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Abstract

We have studied a global corporation that is implementing an IT-enabled change program which affect the whole organization. In this change, there exists many different perspectives that we divided into groups to enable analysis. The different perspectives hold differing missions and knowledge bases which in turn affect their respective understanding of the change and its purpose. In this study, we have divided perspectives according to two dimensions: program – project and business – IT.

The aim has been to understand how these different perspectives affect change implementation. We have interviewed individuals from multiple positions in the organization to understand their view on what is happening in the organization and how they relate to the various issues found in the change program. We have found that there are many instances where misunderstanding can arise because the stakeholders involved in the change lack mutual understanding of each other’s perspectives. When there is an imbalance between perspectives, IT-enabled change is likely to become an IT roll-out and not an IT-related organizational change.

We believe that when stakeholders of change broaden their awareness and understanding regarding the different perspectives that exist, they can enable coordination and cooperation between perspective groups. This will in turn help with successful change implementation.
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1 Introduction

In this first chapter, we will present the background to this study, key theoretical topics, and a brief empirical background illustrating the situation of the case company. We will then present the purpose of this study and pose our research questions.

1.1 Background

Change is an ever-reoccurring process of all corporations and organizations across the globe. Some changes are minor in scope, affecting only a few individuals. Examples of such changes include reformed working practices for a moment in a production line, or the introduction of new metrics within a support team. Other changes take the form of large projects, affecting whole departments in multiple nations, such as a major organizational restructuring, or the spread of reformed core values within the organization (Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986).

Regardless of the scope, change is most often evoked as an adjustment or response to some internal or external inconstant factors (Tushman et al., 1986). As new technologies are made available to the public, companies seek to adapt to the changing environment (Baden-Fuller & Volberda, 1997; Mason & Spring, 2011). The development of information technology (IT) in recent decades is of particular interest to this paper, as it has sparked a debate and research on how, and why, IT should be applied and implemented in an organizational context.

1.1.1 The application of IT

There may be several reasons for why an organization might want to implement the use of a new IT system (Iveroth, 2012). The organization might see a new system as an opportunity to lower costs by consolidating existing functions, increase communication efficiency between teams by standardizing the software employed (Westelius, 2006b), or increase the performance of a sales team by implementing the use of a customer relationship management (CRM) system. Also, some organizations might feel compelled to adapt the use of certain types of systems that are widespread in the industry as not to risk being outperformed by competitors in the future (Carr, 2003). All things considered, the occasional change of internal IT systems might be desirable, and can frequently constitute a necessity for the continuation of the organization.

While it is clear that new IT systems have created opportunities for organizations to improve upon themselves, it is not always as clear how these opportunities are reached (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). Sometimes it might seem like some decision maker believe that installing a new IT system is all there is to it, that the projected performance increase will materialize as soon as the software is made available to the employees to use. However, merely applying one or several IT systems is not a guarantee for the desired positive results to be achieved (Brown, Hagel, Varian, & Carr, 2003; Carr, 2003; Markus & Benjamin, 1997). Previous literature has highlighted a need for both the organization and individual managers to take a holistic approach when conducting a IT change (Valiente & Westelius, 2007), stating that not understanding the needs or processes of the affected organizational members can create problems for both implementation and future use (Suchman, 1995; Westelius, 2006b; Westelius & Märtensson, 2004). As such, organizations can gain much by using IT as a means to support the improvement of the working processes used by employees, rather than performing IT change as a goal in itself (Bensaou & Earl, 1998). When an IT system is acquired or replaced with the purpose of changing work processes we might label it as an IT-enabled change, i.e. it is not the change of IT systems that is
important, rather the focus is on changing processes to enable implementation of best practices. IT-enabled change is central to this paper and will be explained in greater detail in chapter 3, Literature review.

1.1.2 Perspectives in organizations
Owing party to the fact that affected individuals will in some way resist change, change is by its very nature a struggle to execute. Further complicating change within organizations is the fact that the affected individuals are likely to perceive the change in different ways (Westelius, 1996). Every individual is unique and has a mental map that has been formed during his or her lifetime by family, friends, education and occupation. This mental map shapes an individual’s view of what is important to achieve or how a process should be performed, which ultimately translates to the individual being the holder of a certain perspective. A perspective is “an ingrained way of perceiving the world” (Mintzberg, 1987, p. 18) that shape an individual’s view on processes, goals, and strategies. While perspectives are held by individuals, they can to a large extent be shared by members of a group (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995; Brown & Duguid, 1991; Daft & Lengel, 1986; Mintzberg, 1987).

