



Chapter XI

The Collaborative Use of Information Technology: End-User Participation and System Success

William J. Doll
University of Toledo, USA

Xiaodong Deng
Oakland University, USA

User participation seems especially important in the development of collaborative work systems where the technology is used by a work group to coordinate their joint activities. Users rather than systems analysts are often the best source of information on how they will use information technology to collaborate. It is almost an axiom of systems development that end users should participate in a broad range of activities/decisions and that they should be permitted to participate in these decisions as much as they want. Despite these widely held beliefs, research has not focused on the differential efficacy of user participation in collaborative versus non-collaborative applications.

Building upon the work of behavioral scientists who study participative decision making, Doll and Torkzadeh (1991) present a congruence construct of participation that measures whether end users participate as much as they want in key systems analysis decisions. Using a sample of 163 collaborative and 239 non-collaborative applications, this research focuses on three research questions: (1) Is user participation more effective in collaborative applications? (2) What specific decision issues enhance user satisfaction and productivity? and (3) Can permitting

end users to participate as much as they want on some issues be ineffective or even dysfunctional? The results indicate that user participation is more effective in collaborative applications. Of the four decision issues tested, only participation in information needs analysis predicts end-user satisfaction and task productivity. Encouraging end users to participate as much as they want on a broad range of systems analysis issues such as project initiation, information flow analysis, and format design appears to be, at best, a waste of time and, perhaps, even harmful. These findings should help managers and analysts make better decisions about how to focus participatory efforts and whether end users should participate as much as they want in the design of collaborative systems.

INTRODUCTION

A new era of collaborative organizations characterized by lateral leadership and virtual teams is emerging (Ghoshal & Bartlett, 1997; Pasternack & Viscio, 1998). Firms that compete by developing and deploying intellectual assets are finding that their competitive advantage will depend on developing a superior collaborative capability. Collaboration occurs when two or more people interact to accomplish a common goal. Collaboration means that people who work together support each other by sharing their ideas, knowledge, competencies, and information and/or by coordinating their activities to accomplish a task or goal (Hargrove, 1998). Collaborative work systems are defined as applications where information technology is used to help people coordinate their work with others by sharing information or knowledge. In a longitudinal study, Neilson (1997) describes how collaborative technologies such as Lotus Notes can enhance organizational learning.

Knowledge is a social activity. Complex problems can not be solved by specialists thinking and working in isolation, but in coming together through a process of dialogue, deeply informed by human values and focused on practical problems. Today people from all over the world have the capacity to communicate by e-mail and to participate in electronically distributed meetings. Technology has, in most cases, increased the quantity of interactions people are having. But, has it improved the quality of those interactions? To do this will require a shift in thinking and attitudes towards being more creative and collaborative in systems development (Hargrove, 1998).

Can analysts really design collaborative applications that enhance the quality of human interactions without engaging the application's users in the design effort? In other words, should the design of collaborative applications itself be a collaborative activity? The literature on collaborative systems has focused on: (1) the nature and capabilities of the software, and (2) its application to specific problems requiring collaborative interaction. It has largely ignored the issue of user participation in the design of collaborative applications.

User participation is widely accepted as essential to developing successful information systems (Barki & Hartwick, 1994; Ives & Olson, 1984; McKeen,

18 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/collaborative-use-information-technology/4585

Related Content

IS Strategic Processes: Benefitting from People's Competencies in a Geographically Dispersed Organization - A CIO's Challenge

Harald Oddvar Fardaland Jan Sørnes (2010). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* (pp. 50-64).

www.irma-international.org/article/strategic-processes-benefitting-people-competencies/49196

Internet Privacy Concerns versus Behavior: A Protection Motivation Approach

Kenneth J. Sousa, Laurie E. MacDonald and Kenneth T. Fougere (2012). *International Journal of Information Systems and Social Change* (pp. 53-64).

www.irma-international.org/article/internet-privacy-concerns-versus-behavior/72333

A Case of an IT-Enabled Organizational Change Intervention: The Missing Pieces

Bing Wang and David Paper (2005). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* (pp. 34-52).

www.irma-international.org/article/case-enabled-organizational-change-intervention/3138

Legal Expert Systems in Administrative Organizations

Jörgen S. Svensson (2005). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, First Edition* (pp. 1827-1830).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/legal-expert-systems-administrative-organizations/14520

The Lonely Comate - The Adoption-Failure of an Intranet-based Consumer and Market Intelligence System

Paul H. J. Hendriks and Wendy H. Jacobs (2003). *Annals of Cases on Information Technology: Volume 5* (pp. 130-150).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/lonely-comate-adoption-failure-intranet/44538