

Business 9852A – Fall 2017

Critical Analysis of Classic and Emerging Themes in IS Research

Professor: Mustapha Cheikh-Ammar
Office No. 2308
Tel. Number 519-661-3544
Mcheikh-ammam@ivey.ca

Faculty Assistant: Kimberly Booth
Office No. 2319
Tel. Number 519- 661-2111 ext. 85497
kbooth@ivey.ca

Wednesdays 01:00 pm – 04:00 pm
Location: IVEY 3102
(12 Sessions)

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to provide doctoral students in Information Systems (IS) a broad introduction to key issues in management, organizational, and behavioral IS research, and expose them to a variety of theoretical perspectives that have been adopted in classic and contemporary IS research streams. The course covers well established topics in IS research, such as IT Acceptance and IT-mediated communication and collaboration, as well as emerging topics such as those related to Ubiquitous Computing and the Dark Side of Information Systems. By the end of this seminar, students will have an in-depth understanding of important IS theories and perspectives that they should be able to critically assess and eventually contribute to.

This seminar is appropriate for both new and advanced doctoral students; course requirements will be tailored to fit students' needs based on their stage of progression in their doctoral studies.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this course are the following:

- Lead students to appreciate the diversity and breadth of IS Research.
- Provide students with a clear understanding of key theories and perspectives in behavioral information systems research
- Develop students' ability to theorize about IT related phenomena.
- Expose students to significant theoretical and methodological debates in the IS literature.
- Provide exposure and ignite interest in some of the classic and emerging topics in IS research.
- Help students develop and plan a research proposal dealing with IT enabled contemporary societal, organizational, and behavioral phenomenon.

COURSE ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION

To reach the aforementioned objectives, 12 themes will be addressed in this seminar over 12 sessions, each with its own set of readings. For each session approximately five articles are assigned as mandatory readings. Additional readings are listed for each session (further readings), which are expected to

enhance students' understanding of the topic. Although students are not required to read the additional research papers before class, they are nevertheless encouraged to do so. In some classes the professor may ask the students to read one additional paper from the list and to come to class ready to discuss it. This will be indicated at least one week in advance.

This course is a seminar and not a lecture-based class. This implies that active class participation is required to maximize students' learning. Students are required to carefully read all papers for each class (some papers may require multiple reads to reach a good understanding of their content) and to establish links between the assigned papers.

Evaluation

Contributions to class discussions	30%
Weekly papers	25%
Manuscript review	15%
Final paper	30%

Contribution (30%)

Students will be graded based on their contribution to the discussion on the assigned readings. All students are expected to be ready to discuss ALL required articles on the assigned day. Effective contributions can take many forms and should serve to exhibit a student's own comprehension of a topic and to foster a positive learning environment for the class. To make positive contributions a student is expected to build on the comments of others, redirect the discussion into critical new areas, share insights (based on previous experience: technical, industry, or other courses), constructively criticize and summarize key learning points. Effective contribution to the class incorporates a variety of behaviors:

- **Preparation** – your contributions should demonstrate that you have read the materials carefully and have come prepared with thoughtful comments and reactions.
- **Reasoning** – your arguments should be well substantiated and logical, and should demonstrate critical thinking.
- **Listening** – being attentive to what others in the class (the professor and your classmates) is essential to being an effective contributor.
- **Professionalism** – contribution to the class is about more than what you say; it is about your attitude to the learning process, your willingness to engage with the material and to accept responsibility for the progress of the class.

To prepare for the sessions students may want to ponder the following themes/questions for each of the assigned articles:

1. Motivation for the article:
 - a. Practical Problem(s)
 - b. Theoretical Problem(s)
 - c. Existing Gap(s)
2. Research question(s)
3. Theoretical logic
4. Causal model and hypotheses
5. Research design
6. Findings
 - a. Are there any plausible alternative interpretations?
7. Contribution(s) of the Article
 - a. Theoretical
 - b. Methodological
 - c. Practical
8. Personal interest in the article
 - a. Method that can be followed
 - b. Theory that can be followed
 - c. References to pursue
 - d. Interesting opportunity for future research.