Perspective can be shaped by an Individual’s community of knowledge (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995). Within an organization there might exists members that have specialized knowledge regarding certain topics and subjects. Together individuals that share the same specialized knowledge form different communities of knowledge. Boland and Tenkasi’s community of knowledge can be compared to how Mintzberg (1987) describes how individuals can be united by a common thinking and/or behavior using the term collective mind. As Mintzberg further explains, understanding the collective mind involves trying to understand “how intentions diffuse through the system called organization to become shared and how actions come to be exercised on a collective yet consistent basis” (Mintzberg, 1987, p. 17).

As (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995) writes, perspectives are not fixed, but are rather flexible entities capable of influencing each other over time. Mintzberg (1987) observe that perspectives are like cultures, that they in a short term are relatively fixed patterns. Just as context and situations change, perspectives, just like cultures, can be expected to adapt to the new conditions.

Complications might arise when individuals hold perspectives diverging enough for cooperation and coordination to be impeded (Daft & Lengel, 1986). This can arise from a conflict between interests and goals (Van de Ven & Sun, 2011), effectively obstructing coordination between parties, or originate from diverging perspectives on processes that thwart cooperation.

For example, a project manager overseeing the implementation of an IT system believes that for the system to be properly implemented, the end user will to a high degree be involved in testing. The users on the other hand would rather receive the system in its final form, and do not see any benefits from being involved in the testing. During the project, the end users are not willing to cooperate to the degree that the project manager desire. When the system finally goes live the users complain that features are missing or that work processes cannot be accomplished with the software. As a result of diverging perspectives on processes, the users missed a chance to improve upon the system before it went live.

1.1.3 The implementation of IT
In order to succeed with a change implementation, the work and time of several individuals have to be coordinated (Gregory, Keil, Muntermann, & Mähring, 2015). Generally, well-coordinated projects that
employ the full coordination of individuals involved are more likely to succeed (Hendriks, Voeten, & Kroep, 1999; Whitney & Daniels, 2013). Organizations implementing major change must apply a more complex structure in order to successfully coordinate the work of everyone involved (Hobday, 2000). Organizations might divide different parts of the work into subprojects, and coordinate all projects under the umbrella of a program (Gregory et al., 2015). Programs and projects are led by program managers and project managers respectively and have different responsibilities.

The dynamics of coordination and cooperation can seem simple in the terms of a minor project. However, adding additional layers such as program management to coordinate several projects will likewise increase the number of different perspectives involved. It is generally understood that individuals on the receiving end of a change have different perspective on processes than the project manager (Westelius, 2006a), the latter likely required to employ the use of various project management tools such as Gantt-schedules. The same goes for the comparison of project manager and program manager, and while the two share some commonalities of processes their respective goals are different. The project manager is looking to the best interest of assigned project and the program manager striving to balance the interests of several projects and the organization.

Imagine a small change consisting of a single project member and with the intention of changing the working processes of a group of middle managers by instructing them in the use of a certain practice (e.g. Lean Six Sigma). First, while the project only has a single member, the middle managers are involved in the project as receivers of change, and the work of the two groups should be coordinated, e.g. by scheduling workshops. The receivers should cooperate with the project member in some way, as no cooperation is equal to the total abstaining of taking part in the learning process. So, for the change to have even a minor chance of success, both the coordination and cooperation between the two groups should be present to some degree. Second, the teacher might be a middle manager, just like the receivers, who volunteered to lead the proposed change of work practices. However, while the perspectives might be similar as the individuals ordinarily perform the same type of work, they are relatively different in the scope of the change project. The teacher, by definition, has a goal of teaching, while the students should learn.

1.1.4 Empirical background
The increased globalization in the world can open opportunities for corporations to expand their market by increasing their global presence. Some corporations choose to grow to new markets by acquiring and integrating local companies into their organization. This way of expansions causes the organization to consist of multiple subsidiaries with different organizational cultures, values, processes and systems. To integrate these subsidiaries into a unified organization requires lengthy change that is complicated by internal factors such as resistance and organizational inertia. This was the case for the company that is involved in this study, which we will in study name as the Company.

