



ISSN 1536-9323

Journal of the Association for Information Systems (2020) 21(2), 264-267

doi: 10.17705/1jais.00600

EDITOR'S COMMENTS

Editorial Reflections: Lockdowns, Slow Downs, and Some Introductions

Dorothy E. Leidner

Editor-in-Chief, *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*
Ferguson Professor of Information Systems, Baylor University

Dorothy_leidner@baylor.edu

As this issue goes to print, many of our readers, authors, and editorial board members are in various degrees of lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic that is challenging the healthcare infrastructure of many countries, with ripple effects for the larger economic and social fabric that constitutes everyday life. Our thoughts are with those who have been closely implicated in the virus' progression, either having suffered themselves or having known someone who has suffered.

As IS academics, we cannot help but look with curiosity at the role that information and social technologies play in the information dissemination processes associated with the virus and its transmission, both formally and informally, as well as the importance of IT infrastructure in enabling effective work from home and online course delivery, in addition to socialization, entertainment and even religious practice during confinement. Many of you have probably reflected on what it must have been like to live through a major, life-threatening pandemic before social and entertainment technologies existed and before working at home or telework was widely possible. One wonders how people coped with the Bubonic Plague (200 million deaths¹) in the 1400s, the Smallpox pandemic (56 million deaths²) in the 1600s and the 1918 flu pandemic (40-50 million deaths³). How did they inform themselves? How was information gathered and shared? How did they protect

themselves? How did they know when it was safe to resume life as normal? Whereas a paucity of information likely created unsettling uncertainties for previous generations facing epidemics, the abundance of information creates for many today troubling uncertainties. As with other areas of life, the more information one takes in, the more knowledge one needs in order to make sense of and/or filter the information, creating an ever growing spiral of information and knowledge needs. *JAIS* has welcomed research in the past on the role of information systems in crisis, disaster, and emergency response (see, for example, Chen et al., 2008, Day et al., 2009, Leong et al., 2015, Pan et al., 2012, and Valecha et al., 2019) and will continue to advance our knowledge in this area through the various research endeavors that will undoubtedly be spawned following the current crisis in which we find ourselves. I already look forward to publishing in the near future a conditionally accepted paper that examines information sharing behavior during emerging infectious disease events.

In the immediate term, the greater demand placed upon faculty in converting their courses to an online format, in taking care of young children barred from physically attending school, and/or in caring for elderly parents who should not be leaving their homes, has resulted in a slight slowdown for some reviews packages. Please be patient as our dedicated senior editors, associate editors, and editorial board reviewers do their best to

¹ <https://www.visualcapitalist.com/history-of-pandemics-deadliest/>

² Ibid

³ Ibid

provide reviews as reasonably quickly as they are able. We have several workshops that we have been planning for various upcoming conferences but we will wait to make those announcements until we are more certain that the conferences will be able to proceed.

Speaking of our editorial board, I would like to describe the new associate editorial (AE) role that we piloted in the fall and have now implemented in full. The AE role at *J AIS* is a blind role—the AE is not aware of the authors and does not line up reviewers for a paper nor see the reviews. Instead, the AE plays one of five roles. The first, and among the most important roles, is that of a super-reviewer, meaning that the AE may be the sole reviewer on certain papers or the deciding reviewer on papers with conflicting reviews. With *J AIS* Promise submissions, senior editors may elect to rely on a sole reviewer—in this case, an AE as super-reviewer. The SE and AE decide in the first round whether the paper has the potential to be publishable in *J AIS* and, if so, the two provide detailed feedback to authors on how to revise their papers. This both speeds up the review process and avoids conflicting reviews. The AE role is central to the *J AIS* Promise review option. For more on this option, see the announcement on the *J AIS* homepage or the editorial from the *J AIS* volume 21, issue 1, 2020. The other four roles of the AE at *J AIS* include the role of fast-turnaround emergency reviewer when a review process has been held up by unforeseen circumstances, the role of assisting senior editors with the screening of submissions, particularly *J AIS* Promise submissions, the role of co-guest editor on a special issue and, later in the AE term, and the role of guest senior editor on a regular *J AIS* submission. To qualify as a *J AIS* AE, an individual must be an associate-level (or the equivalent) faculty member and must have published at least two publications in such journals as *J AIS*, *MIS Quarterly*, *Information Systems Research*, and the *Journal of Management Information Systems*. The AE load is approximately eight tasks across the five roles per year during the three-year term. AEs may volunteer, may be nominated by an SE, or may be invited based on outstanding services as an editorial board member. Our inaugural associate editors are Indranil Bose, Suranjan Chakraborty, Michelle Carter, John D’Arcy, John Dong, Line Dube, Robert W. Gregory, Yili Hong, Juliana Kotlarsky, Nancy Lankton, Nirup M. Menon, Chitu Okoli, Min-Seok Pang, Lionel P. Robert Jr., Pallab Sanyal, Tuure Tuunanen, Daniel Veit, and Jennifer Xu. I am deeply grateful to these individuals for their commitment to *J AIS* and their dedication to helping improve review processes and research quality.