These are general guidelines to consider when reading the assigned articles. Answers to these questions are not mandatory nor are they required. However, they are here presented as possible tools that students may find helpful.

Weekly Papers

Students are required to hand in 10 weekly synthesis papers (maximum 3 pages) to be submitted before each session. For the first two classes, students are asked to write a summary of what they have learned from the list of readings. From session 3 to 12 (except session 7), students are expected to submit an integration paper that evaluates, integrates and synthesizes the core concepts and issues across papers. A good integration paper is one that reflects a student's own thoughts and interpretation of a subject matter, and not one that simply summarizes what was advanced in the readings. For session 7, students have to develop and present a "new" relevant construct to the IS literature (more information will be provided in class). All weekly papers need to be submitted by email to the professor no later than 8 am on Wednesdays.

Manuscript Review

Students will be asked to act as reviewers for a manuscript submitted for consideration at a leading journal in Information Systems (senior scholar basket of 8). Students will be required to assess the

manuscript and write their review (divided into major and minor concerns) in no more than three pages. The review should tackle the contribution of the submitted manuscript, as well as the theoretical and methodological issues that are deemed relevant. As reviewers, students are also expected to include in their reviews recommendations to the authors suggesting ways/avenues to improve their manuscript.

The following references provide useful guidance on how to conduct and write a review:

- Lee, A., "Reviewing a Manuscript for Publication," *Journal of Operations Management* 13, 1 (1995), 87-92. (<http://www.people.vcu.edu/~aslee/referee.htm>)
- Lepak, D., "Editor's Comments: What is Good Reviewing?" *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 3 (2009), 375-381.

Final paper/Research proposal

Each student will write and submit a research proposal on a topic related to the content of the seminar. The topic needs to be discussed with the professor for approval midway through the semester. A draft of the paper will be presented on the last day of classes, as indicated in the course schedule. The proposal should include the following elements: a research question, a clearly stated research motivation, a relevant literature review section (should not be limited to the articles presented in the syllabus), theory/theoretical foundation, hypotheses/propositions, potential research method (how would this study be empirically assessed), expected findings (if appropriate), a section discussing the study's limitations, and a section discussing the expected contributions of the proposed research to theory and/or to practice.

PLAGIARISM / 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 the following Web site:

http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf

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

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. For example, to support physical activity, all students, as part of their registration, receive membership in Western's Campus Recreation Centre. Numerous cultural events are offered throughout the year. Please check out the Faculty of Music web page <http://www.music.uwo.ca>, and our own McIntosh Gallery <http://www.mcintoshgallery.ca>. Information regarding health- and wellness-related services available to students may be found at <http://www.health.uwo.ca>.

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), or other relevant administrators in their unit. Campus mental health resources may be found at http://www.health.uwo.ca/mental_health/resources.html.

To help you learn more about mental health, Western has developed an interactive mental health learning module, found here: http://uwo.ca/health/mental_wellbeing/education/module.html. This module is 30 minutes in length and provides participants with a basic understanding of mental health issues and of available campus and community resources. Topics include stress, anxiety, depression, suicide and eating disorders. After successful completion of the module, participants receive a certificate confirming their participation.

SCHEDULE (tentative)

Session	Date	Topic
1	September 13, 2017	Introduction to the IS Field
2	September 20, 2017	Theory & IS Research
3	September 27, 2017	IT & Human behavior
4	October 04, 2017	IS Resistance
5	October 11, 2017	Alternative Approaches to Studying IT Effects
6	October 18, 2017	Structuration
7	October 25, 2017	The Value of Constructs
8	November 01, 2017	Virtual Communication & Communities
9	November 08, 2017	The Dark Side of Technology
10	November 15, 2017	Ubiquitous Communication
11	November 22, 2017	IT Privacy
12	November 29, 2017	IT Ubiquity
13	December 06, 2017	Research Proposals