The Company is a large, global corporation that is active in 150 countries, with a workforce of around 16’000 employees, and a software infrastructure that includes a few hundred different systems. The size of the organization increases the scope and the complexity of implementing change. The Company is a corporate group that has grown through acquisitions and mergers which has resulted in a corporation that contains multiple organizational cultures, values, processes and systems. Keeping true to their decentralized management style, newly acquired subsidiaries have been allowed to keep their own pre-existing IT systems. That each subsidiary has their own IT system makes it even more difficult to
coordinate operations for upper management as there is no unified way of working and information is managed in different ways in different parts within the organization.

To combat management difficulties while at the same time reduce risks and costs related to having a too varied software infrastructure, the company have started an internal change. Since a few years back the company has aimed to reduce the total number of systems employed in the organization, from several hundred down to five, by rolling out a corporate wide suit of systems. The systems suit will be standardized so that subsidiaries will be working with the same systems and information, which management believes will enable the different subsidiaries to adopt similar processes, making it easier to transfer of information across borders. The systems will also be integrated, further enabling the flow of information between different departments, operations and levels within the organization. This strategy will from now on be called the Company Integrated System strategy, or CIS.

The organizational structure is complex and there are many parties involved in the change; management team in the US, IT implementation teams in Sweden, local subsidiaries around the globe, as well the system providers and affiliated consulting firms. This means that there are lots of breakpoints for communication and high risks of conflicts of interest.

The fundamental aim of changing to a more integrated organization by having every subsidiary use the same systems and processes are divided into multiple, and often parallel, projects, according to system and country (or geographical area). One implementation project of a system at a subsidiary can take multiple years to complete and does not create value until the system is live.

Implementing this change includes the cooperation of several divisions, both IT and commercial, each answering to the Chief Intelligence Officer (CIO) and Chief Marketing Officer (CMO) respectively. The commercial departments work with the processes to modify and improve upon them. The IT department creates IT solutions that fulfil business requirements and offer support services post-implementation of a system. The project of implementing systems at local subsidiaries has commonly been driven by the IT department, with them being responsible for the budget and planning of the projects.

The organization is spread across the globe with the Company’s management team located in the US. The Company’s management team therefore must rely on support from the local subsidiaries when implementing change. The local view on how to run a project and what the project should result in does not necessarily coincide with the view of the Company’s management team. This has implications for how global and local needs tie-in with each other.

The IT department in Sweden is tasked with implementing and supporting the IT-enabled change program. They are responsible for finding system requirements, implement, and support the various IT systems. The overall change is complex as every IT system is implemented in separate projects but is required to be combined with operational processes as well as connected to other systems. This has meant that there is a requirement for cooperation and coordination between both departments and projects.

1.1.5 Problem description
The CIS change is a large scale, complex change that involves multiple systems, projects, and subsidiaries globally. We believe that it is vital that the Company is able to coordinate both projects and
departments as well as make sure that the stakeholders involved are able to cooperate efficiently. To do that the people managing the change should make sure that the people involved in and affected by the change, understands and are committed to the change (Kotter, 1995). People not realizing the need for change and creating resistance is one of the most common reasons for fail to change (Lewin, 1947). To manage the change they should also see to it that the people involved in the change can reach a consensus regarding the goals and change delivery means (Chang, Jiang, Klein, & Wang, 2014).

As mentioned before, we believe that all parties that are affected by the change have their own viewpoints, needs, requirements, and goals, which if not managed might impede cooperation and coordination. How people act and react is based on their previous experiences and knowledge bases (Ko & Kirsch, 2017). To execute change successfully there is a need to understand how these different viewpoints consociate and impede each other.

The various issues that have emerged the Company show that large IT-enable change programs are complex, and we can assume that the multiple perspectives involved is part of this complexity. The dynamics of programs and projects have previously been studied to some degree (Gregory et al., 2015), as has the effect of perspectives in communication (Westelius, 1996). And while the technical knowledge and business knowledge of IT project managers has been studied (Ko & Kirsch, 2017), we have seen little research explaining the dynamics of both IT and Business perspective interaction within a program frame of reference. How can we better come to understand the interactions between perspectives and its implication on defining the success or failure of major IT-enabled change programs?

