

**The Dynamics of Alignment:
Resolving Strategy Ambiguity
within Bounded Choices**

Bruce Campbell

University of Technology, Sydney

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Sciences

2007

Declaration:

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

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

Bruce Campbell

17th November, 2007

M4. *So what makes up the information system?*

M1. *Business. Process. People. That's the system.*

M4. *So the system is the business, the processes within that business, and the people who operate the processes in that business. That's an information system?*

M1. *Business, process, people. That's it. And that's what you've always got to focus on when you're looking at an IS system.*

M4. *So how can an information system, then, be misaligned with the business?*

(Exchange between two business managers in a focus group held 28th August 2003)

Dedication:

This thesis is dedicated to my father whose last regret was that he would be unable to see its completion.

Acknowledgements:

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the participants of this research. Without them it would not exist.

I would also like to acknowledge my supervisors. Ken Dovey gave me the space to make my own journey whilst Jim Underwood always questioned my assumptions and beliefs. Both were valuable and appreciated. David Avison acted as a supervisor for most of this thesis but due to circumstances had to relinquish that position towards the end. He taught me more about writing than he realises.

I would also like to thank Walter Fernandez (ANU), Cathy Urquhart (University of Auckland) and Melanie Kan (UTS) who provided support when I got lost in the grounded theory method – an occupational hazard for a “minus mentor” student.

Abstract

Alignment of information systems (IS) with business activities has been an important problem for practitioners for many years even though there has been considerable research in the area. A criticism of some past research into IS/business alignment is that it has ignored organisational complexity and context. This is partly due to the dominant paradigm in use within IS research. One result of this paradigm is that there are numerous prescriptions provided in the literature for improving alignment but little in the way of theory development that explains the behaviour of practitioners when confronted with the task of attaining alignment.

To address these criticisms a grounded theory approach was adopted using a coding family that encouraged the discovery of systems of interaction between variables rather than assuming linear causality. Data was collected via three unstructured focus groups that limited the effect of prior reading of the literature, an important consideration when conducting a grounded theory study. These were followed by semi-structured individual interviews. The instruments for the latter were developed after the focus group interviews were analysed, so reducing the impact of a priori reading.

Analysis of the focus group interviews found that the major concern of practitioners was aligning IS strategies to either business strategies documented in business plans or the business strategies in use. This is a similar result to earlier alignment research. As a result of analysis of the focus group interviews the research question stabilised.

This research investigated how factors within an organisational setting impact the ability of senior IT managers to identify, then act upon, the business strategies in use.

It confirmed many of the enablers and inhibitors to alignment identified in earlier research. However, it also identified two variables that are rarely given prominence in the literature: the mental models held by managers; and the motivation and

measurement schemes applied to managers. It is believed that both these variables have a significant impact on the alignment of IS and business strategies.

The theory developed here demonstrates that a system of variables will tend to encourage IT managers to either collaborate with their business peers, or retreat from the business and concentrate on providing a low cost reliable technical IT solution. In the former situation alignment of IT managers' actions to those of their business peers is encouraged. In the latter situation there will be little alignment between business and IS strategies nor between the actions of business and IT managers.