In this issue, you will find six research articles, two research perspective papers, and one guest editorial. The first research article—“Value Co-creation for Service Innovation: Examining the Relationships

Between Service Innovativeness, Customer Participation, and Mobile App Performance” written by Jonathan Ye and Atreyi Kankanhalli—is a rigorous study of service innovativeness in the context of mobile apps. The authors address the question of how service innovativeness and customer participation affect new service performance. Using a panel dataset of 234 mobile apps over a period of 14 months, the authors find differences in the relationship of innovation novelty and innovation intensity on mobile app performance and find a moderating effect of customer participation. Prior to reading this paper, I had not thought much about different dimensions of service innovation, and particularly about innovation novelty (the degree of departure from existing services) versus intensity (the frequency of innovating reflecting the depth of resource integration). Reading the paper makes one think about one’s own response to innovations in services offered by mobile apps.

The second research article—“Reinforcing Effects of Formal Control Enactment in Complex IT Projects” by Gloria Liu and Cecil Chua—is a case study of a large manufacturing organization that designs and manufactures wireless communication products embedding software and hardware to enable new product functionality. The authors study a manufacturing center comprised of 45 engineers working in an open-plan office with the responsibility of coordinating and controlling production. The introduction of a new control system proved to have very different results across two projects. The authors compare and contrast the control enactment styles (enabling vs. authoritative) and controlee responses (external control, self-goals, self-monitoring, and intrinsic motivation) and enactment outcomes (facilitation/hindrance, compensation/reinforcement) as well as project outcomes. The discussion is particularly interesting, with the authors introducing the notions of creating (vs. inhibiting) transparency to clarify goals with controlees and allowing for (vs. inhibiting) repair to relax formal controls in order to allow controlees to try new behaviors. Transparency is a theme also taken up in Hornvak, Rai, and Dong’s paper in this issue.

In the third research article in this issue—“Predicting Intention to Participate in Socially Responsible Collection Action in a Social Networking Website Group” by Victor Chen, Timothy Hiele, Adam Kryszak, and William Ross—the authors discuss the notion of “we-intention,” which highlights individuals’ commitment to group activities. Their study focuses on members of “KolorujeMY,” a Facebook group that encourages charitable and socially responsible activities among sports fans and soccer players. Drawing on several theoretical concepts from the belief-desire-intention model and social influence theory and data from a sample of Polish soccer fans,

the authors hypothesize and test the relationships of various social influence processes and perceived corporate social responsibility on desire and on intention to use social networking systems for collection action.

The fourth research article is “Incumbent System Context and Job Outcomes of Effective Enterprise System Use” by Rob Hornyak, Arun Rai, and John Qi Dong. This paper is a longitudinal study of the effects of information transparency (conceptualized as information visibility and information credibility) on the performance expectancy of a new enterprise system, and 6 months later, the effects of performance expectancy on effective system use, and then 12 months later, the effects of effective system use on user satisfaction and the effect of user satisfaction on job effectiveness. This is a very well-executed study and a fascinating read. I particularly enjoyed the exposition of information transparency and the role this plays in the performance expectancy of a new system. This paper, together with Liu and Chau’s paper in this issue, provides novel insights into the notion of transparency and its importance to various IS phenomena.

The fifth research article—“Synthesizing and Integrating Research on IT-Based Value Cocreation: A Meta-Analysis” by Markus Mandrella, Simon Trang, and Lutz M. Kolbe—synthesizes and integrates (as the title suggests) the body of knowledge of IT-based value cocreation. In analyzing 80 studies, the authors isolate 21,843 observations and highlight the value-generating effect of four interorganizational IT capabilities: IT-based relation-specific assets, IT-based knowledge sharing, IT-based complementary capabilities, and IT-based governance. The authors address two research questions—(1) What is the effect of interorganizational IT on business value? and (2) How do the methodological and contextual attributes of the studies affect the relationship between interorganizational IT and business value?—and synthesize the expected answer to these two questions in a parsimonious yet comprehensive model based on the literature. The authors then test their hypotheses through their meta-analysis of the literature. In addition to the paper’s content, the paper’s structure is very effective. The paper’s structure follows the three major relationships displayed in the model before very clearly tying the findings back to the original research questions. The reader is able to read the paper front to back without getting lost, an impressive feat for a meta-analysis of any sort, much less a meta-analysis with 21,843 observations!