1.2 Purpose
Our paper builds on the knowledge that change in organizations most often mean that some issues have to be resolved. We believe that cooperation and coordination between individuals is essential to achieve if a change is to succeed.

Our purpose is to explore if different perspectives within an organization affect cooperation and coordination during a global IT-enabled change program.

We want to discern and understand the different perspectives associated with individuals involved in, or affected by, an IT-related organizational change. We want to explore how the perspectives differ between internal groups, how the perspectives relate to each other, and how a lack of alignment between perspectives could cause complications for companies performing change. By analyzing the tensions during change, we can provide information that may be useful for managing global IT-enabled change programs.

1.3 Research questions
In order to fulfil the purpose of this study and to bring clarification to our answer, we have formulated three research questions.

1. What groupings of perspectives can we discern?

During a major organizational change, there are many stakeholders to consider. However, actually considering the perspectives of all stakeholders is both complex and time consuming. As with
stakeholders, considering all theoretically available issues is practically impossible, and it follows that we have to know what issues to consider when comparing perspectives. There is therefore the question of how stakeholders and their subsequent perspectives should be grouped. So, considering an IT-enabled change program, we have to decide a) which perspective groups are relevant to compare between, and b) which issues and perspectives are relevant to compare? We will use these perspectives as a way to structure data for further analysis.

2. How do the perspective groups differ?

Before we can start any discussion of whether or not contradicting perspectives affect the change process, we have to know how, and if, the perspective groups differ. We hope to gather clear examples that can instigate thoughts and questions. Using the answers gained from the previous question as a base, we can systematically compare perspectives pertaining to relevant issues.

3. How can differences in perspective affect a change?

When we have managed to elicit some of the many viewpoints that differ between perspectives, we may use the viewpoints in our analysis and discussion to broaden our understanding of perspectives during change. We hope to be able to relate and discuss the correlations between perspectives’ viewpoints and various issues and complications that we are able to find in the empirical setting.

1.4 Scope

As the master thesis is about strategy and management we have chosen not to focus on aspects that are relevant only for IT projects. Rather, aspects supporting the understanding of hybrid change (i.e. change with individuals from both operations and IT departments involved) are the main focus. These concepts will be defined in the Literature review.

The focus perspectives of this study exist in a change that involves multiple projects and IT systems, as well as the simultaneous change of both business operations and IT systems in a corporation. We call this an IT-enabled change program. During this study, we will analyze the changes, complications, and situations that exist given the frame of a change program, in contrast to a single project.

Given the time scope of this thesis project and the large scope of the change that is being analyzed, we will only collect empirical data from a single company. The study is not a longitude study and we do not hope to construct a complete data set of all individuals involved in the change. Neither will we search for empirical information from actors not directly involved in the change, such as external customers, governments, consultants etc. The resulting empirical findings will be limited in its general use. However, by spending time on collecting data from a single change process the data we can also collect can be more in depth from which we can infer more detailed explanations. This and other methodical choices will be discussed at greater length in chapter 2, Methodology.

As the focus of the thesis is on the strategic implementation of a specific change program we have chosen not to evaluate, or analyze, the case company’s strategy formation, strategies regarding other parts of their business operation, or their business model in general. We have also chosen not to evaluate the case company’s project leadership and specific project management processes.
2 Methodology

In this chapter, we will explain the research methodology and our reasons for choosing it. We will start out by describing our research approach. This is followed by a description of our choice of research strategy and how this study is conducted, including our processes and methods for collecting theoretical and empirical data. The reader will also get an understanding of how we create, and apply, our analytic processes and tools.

2.1 Research approach and design

The main goal of the study is to understand and relate perspectives, held by different individuals, to each other in order to understand how they might affect IT-enabled change programs. In order to answer the research questions, we need to look for patterns connecting individual events and processes. As the intention is to generate further understanding of possible relationships between perspectives and change effect, in contrast to describing or verify to what degree certain perspectives affect change, this paper will be exploratory in nature.

From previous courses in our education, we as researchers have attained a basic understanding of several relevant subjects (e.g. corporate strategy, change management, and project management), but do not feel confident enough to propose a full hypothesis to research. In order to generate a concluding answer, we will therefore rely on empirical data and our observations to lead our research. In other words, because we are seeking to understand patterns rather than to confirm an existing theory or hypothesis, analysis and propositions will be performed as an inductive study (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007).