LIST OF READINGS

Session 1: Introduction to the IS Field

1. Orlikowski, W. J. and Iacono, C.S., "Research Commentary: Desperately Seeking the 'IT' in IT Research--A Call to Theorizing the IT Artifact," *Information Systems Research*, 2001, 12(2), 121-135.
2. Whinston, A.B. and X. Geng, "Operationalizing the Essential Role of the Information Technology Artifact in Information Systems Research: Gray Area, Pitfalls, and the Importance of Strategic Ambiguity," *MIS Quarterly*, 28 (2), 2004, 149-159.
3. Benbasat, I. and R.W. Zmud, "The Identity Crisis Within the IS Discipline: Defining and Communicating the Discipline's Core Properties," *MIS Quarterly* 27 (2), 2003, 183-194.
4. Sidorova, A., Evangelopoulos, N., Valacich, J., and Ramakrishnan, T. "Uncovering the Intellectual Core of the Information Systems Discipline." *MIS Quarterly*, 2008, 32(3), 467-482.
5. DeSanctis, G., "The Social Life of Information Systems Research: A Response to Benbasat and Zmud's Call for Returning to the IT Artifact," *Journal of the AIS*, 4 (7), 2003, 360-376.

Further Readings:

- Gallier, R.D., "Change as Crisis or Growth? Toward a Trans-Disciplinary View of Information Systems as a Field of Study: A Response to Benbasat and Zmud's Call for Returning to the IT Artifact," *Journal of AIS*, 4 (6), 2003, 337-351.
- Robey, D., "Identity, Legitimacy and the Dominant Research Paradigm: An Alternative Prescription for the IS Discipline: A Response to Benbasat and Zmud's Call for Returning to the IT Artifact," *Journal of the AIS*, 4 (7), 2003, 352-359.

Rigor and Relevance of IS Research

- Applegate, L. M. and J.L. King, "Rigor and Relevance: Career on the Line," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1999, 17-18.
- Benbasat, I, and R. Zmud, "Empirical Research in Information Systems: The Practice of Relevance," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1999, 3-16.
- Davenport, To and M.L. Markus, "Rigor vs. Relevance Revisited: Response to Benbasat and Zmud," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1999, 19-24.
- Lee, A., "Rigor and Relevance in MIS Research: Beyond the Approach of Positivism Alone," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1999, 29-34.
- Lee, A., "The Social and Political Context of Doing Relevant Research," *MIS Quarterly*, 24 (3), 2000, v-viii.
- Lyytinen, K., "Empirical Research in Information Systems: On the Relevance of Practice in Thinking of IS Research," *MIS Quarterly*, 23 (1), 1999, 25-28.

Session 2: Theory and IS Research

1. Sutton, R.I., Staw, B.M., "What Theory is Not," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 3 (1995), 371-384.
2. Weber, R., "Theoretically Speaking," Editor's comments, *MIS Quarterly*, 27, 3 (2003), iii-xi.
3. Weick, K.E. "What theory is not, theorizing is," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1995, 40(3), 385-390.
4. Gregor, S., "The Nature of Theory in Information Systems," *MIS Quarterly*, 30, 3 (2006), 611-642.
5. How to theorize: <http://www.analytictech.com/mb313/howto.htm>
6. Gray, P.H. and W.H. Cooper, "Pursuing Failure," *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 4 (2010), 620-643.

Further Readings:

Diversity in IS Research

- Benbasat, I. and R. Weber, "Rethinking "Diversity" in Information Systems Research," *Information Systems Research*, 7 (4), 1996, 389-399.
- Robey, D. "Diversity in Information Systems Research: Threat, Promise, and Responsibility," *Information Systems Research*, 7 (4), 1996, 400-408.
- Hirschheim, R.A. "Information Systems Epistemology: An Historical Perspective," *Research Methods in Information Systems*, E. Mumford et al. (eds.), Elsevier Science Publishers, North-Holland, 13-36, 1985.
- Vessey, I., V.R. Ramesh, and R.L. Glass, "Research in Information Systems: An Empirical Study of Diversity in the Discipline and its Journals, *Journal of MIS*, 19 (2), 2002, 129- 174.
- Zmud, R.W. "Research in Information Systems: What We Haven't Learned," *MIS Quarterly*, Editor's Comments, 25 (4), 2001, v-xv.

