y.E. 2019. "A Review of the Practical Relevance of IS Strategy Scholarly Research." *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 28 (2): 196–217.
3. *Problematization*: Alvesson, M., and Sandberg, J. 2011. "Generating Research Questions Through Problematization," *Academy of Management Review* (36:2), pp. 247–271.