The sixth and final research article in this issue is “Can Secure Behaviors Be Contagious? A Two-State Investigation of the Influence of Herd Behavior on Security Decisions” by Ali Vedadi and Merrill Warkentin. Using a multistage experiment, the research investigates the extent to which users in

uncertain circumstances cope with security threats by engaging in herd behavior and the extent to which herd mentality influences users’ post-adoption security behavior. The findings provide insights about the influence and duration of herd mentality on individual security decisions.

Following the research articles are two research perspectives papers. The first research perspectives paper is “The Rise of Human Machines: How Cognitive Computing Systems Challenge Assumptions of User-System Interaction” by Sebastian Schuetz and Viswanath Venkatesh. The paper introduces a new type of system that mimics human cognitive abilities—cognitive computing systems (CCS). The authors argue that CCS require a paradigm shift in our thinking away from viewing humans as users and IT artifacts as tools. The authors take us through the progression in human-like capabilities in systems, from knowing in DSS, to reasoning in expert systems, to acting in intelligent agents, and now to perceiving in CSS. The first three of these forms were reliant on structured data input, hence the interaction with the user was still non-human-like. With CSS, the human-computer interface has become human-like and the systems are able to make sense of their own unstructured environment. This ability of the machine to process unstructured data and interact in a human-like fashion represents a radical rather than incremental shift in the human-technology relationship, forcing us to reconsider fundamental assumptions that have dominated our research and shaped our theories for decades. The authors present five major assumptions of IS research and demonstrate how CSS are challenging these assumptions. Challenging these assumptions creates significant implications for IS research, such as rendering some theories obsolete and creating the need for novel theories and addressing questions of how human-like systems fundamentally change the way we live, work, and even think. The authors conclude with 14 intriguing research questions surrounding CSS, questions that IS researchers are well-positioned to examine.

The second research perspectives paper is “Through Whose Eyes? The Critical Concept of Researcher Perspective” by Roger Clarke and Robert M. Davison. The authors’ analysis of over 600 articles from the AIS Basket of Eight journals suggests that the overwhelming majority—90%—adopt a single stakeholder perspective in whose interest the research was conducted. The authors challenge researchers to consider multiple perspectives in their work. It would behoove us all to consider different research questions related to the same phenomenon that we might ask if we were to examine the phenomenon from different research perspectives, such as that of the system sponsor, the employees, the economic region, the

customers, the executives, and so forth. The authors provide a plethora of perspectives across economic, social, and environmental dimensions. This perspectives paper is a great read for novice and senior researchers alike. It inculcates us to engage in multiple perspective-taking in order to strengthen our theories and invigorate our findings.

I conclude this editorial reflection with the first paper in this issue, a guest editorial by some veritable legends in the field. Varun Grover, Aron Lindberg, Izak Benbasat, and Kalle Lyytinen provide a scintillating commentary titled “The Perils and Promises of Big Data Research in IS.” The authors reflect on why big data research (BDR) has been so embraced in the field and then present five major conjectures concerning BDR. They suggest that BDR will tend to address tactical problems, will tend towards local diversity

rather than cumulative tradition, will exhibit bias towards a nominal treatment of the IT artifact, will tend to treat theory in a cursory, sometimes after-the-fact fashion, and will focus on data and methods over theoretical knowledge. The authors provide evidence from a sample of 392 papers published in the AIS Basket of Eight journals over a three-year period to support their conjectures. The authors then provide their insights into how IS researchers can leverage BDR in their research through a symbiotic balancing of theoretical skills with data/analytical skills. This editorial is as important for BDR researchers as it is for researchers inclined to case studies, survey studies, or experiments because the implications of BDR extend to the field’s legitimacy and identity.

References

- Chen, R., Sharman, R., Chakravarti, N., Rao, H. R., & Upadhyaya, S. J. (2008). Emergency response information system interoperability: Development of chemical incident response data model. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 9(3), 200-230.
- Day, J. M., Junglas, I., & Silva, L. (2009). Information flow impediments in disaster relief supply chains. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 10(8), 637-660.
- Leong, C. M. L., Pan, Shan L., Ractham, P., & Kaewkitipong, L. (2015). ICT-enabled community empowerment in crisis response: Social media in Thailand flooding 2011. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 16(3), 174-212.
- Pan, S. L., Pan, G., & Leidner, D. E. (2012). Crisis response information networks. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(1), 518-555.
- Valecha, R., Rao, R., Upadhyaya, S., & Sharman, R. (2019). An activity theory approach to modeling dispatch-mediated emergency response. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 20(1), 33-57

Copyright © 2020 by the Association for Information Systems. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and full citation on the first page. Copyright for components of this work owned by others than the Association for Information Systems must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or fee. Request permission to publish from: AIS Administrative Office, P.O. Box 2712 Atlanta, GA, 30301-2712 Attn: Reprints, or via email from publications@aisnet.org.