A feedback loop of actions by actors within the system tends to reinforce the situation making a change in response extremely problematic. This, then, helps explain the intractable nature of alignment that has been observed for many years.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	VII
<i>Table of Figures.....</i>	<i>xiii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH.....	1
1.2 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH.....	4
1.3 RESEARCH METHOD.....	5
1.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....	7
1.5 ASSOCIATED WORK AND PUBLICATIONS.....	8
1.6 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS.....	10
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
2.1 ABSTRACT.....	13
2.2 INTRODUCTION.....	13
2.3 DEFINITIONS AND TERMS.....	15
2.3.1 <i>What is Alignment?</i>	17
2.3.2 <i>The Development of Alignment</i>	19
2.3.3 <i>Measuring Alignment</i>	23
2.3.3.1 The Strategic Alignment Maturity Model.....	24
2.4 ENABLERS AND INHIBITORS TO ALIGNMENT.....	26
2.4.1 <i>IT and Business Executive Relationships</i>	29
2.4.2 <i>Social Capital Theory</i>	31
2.4.2.1 The Structural Dimension of Networks.....	32
2.4.2.2 The Relationship Dimension of Networks.....	33
2.4.2.3 The Cognitive Dimension of Social Networks.....	34
2.5 SUMMARY.....	35
3 RESEARCH PARADIGM.....	39
3.1 ABSTRACT.....	39
3.2 CHOICE OF METHODOLOGY.....	39
3.2.1 <i>Research Problem</i>	39
3.2.2 <i>Theoretical Lens of the Researcher</i>	41
3.2.3 <i>Degree of Uncertainty Surrounding the Research Problem</i>	42
3.2.4 <i>Researcher's Skills and Experience</i>	43
3.2.5 <i>Dominant Research Paradigm within the Discipline and Research Institution</i>	44
3.3 THE RESEARCH PARADIGM.....	45
3.3.1 <i>Reasons for Choosing Interpretivism as the Paradigm</i>	49

3.4	INTERPRETIVISM.....	51
3.5	SUMMARY.....	53
4	METHODOLOGY.....	55
4.1	ABSTRACT.....	55
4.2	GROUNDING THEORY.....	55
4.2.1	<i>Glaserian Approach to Grounding Theory</i>	58
4.2.1.1	Theoretical Sampling.....	59
4.2.1.2	The Literature Review Dilemma.....	59
4.2.1.3	Coding Dilemmas	62
4.2.1.4	Minus Mentoring.....	65
4.3	DATA COLLECTION.....	66
4.3.1	<i>A Priori Knowledge and the use of Focus Groups</i>	68
4.3.1.1	Focus Group Definition.....	68
4.3.1.2	History of Focus Groups.....	68
4.3.1.3	Focus Groups in Social Research.....	69
4.3.1.4	Focus Groups compared with Individual Interviews.....	70
4.3.1.5	Design of Focus Groups.....	71
4.3.2	<i>Interviews</i>	75
4.3.2.1	Semi-Structured Interviews.....	75
4.3.2.2	Selection of Subjects: Theoretical Sampling.....	76
4.3.2.3	Theoretical Saturation.....	76
4.3.2.4	Recording of Interviews.....	77
4.4	ANALYSIS.....	78
4.4.1	<i>Coding</i>	78
4.4.2	<i>Memos</i>	79
4.4.3	<i>Use of Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)</i>	80
4.5	SUMMARY.....	83
5	STRATEGY AMBIGUITY: THE PROBLEM OF ALIGNMENT.....	85
5.1	ABSTRACT.....	85
5.2	GENERAL.....	86
5.3	DEFINITION OF ALIGNMENT.....	86
5.4	DEFINITIONS OF STRATEGY.....	90
5.4.1	<i>Strategy as Plan</i>	90
5.4.2	<i>Strategy as Pattern</i>	90
5.4.3	<i>Strategy as Position</i>	90
5.4.4	<i>Strategy as Perspective</i>	91
5.4.5	<i>Strategies or Goals? What are we Investigating?</i>	92
5.5	THE CORE PROBLEM OF ALIGNMENT.....	92