Research Methods

- Goles, T. and R. Hirschheim, "The Paradigm is Dead! Long Live the Paradigm: the Legacy of Burrell and Morgan," *Omega*, 28, 3 (2000), 249-268.
- Myers, M., *Qualitative Research Methods*, <http://www.qual.auckland.ac.nz/>
- Walsham, G., "The Emergence of Interpretivism in IS Research," *Information Systems Research* (6:4), 1995, pp. 376-394.
- Weber, R., "The Rhetoric of Positivism Versus Interpretivism: A Personal View," *MIS Quarterly*, 28, 1 (2004), iii-xii.

Session 3: IT and Individual Performance

1. Goodhue, D., and Thompson, R. 1995. "Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance," *MIS Quarterly* (19:2), pp. 213–236.
2. Davis, F.D., R.P. Bagozzi, and P.R., Warshaw, "User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models," *Management Science* (35:8), August 1989, pp. 982-1003.
3. Benbasat, I. and H. Barki, "Quo Vadis TAM," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 211-218.

TAM Contributions and Limitations

- Goodhue, D.L., "Comment on Benbasat and Barki's "Quo Vadis TAM" article," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 219-22.
- Straub, D. and A. Burton-Jones, "Veni, Vidi, Vici: Breaking the TAM Logjam," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 223-229.
- Schwarz, A., "Looking Forward: Toward an Understanding of the Nature and Definition of IT Acceptance," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 230-243.
- Bagozzi, R.P., "The Legacy of the Technology Acceptance Model and a Proposal for a Paradigm Shift," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 244-254.
- Venkatesh, V., F. Davis and G.B. Morris, "Dead or Alive? The Development, Trajectory and Future of Technology Adoption Research," *Journal of the AIS* (8:4), April 2007, pp. 267- 286.

Session 4: IS Resistance

1. Kim, H.W. and A. Kankanhalli, "Investigating User Resistance to Information Systems Implementation: A Status Quo Bias Perspective," *MIS Quarterly* (33:3), September 2009, pp. 567-582.
2. Marakas, G. M. and S. Hornik, "Passive Resistance Misuse: Overt Support and Covert Recalcitrance in IS Implementation," *European Journal of Information Systems* (5:3), September 1996, pp. 208-220.
3. Markus, M. L. "Power, Politics, and MIS Implementation," *Communications of the ACM* (26:6), June 1983, pp. 430-444.
4. Lapointe, L., and Rivard, S. "A Multilevel Model of Resistance to Information Technology Implementation," *MIS Quarterly* (29:3), 2005, pp. 461-491.
5. Piderit, S. K. "Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes toward an Organizational Change," *The Academy of Management Review* (25:4), October 2000, pp. 783-795.

Further Readings:

- Martinko, M. J., J. W. Henry, and R. W. Zmud, "An Attributional Explanation of Individual Resistance to the Introduction of Information Technologies in the Workplace," *Behaviour & Information Technology* (15:5), 1996, pp. 313-330.

- Lapointe, L. and S. Rivard, "A Triple Take on Information Technology Implementation," *Organization Science* (18:1), Jan-Feb 2007, pp. 89-107.
- Rivard, S., and Lapointe, L. 2012. "Information Technology Implementers' Responses to User Resistance," *MIS Quarterly* (36:3), pp. 897–A5.