In this study we will strive to let our research be guided by observation. As this choice call for a flexible approach to dealing with information, we will most likely not be able to clearly define any specific data sets. We have therefore chosen to apply qualitative research design to answer the research questions, and we believe the approach is better suited to fulfil the exploratory nature of this study compared to a quantitative design. Primary data will to a large degree consist of interviews, but will also include internal reports and first-hand observations collected in collaboration with the Company. The assessment and analysis will be formative in nature as we will explore the nature of projects and processes in close relationship with the Company.

2.2 Grounded theory as research strategy

Even in qualitative research there is a need for structure (Berson, Avolio, & Kahai, 2003a; Corbin & Strauss, 2015, Chapter 5). And while there is a balancing act between rigidity and flexibility, we believe that applying an analytic strategy can assist us in avoiding overlooking something that might be significant and guide us in our research. In order to fulfil our requirement of relying on data and observations to guide us in this study we choose to follow some of the guidelines described in the methodology of grounded theory. We do not fully adhere to the guidelines of grounded theory, as that would imply that the goal of this study it to generate new theory (see section 2.2.1 below). Instead, we draw on the basic principles of grounded theory as described by Strauss (Corbin & Strauss, 2015), which, in contrast to the Glaser school of grounded theory, embraces a higher degree of formalization (Urquhart, Lehmann, & Myers, 2010) that should support our need for basic research structure.
2.2.1 What is grounded theory

Grounded theory is a qualitative methodology that was developed by researchers Glaser and Strauss in 1967 as a way of describing how to use data to support the generation of theory (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Urquhart et al., 2010). According to the authors, the observations and data is supposed to decide the direction of the research, ultimately leading to a theory that is closely linked to the derived data. As the methodology rubs out the line separating data collection and interpretation, the scholar is required to apply a flexible mind set when conducting research. While we will strive to use data as a guiding tool in this study, we are not seeking to fully develop a theory. We do however believe that by using grounded theory methodology we can get a broader understanding of the concepts inherent in the type of situation under investigation.

Grounded theory is not a rigid set of methods or directives. However, an important aspect of grounded theory is how the end result is different from other types of research methodology in both what it contains and its apparent relationship to the data. According to grounded theory, analysis and theory generation is carried out in close interaction with data, with the concluding results being a representation of the researchers’ interpretation of data. As stated by (Corbin & Strauss, 2015):

Analysis involves working with data. Analysis is the act of taking data, thinking about it, and denoting concepts to stand for the analyst’s interpretation of the meaning intended by the participant. (p. 88)

Grounded theory requires the scholar to consider many different aspects and perspective relevant to the research topic. The methodology will enable the researcher to formulate comprehensible explanations that “not only tells what happens but also offers explanations” (Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 153). The literature explaining and describing grounded theory presents the reader with central terminology, structural requirements, general processes, and suggest analytic methods. In the following subsections, we discuss some of these aspects.

2.2.2 Central terminology

Forming the backbone of a grounded theory is its concepts (See Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 77). Concepts are words chosen to stand for the meaning of data as interpreted by the researcher. In order to provide a greater degree of structure to a theory, some concepts can be more abstract than others and be used to explain groups, or categories, of more basic concepts. Corbin & Strauss (2015) distinguish between different levels of abstraction, see Figure 2-1. Closest in abstraction level to the data are the lower-level concepts, which act as the foundation of any grounded theory. Categories are broader concepts, or themes, that can accommodate several lower-level concepts within its explanatory field of range. While being less specific than a lower-level concept, categories give its more detailed counterparts extra meaning. For example, a plane can be categorized as either something that flies or as a vehicle. Depending on the chosen category, our perception of how to relate the concept to other concepts is altered. Corbin & Strauss (2015) uses the term core category as the most broad concept that should, in a few words, encompass the main ideas of the study.
For concepts to actually form a grounded theory, various links and relationships has to be expanded upon (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Urquhart et al., 2010). The paradigm is an analytic tool developed by Strauss that highlights the importance of links between conditions, actions-interactions, and consequences (Corbin & Strauss, 2015). In order for the paradigm to be useful in developing theory, it and its contents must be placed within a context. Context is important to include in grounded theory as it helps explain the links between actions and consequences, supporting broader understanding rather than a verifying ideas.