5.5.1	<i>Self-Interest</i>	97
5.5.2	<i>Leadership</i>	98
5.5.2.1	Commitment.....	99
5.5.2.2	Consistency of Message.....	99
5.5.2.3	Competitive or Collaborative Business Culture.....	100
5.5.3	<i>Espoused versus Enacted Strategies</i>	100
5.5.4	<i>The Core Category and Its Relevance</i>	103
5.6	THE SUBSTANTIVE THEORY: RESOLVING AMBIGUITY WITHIN BOUNDED CHOICES.....	104
5.6.1	<i>Early Iterations of the Theory</i>	104
5.6.2	<i>The Substantive Theory</i>	110
5.6.3	<i>The Theory in a Nutshell</i>	111
5.6.3.1	The Technological Response to Strategy Ambiguity.....	112
5.6.3.2	The Collaborative Coping Response.....	112
5.6.3.3	Self-Perpetuating Cycles and the Difficulty of Improving Long Term Alignment.....	114
5.7	SUMMARY.....	115
6	THE LOCUS OF CONTROL	117
6.1	ABSTRACT.....	117
6.2	MEASUREMENT AND INCENTIVE SCHEMES.....	117
6.3	STRATEGIES AND PLANS.....	130
6.4	LEADERSHIP.....	136
6.4.1	<i>Provide Direction</i>	137
6.4.2	<i>Commitment to, and Consistency of, the Message</i>	143
6.4.3	<i>Leadership Style</i>	146
6.5	IS STATUS.....	149
6.5.1	<i>History of IT/Business Relationships</i>	151
6.5.2	<i>Perception of IT</i>	159
6.5.3	<i>Perceived Role of IT</i>	162
6.6	SUMMARY.....	168
7	THE LOCUS OF COMPREHENSION	171
7.1	ABSTRACT.....	171
7.2	THE LOCUS OF COMPREHENSION.....	172
7.2.1	<i>Shared Domain Knowledge</i>	173
7.2.1.1	Shared System of Meaning.....	177
7.2.1.2	Trust and Credibility.....	183
7.2.1.3	Relationships.....	188
7.2.1.4	Ability to Communicate.....	195
7.2.1.5	Organisation Structure.....	199
7.2.1.6	Mental Models.....	205

7.3	SUMMARY.....	212
8	THE TWO COPING RESPONSES.....	215
8.1	ABSTRACT.....	215
8.2	THE INFLUENCE OF THE LOCI ON STRATEGY AMBIGUITY.....	215
8.3	THE COLLABORATIVE COPING RESPONSE.....	218
8.3.1	<i>The Target and Horizon of Alignment within a Collaborative Coping Response.....</i>	<i>219</i>
8.3.2	<i>Level of Formality within a Collaborative Coping Response.....</i>	<i>224</i>
8.3.3	<i>Emphasis of IT Personnel.....</i>	<i>227</i>
8.3.4	<i>Attitude of IT Managers Adopting a Collaborative Coping Response.....</i>	<i>229</i>
8.4	THE TECHNOLOGICAL COPING RESPONSE.....	230
8.4.1	<i>Alignment within a Technological Coping Response.....</i>	<i>232</i>
8.4.2	<i>Level of Formality within a Technological Coping Response.....</i>	<i>235</i>
8.4.3	<i>Emphasis of IT Personnel.....</i>	<i>237</i>
8.4.4	<i>Attitude of IT Managers Adopting a Technological Coping Response.....</i>	<i>240</i>
8.5	DISCUSSION.....	241
8.6	WRAPPING UP.....	253
9	CONCLUSION.....	255
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	265
	APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANT DETAILS.....	279
	APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW INSTRUMENTS.....	281
	APPENDIX C: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT:	285
	APPENDIX D: SAMPLE NODE REPORT.....	305
	APPENDIX E: SAMPLES OF WRITTEN MEMOS.....	315
	APPENDIX F: SAMPLES OF MODELS CONSTRUCTED AS MEMOS.....	329
	APPENDIX G: ETHICS APPLICATION.....	332

Table of Figures

CHAPTER 2

2.1	<i>A model of IS/business alignment. From Sabherwal, Hirschheim & Goles (2003).....</i>	15
2.2	<i>The research model of the social dimension of alignment developed by Reich & Benbasat (2000)</i>	20
2.3	<i>Some anomalies in prior IS literature detected by Campbell, Kay & Avison (2005).....</i>	21
2.4	<i>The levels within the Strategic Alignment Maturity Model of Luftman (2001).....</i>	25
2.5	<i>The alignment criteria used by Luftman (2001) in his Strategic Alignment Maturity Model.....</i>	26