Session 5: Alternative Approaches to Studying IT Effects

1. Cenfetelli, R.T. "Inhibitors and Enablers as Dual Factor Concepts in Technology Usage", *Journal of the AIS* (5:11-12), December 2004, pp 472-492.
2. Lamb, R. and R. Kling, "Reconceptualizing Users as Social Actors in Information Systems Research," *MIS Quarterly* (27:2), June 2003, pp. 197-236.
3. Al-Natour, S. and I. Benbasat, "The Adoption and Use of IT Artifacts: A New Interaction-Centric Model for the Study of User-Artifact Relationships," *Journal of the AIS* (10:9), September 2009, pp. 661-685.
4. Burton-Jones, A., and Grange, C. 2013. "From Use to Effective Use," *Information Systems Research* (24:3), pp. 632–658.
5. Beaudry, A., and Pinsonneault, A. "The Other side of Acceptance: Studying the direct and indirect effects of emotions on information technology use," *MIS Quarterly*, 2010, 34(4), 689-710.

Further Readings:

- 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.
- Kim, S.S. and J.Y. Son, "Out of Dedication or Constraint? A Dual Model of Post-Adoption Phenomena and its Empirical Test in the Context of Online Services", *MIS Quarterly* (33:1), March 2009, pp. 49-70.
- Majchrzak, A., R.E. Rice, A. Malhotra, N. King and S. Ba, "Technology Adaptation: The Case of a Computer Supported Inter-Organizational Virtual Team," *MIS Quarterly* (24:4), December 2000, pp. 569-600.
- Au, N., E.W.T. Ngai, and T.C.E. Cheng, "Extending the Understanding of End User Information Systems Satisfaction Formation: An Equitable Needs Fulfillment Model Approach," *MIS Quarterly* (32:1), March 2008, pp. 43-66.

Session 6: Structuration

1. DeSanctis, G., and Poole, M. S. 1994. "Capturing the Complexity in Advanced Technology Use," *Organization Science* (5:2), pp. 121–147. (<https://doi.org/10.2307/2635011>).
2. Jones, M. R., and Karsten, H. 2008. "Giddens's Structuration Theory and Information Systems Research," *MIS Quarterly* (32:1), pp. 127–157.
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. Poole, M. S. 2009. "Response to Jones and Karsten, 'Giddens's Structuration Theory and Information Systems Researched'." MIS Quarterly (33:3), pp. 583–587. (<https://doi.org/Article>).
5. Jones, M. R., and Karsten, H. 2009. "Divided by a Common Language? A Response to Marshall Scott Poole.," MIS Quarterly (33:3), pp. 589–595. (<https://doi.org/Article>).

Session 7: The Value of Constructs

1. Barki, H., "Thar's Gold in them thar Constructs," Data Base for Advances in Information Systems, 39, 3 (2008), 9-20.
2. MacKenzie, S. B., §, P. M., and Podsakoff, N. P. 2011. "Construct Measurement and Validation Procedures in MIS and Behavioral Research: Integrating New and Existing Techniques.," MIS Quarterly (35:2), pp. 293-A5.
3. Suddaby, R. "Editor's Comments: Construct Clarity in Theories of Management and Organization," Academy of Management Review, 35, 3 (2010), 346-357
4. Jarvis, C. B., MacKenzie, S. B., and Podsakoff, P. M. 2003. "A Critical Review of Construct Indicators and Measurement Model Misspecification in Marketing and Consumer Research," Journal of Consumer Research (30:2), pp. 199–218. (<https://doi.org/10.1086/376806>).

Further Readings:

- Straub, D., M.C. Boudreau, and D. Gefen, "Validation Guidelines for IS Positivist Research," Communications of AIS, 13, Article 24 (2004), 380-427

Examples of Construct development:

- Polites, G. L., and Karahanna, E. 2013. "The Embeddedness of Information Systems Habits in Organizational and Individual Level Routines," MIS Quarterly (37:1), pp. 221–246.
- Moore, G.C. and I. Benbasat, "Development of an Instrument to Measure the Perceptions of Adopting an Information Technology Innovation," Information Systems Research (2:3), September 1991, pp. 192-222.