Conditions, together with context, should explain the perceived reason, or reasons, behind a particular action-interaction and its resulting consequence or outcome. Note that the use of the word “perceived” imply that the description of a particular chain of condition – action-interaction – consequence originates from a certain perspective, and that other perspectives might give another description. The matrix for explanatory paradigm by Schatzman (as cited in Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 89) further enunciate this reasoning:

- (from) Perspective
- (attributes) Dimensions-properties
- (in) Context (under) conditions
- Action/process (with) consequences

2.2.3 Structural requirements
During analysis, a researcher employing grounded theory will have to conduct constant comparison of data in order to succeed with both coding and theoretical sampling. This is a major defining aspect of grounded theory, as described by Urquhart et al. (2010):

*The major difference between grounded theory and other qualitative research methods is its specific approach to theory development – grounded theory suggests that there should be a continuous interplay between data collection and analysis. (p. 357)*
For us as researchers it is important that we during analysis go back and forth between data and literature. As there might exist different meanings and explanations for a word, we will apply theoretical comparisons to make clear which meaning we intend to apply to a word or concept. This interplay also works as a calibration in that we use both literature and empirical findings to set our aim straight. For example, a particular statement given by an interview participant could trigger a need in us as researchers to search, or hunt, for explanations given in the literature that could support or help us understand the statement.

2.2.4 Processes and methods

During the grounded theory process, the first step is generating hunches, or seed concepts, that will lead to the area of inquiry (Urquhart et al., 2010). The seed concepts come from sources of data, both theoretical and empirical. In this paper, the literature we have gathered from previous courses will act as an initial guide (Walsham, 1995) and will, together with some preliminary empirical data (i.e. four pilot interviews and previous internal report), form the foundation of our seed concepts. Over time some seed concepts will evolve from merely being something of interest into something that in this study will require further inquiry. Individual seed concepts will not be further described in this paper as seed concepts, as this study focus on those seed concepts that made it from hunch to actual concept. However, as an example, we had an early hunch that individuals held differing explanations and interpretations regarding a given situation. Further inquiry into the subject in the literature helped us refine the concept. The seed concept later evolved into the concept of different perspectives shared among individuals shape their explanations and interpretations of event and processes.

After deciding upon a first area of inquiry the scholar starts with the main work of generating a grounded theory. The continuous interaction between raw data and researcher interpretation is divided into three general methods (Urquhart et al., 2010) – 1) Coding, 2) theoretical sampling, and 3) theoretical integration.

As previously explained, concepts form the backbone of any grounded theory. In order for the scholar to generate concepts explaining the studied phenomenon the method of coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Urquhart et al., 2010). Simply put, the researchers’ interpretation of data is coded into concepts and presented in one or a few words. Coding is used interchangeably with analysis. Furthermore, coding can be divided into different stages (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Urquhart et al., 2010): During open coding the aim is to identify concepts, while during axial coding the attributes and properties of concepts are fleshed out and given an added layer of explanation by taking context into account. Selective coding is the final stage of coding whereas concepts and categories are integrated and refined to form an emerging theory.

The method of theoretical sampling is a method of data collection used in close relationship with analysis in a circular process (Corbin & Strauss, 2015), as is shown in Figure 2-2. According to the method, data collected should lead to analysis and coding of concepts, which in turn should form the next iteration of data collection. During each iteration, questions are either generated or have to be revised, and based on what the analysis have produced the following data collection can lead to varying avenues of research and thought. As such, for each iteration the researcher decide where to “sample from next” (Urquhart et al., 2010, p. 371), which ultimately means that the researcher cannot, until late in the study, know what the end product will be. The method requires the scholar to stay flexible as the direction of research must be steered by data and not according to a preconceived plan. Data is added
until categories and concepts are saturated. For example, in this study we will try not to verify the thoughts attached to our perspectives groups (see chapter 5, Perspective typology). Instead, we only seek to get an indication of what thoughts and divisions there might be. As researchers, we have to decide when the concepts of perspective groups have been saturated to an adequate degree for it to serve as an indication useful for answering the research questions.

**Figure 2-2:** Circular relationship between methodology processes and results. Adapted from Corbin & Strauss (2015).

Finally, during theoretical integration we try to construct a broader understanding of the subject by comparing and integrating relevant literature with the evolving ideas. By merging different concepts and ideas we hope to form our concluding remarks and make clear what we have come to understand about the research subject of this study.