CHAPTER 3

3.1	<i>Research model of Reich & Benbasat (2000) developed deductively from the literature.....</i>	51
-----	---	----

CHAPTER 4

4.1	<i>Model of the Grounded Theory methodology from Fernandez (2004).....</i>	58
-----	--	----

CHAPTER 5

5.1	<i>Relationships between codes identified after initial Open Coding.....</i>	106
5.2	<i>Development of theory of bounded choices within strategic alignment.....</i>	108
5.3	<i>Strategic Alignment: Resolving Ambiguity within Bounded Choices.....</i>	110

CHAPTER 6

6.1	<i>Part of model developed on 18/10/04 showing relationships between codes identified after initial coding.....</i>	126
6.2	<i>The category Motivation and Measurement Schemes and its properties.....</i>	127
6.3	<i>The conceptual category locus of control and its sub-category motivation and measurement schemes.....</i>	129
6.4	<i>The direction of major influence between variables so far identified within the locus of control</i>	129
6.5	<i>The inclusion of the sub-category strategies and plans within the locus of control.....</i>	135
6.6	<i>Adding strategy ambiguity to the influence diagram commenced in Figure 6.4.....</i>	136
6.7	<i>Shared domain knowledge and the mental models of senior management influence their leadership which, in turn, can influence strategies and plans.....</i>	143
6.8	<i>Motivation and measurement schemes may also influence leadership.....</i>	145
6.9	<i>Leadership can influence the level of strategy ambiguity.....</i>	147

6.10	<i>The addition of leadership and its sub-categories to the locus of control.....</i>	149
6.11	<i>Perceived relationships between codes identified after initial open coding.....</i>	150
6.12	<i>There is mutual influence between history of IT/business relationships and communication...158</i>	
6.13	<i>The properties within IS status influence, and are influenced by, the level of personal relationships, trust and credibility, and the mental models held by managers.....</i>	164
6.14	<i>The locus of control and its sub-categories.....</i>	168

CHAPTER 7

7.1	<i>Model of the emerging theory developed on 18th October 2004.....</i>	173
7.2	<i>A development of Figure 6.13 from the previous chapter showing the mutual influence between shared domain knowledge, shared system of meaning, and relationships.....</i>	183
7.3	<i>There is a recursive link between trust and credibility, and relationships as well as a link between relationships and shared system of meaning.....</i>	194
7.4	<i>Ability to communicate is influenced by IS status and its sub-categories. It then influences a person's ability to develop relationships.....</i>	198
7.5	<i>Organisation structure tends to influence both the ability to communicate and implementation of strategies and plans.....</i>	205
7.6	<i>Mental models influence the ability to communicate. This in turn influences relationships, trust and credibility, shared system of meaning, and shared domain knowledge. Mental models also affect, and are affected by, IS status and its sub-categories.....</i>	211
7.7	<i>The identification of the major categories Locus of Comprehension and Locus of Control</i>	212
7.8	<i>The model shown in Figure 7.7 brought to a higher conceptual level by removing variables within the two loci and replacing these with a double ended arrow.....</i>	213

CHAPTER 8

8.1	<i>The variables within the two loci impact business managers' reactions to business strategies. These actions then add to the strategy ambiguity faced by IT managers.....</i>	216
8.2	<i>This is a reproduction of Figure 7.7 from the previous chapter.....</i>	217
8.3	<i>A theory of alignment that explains both the development of strategy ambiguity and IT managers' reaction to that ambiguity.....</i>	242

CHAPTER 9

9.1	<i>A simplification of the Strategic Alignment Model developed by Henderson & Venkatraman (1993).....</i>	256
-----	---	-----