Session 8: Virtual Communities

1. Jeppesen, L. B. and Frederiksen, L. "Why Do Users Contribute to Firm-Hosted User Communities? The Case of Computer-Controlled Music Instruments," Organization Science, 2006, 17(1), 45-63.
2. Constant, D., S. Kiesler and L. Sproull, "What's Mine is Ours, or is it? A Study of Attitudes about Information Sharing," Information Systems Research, 5 (4), 1994, 400-438.
3. Constant, D., L. Sproull and S. Kiesler, "The Kindness of Strangers: The Usefulness of Electronic Weak Ties for Technical Advice," Organization Science, 7 (2), 1996, 119-135.
4. Wasko, M.M. and Faraj S. 2005. "Why should I share? Examining Social Capital and Knowledge Contribution in Electronic Networks of Practice," MIS Quarterly, 29 (1), 35- 51.
5. Chidambaram, L., and Tung, L. L. 2005. "Is out of sight, out of mind? An empirical study of social loafing in technology-supported groups," Information Systems Research (16:2), pp. 149–168.

6. Animesh, A., Pinsonneault, A., Yang, S.-B., and Oh, W. 2011. "An Odyssey into Virtual Worlds: Exploring the Impacts of Technological and Spatial Environments on Intention to Purchase Virtual Products," *MIS Quarterly-Management Information Systems* (35:3), p. 789.

Further Readings:

- Bagozzi, R. P., and Dholakia, U.M. "Open source software user communities: A study of participation in Linux user groups," *Management Science*, 2006, 52(7), 1099-1115.
- Bin, G., Konana, P., Rajagopalan, B., and Chen, H.M., "Competition Among Virtual Communities and User Valuation: The Case of Investing-Related Communities," *Information Systems Research*, 2007, 18(1), 68-85.
- Faraj, S., Jarvenpaa, S.L., and Majchrzak, A. "Knowledge Co-Creation in Online Communities," *Organization Science*, September 2011, 22(5), 1224-1239.
- Bateman, P. J., Butler, B.S., and Gray, P. H. "The Impact of Community Commitment on Participation in Online Communities," *Information Systems Research*, 2011, 22(4), 841- 854.
- Butler, B.S. "Membership size, communication activity, and sustainability: A resource- based model of online social structures," *Information Systems Research*, 2001, 12(4), 346-362.

Session 9: The Dark Side of Technology

1. Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., and Qiang Tu. 2008. "The Consequences of Technostress for End Users in Organizations: Conceptual Development and Empirical Validation.," *Information Systems Research* (19:4), pp. 417–433. (<https://doi.org/Article>)
2. Ayyagari, R., Grover, V., and Purvis, R. 2011. "Technostress: Technological Antecedents and Implications," *MIS Quarterly* (35:4), pp. 831–858.
3. Barley, S. R., Meyerson, D. E., and Grodal, S. 2011. "E-Mail as a Source and Symbol of Stress," *Organization Science* (22:4), pp. 887–906. (<https://doi.org/10.2307/20868902>).
4. Maier, C., Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., and Weitzel, T. 2014. "Giving Too Much Social Support: Social Overload on Social Networking Sites," *European Journal of Information Systems*. (<https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2014.3>).
5. Turel, O., Serenko, A., and Giles, P. 2011. "Integrating Technology Addiction and Use," *MIS Quarterly* (35:4), pp. 1043–1061.
6. Kardefelt-Winther, D. 2014. "A Conceptual and Methodological Critique of Internet Addiction Research: Towards a Model of Compensatory Internet Use," *Computers in Human Behavior* (31), pp. 351–354.

Further Readings:

- Griffiths, M. 2000. "Does Internet and Computer' addiction' exist?," *CyberPsychology and Behavior* (3:2), pp. 211–218.
- Griffiths, M. D., Van Rooij, A. J., Kardefelt-Winther, D., Starcevic, V., Király, O., Pallesen, S. ale, Müller, K., Dreier, M., Carras, M., Prause, N., and others. 2016. "Working towards an

International Consensus on Criteria for Assessing Internet Gaming Disorder,” *Addiction* (111:1), pp. 167–175.