### 2.3 Literature review
There are many ways which theory can be used (Walsham, 1995), for example as an “initial guide to design and data collection” (Walsham, 1995, p. 76), or as “part of an iterative process of data collection and analysis” (Walsham, 1995, p. 76). The former is, in contrast to the latter, not usually part of grounded theory as it can disrupt the discovery process. In the continuous process of grounded theory, the data will be expanded upon using the literature to better help us understand the various concepts and elements as well as what might be missing.

The use of previous literature and research differ between grounded theory to that of other methodologies. In order to generate grounded theory, the direction of the study needs to be steered by the data rather than previous research. The researcher therefore has to balance the use of literature, as not to let existing research block interesting avenues of research. It is particularly during the initial part of the study that the researcher should ask themselves how literature influences their work. As Corbin & Strauss (2015) stated:

> How can the literature be used to enhance rather than constrain analysis? (p. 49)
During the initial empirical studies, we generated some basics concepts on which to base further inquiries. We will look for sources that might give us more insight into the basic concepts and guide us in further research by supplying us with questions. In later stages, the literature will be used to enhance sensitivity, provide descriptive material, stimulate analytic questions, and provide comparisons to evaluate or verify our findings. And even though we are novices of research, we believe our interpretation of previous research and the studied organization has its value. As told by (Corbin & Strauss, 2015):

Though readers of research place their own interpretations on data, the fact that these are constructions and reconstructions does not negate the relevance of findings nor the insights that can be gained from them. (p. 26)

We do have some knowledge of the research area, and while we are not experts, we do have ideas and hypothesizes that might cause a problem if we are to follow the grounded theory methodology (Urquhart et al., 2010, p. 359). However, our ideas and hunches have all been created since discussions started with the Company about undertaking a possible master thesis. If these initial discussions are seen as part of our study, we can conclude that we did not bring any preconceived ideas that might have otherwise disturbed our theory generation.

A major difficulty is the selection of literature. Grounded theory tells the practitioner to be sceptic of established theories (Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 10) but one should not outright dismiss research that doesn’t comply to ones wishes. No single model holds universal truth and all have been invented by humans. It is not possible to review all literature pertaining to the subjects at hand, so the question follows – how do we know if an article is a good source? The literature will be evaluated with regards to its age, quality of journal, number of citations, and applicability on the research subject.

The literature review will include research mainly from the subjects of strategy, organization, and organizational change. The range of theoretical material will be based on scientific articles and literature employed by the authors in previous coursework, and will be expanded using mainly electronic databases provided by Linköping University, Google, and Mendeley. Pages with user created content, such as Wikipedia, forums or blogs, will not be used.

2.4 Empirical data collection

In order to answer the research questions, we study the phenomena of IT-enabled change within a multinational corporation performing both a global IT system implementation and business process change. The empirical data will be constructed primarily by formal internal documentation found in the organization as well by interviews of both current and former employees.

The study is used to shed light on patterns related to the presence of dissimilar perspectives within a change. We hope to learn more about how and if the organization has previously encountered any of them. As such, the empirical study will be performed as to aid both in reality constructing and meaning-making. The interviews will be conducted during the first half of the study but will include discussions of events or processes that have taken place since the first proposals of change were put forward some five years ago. The same holds true for internal documents. Documents that were created more than five years ago will be disregarded.
Our method of data collection must be flexible but still enable us to get answers to a few core questions. The interviews will be semi-structured in order to elicit experience and thoughts relevant to the area of inquiry (Schultze & Avital, 2011). In the beginning, the interviews will be more exploratory and less structured. As we begin to triangulate the areas of interests, the interviews will become more structured. We believe that the *laddering interviews* laid out by Schultze & Avital (2011) suits the needs of this paper. The interviews will be semi-structured and rely on the participants’ definitions of the issues and major decisions. The role of the researcher will be to provide structure to the interview by giving examples and probe, to seek patterns and structures in their explanations, asking questions such as “why is this important?”, “is your interpretation shared by others”, or “who might have an opposing interpretation?” We will compare and contrast the interpretations to get an understanding of the various concepts, while also seeking to understand their means-end chain in order to understand what they find important.