Session 10: Ubiquitous Communication

1. Cameron, A-F., and Webster, J. “Relational Outcomes of Multicommunicating: Integrating Incivility and Social Exchange Perspectives,” *Organization Science*, 2011, 22 (3), 754-771.
2. Wajcman, J., and Rose, E. “Constant Connectivity: Rethinking Interruptions at Work,” *Organization Studies*, July 2011, 32(7), 941-961.
3. Dennis, A.R., Fuller, R.M., and Valacich, J.S. "Media, Tasks, and Communication Processes: A Theory of Media Synchronicity." *MIS Quarterly*, 2008, 32(3), 575-600.
4. Stephens, K.K. “Multiple Conversations During Organizational Meetings: Development of the Multicommunicating Scale,” *Management Communication Quarterly*, November 2011.
5. Ngwenyama, O.K. and Lee, A.S. “Communication richness in electronic mail: Critical social theory and the contextuality of meaning,” *MIS Quarterly*, 1997, 21(2), 145-167.
6. Carlson, J. R. and Zmud, R. W., “Channel Expansion Theory and the Experiential Nature of Media Richness Perceptions,” *Academy of Management Journal*, April 1999, 42(4), 153-170.

Session 11: IT Privacy

1. Sutanto, J., Palme, E., Tan, C.-H., and Phang, C. W. 2013. “Addressing the Personalization-Privacy Paradox,” *Mis Quarterly* (37:4). (<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/6afc/ca90e14e59bd281a850cfa86e61960a605fe.pdf>).
2. Xu, H., Dinev, T., Smith, J., and Hart, P. 2011. “Information Privacy Concerns: Linking Individual Perceptions with Institutional Privacy Assurances,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (12:12), pp. 798–824.
3. Hong, W., and Thong, J. Y. 2013. “Internet Privacy Concerns: An Integrated Conceptualization and Four Empirical Studies,” *MIS Quarterly* (37:1), pp. 275–298.
4. Malhotra, N. K., Sung S. Kim, and Agarwal, J. 2004. “Internet Users' Information Privacy Concerns (IUIPC): The Construct, the Scale, and a Causal Model,” *Information Systems Research* (15:4), pp. 336–355. (<https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1040.0032>).
5. Son, J.-Y., and Kim, S. S. 2008. “Internet Users’ Information Privacy-Protective Responses: A Taxonomy and a Nomological Model,” *MIS Quarterly* (32:3), pp. 503–529. (<https://doi.org/Article>).

Further Readings:

- Sheng, H., Fiona Fui-Hoon Nah, and Keng Siau. 2008. “An Experimental Study on Ubiquitous Commerce Adoption,” *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* (9:6), pp. 344–376.
- Lee, D.-J., Ahn, J.-H., and Bang, Y. 2011. “Managing Consumer Privacy Concerns in Personalization: A Strategic Analysis of Privacy Protection.,” *MIS Quarterly* (35:2), pp. 423–A8.

- Pavlou, P. A. 2011. "State of the information privacy literature: where are we now and where should we go?" *MIS Quarterly* (35:4), pp. 977–988.
- Bélanger, F., and Crossler, R. E. 2011. "Privacy in the Digital Age: A Review of Information Privacy Research in Information Systems," *MIS Quarterly* (35:4), pp. 1017–1042.

Session 12: IT Ubiquity

1. Vodanovich, S., Sundaram, D., and Myers, M. 2010. "Research Commentary—Digital Natives and Ubiquitous Information Systems," *Information Systems Research* (21:4), pp. 711–723. (<https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1100.0324>).
2. Sorensen, C. "Cultivating interaction ubiquity at work," *The information society*, 2010, 26, 276-287.
3. Yoo, Y. 2010. "Computing In Everyday Life," *MIS Quarterly* (34:2), pp. 213–231.
4. Bødker, M., Gimpel, G., and Hedman, J. 2014. "Time-Out/time-In," *Information Systems Journal* (24:2), pp. 143–166.

Further Readings:

7. Lyytinen, K., and Yoo, Y. 2002. "Ubiquitous Computing," *Communication of the ACM* (45:12), p. 63.
8. Jessup, L. M., and Robey, D. 2002. "The Relevance of Social Issues in Ubiquitous Computing Environments," *Communications of the ACM* (45:12), pp. 88–91.