A number of interviews are conducted using teleconference systems as meeting the participants face-to-face was not feasible due to distance of separation. Using teleconference systems allowed both researchers to state questions and take an active part in the discussions. However, the system rendered it impossible to observe any physical response to questions, leaving only the verbal answer as material.

We do not believe it is possible to retrieve the various ideas and interpretations an individual may have to share within a short time span, and we refrain from quickly passing initial judgment vis-à-vis the insights we gain from an interview. During interviews, it usually takes the participant half an hour to get past the basic narrative that is given and shared by the organization, and to the personal opinions and explanations. As such, longer interviews are usually better suited to the task of elevating the information we seek to understand. However, we will not be able to perform long interviews with the participants due to time restraints. We therefore seek to perform interviews that are at least 45 minutes long, with the maximum set by the participants. During this time, we hope to gather enough information so that we during the analysis can get an indication of spread of thoughts and interpretations. For this study getting an indication of spread is enough to support our research questions. Also, verification of spread would require a research design leaning towards quantitative.

The first phase of interviews will be used to generate distinctions between concepts that can be explored in the following interviews. Questions will become more articulated over time as concepts are formed. There will however still be a core set of questions that will enable us to describe the context and relationship of collected data.

In this study, we will use RQ1 (see page 5), as an analysis tool to answer RQ2 and RQ3. The implication is that we early in the study need to generate an embryo of possible perspective groups (see chapter 5, Perspective typology). To get an adequate spread of answers, so that we more likely to receive different sets of narratives and explanations, interviewees will partly be chosen based on possible group affiliation. Some individuals might have attributes that may make them hard to classify according to a certain perspective. Any such individual is put within the proper perspective groups after the interview has taken place, and the arrangement of succeeding interview participants might have to changes to ensure an adequate spread across groups.

There is the possibility that we as researchers apply subjective judgment when deciding what data to include and how it is described. Researcher error and bias such as *ambiguity of language*, *constructing knowledge* and *elite bias* might negatively affect to which degree our observation of reality is correct.
and accurate (Gibbert, Ruigrok, & Wicki, 2008; Myers & Newman, 2007). Certain pitfalls such as lack of trust, lack of time, and level of entry might prove difficult to affect as researchers, while still affecting the answers we receive (Ibid.). We will record the interviews to minimize researcher error. However, the transcripts will not be published, but we will attach the interview guides as an appendix to improve transparency and replicability.

Possible pitfall related to incorrect observation of reality is that we as researchers are working in close proximity to interview participants, i.e. we are internal researcher, and will influence the answers of the interviewee (Klein & Myers, 1999; Myers & Newman, 2007). We are unintentionally constructing knowledge as interview participants formulate their answers in response to our questions. We hope to mitigate this pitfall by performing semi-structured interviews and by allowing interviewees more freedom in steering the story. There is also the possible pitfall of ambiguity of language related to both interview questions and written description in the report. When there is a possible ambiguity in interviews, we will try to restate the question with different wording. The interviews will also be recorded in audio format and listened to at a later date. We can at that time go back to the participant to clarify out any ambiguous or unclear answers.

As we are working in close proximity with a certain group of employees within the Company, it is easy to overlook the input of other groups. We include in our interviews several employees involved in a certain type of IT systems (front-end systems). The answers we receive are likely to have a certain focus, and there is a risk that our underlying understanding of the processes being undertaken is shaped accordingly (Klein & Myers, 1999). In our study, we will strive to create a basic understanding of the situation not based on group biases by taking into account internal documents from created and used by numerous groups and departments. We will try to avoid elite bias (Myers & Newman, 2007) by inviting members from different levels and departments. We’ve looked at several projects and talked to both current and former project participants.

A lack of trust of interviewees towards the interviewer can also lower construct validity as sensitive information might not be conveyed (Myers & Newman, 2007). Interviewees might not want to reveal sensitive information while the recorder is on. During interviews, a lack of time could also affect the answers given as a strict schedule could limit the data. The pressure might also enable a large amount of data that however might be unreliable. The answers will also be affected by the level of entry of the researcher. For example, as we enter the organization per IT department invitation, we could have an easier time interviewing IT department employees compared to sales employees. Furthermore, because we were invited by employees at a middle manager level, it might prove more difficult for us to get in contact with senior managers.

We will conduct our research and examination of a single company, which will limit the generalizability of the study. However, we believe the Company is a good match as they have a grasp of the problems related to change, but is still not able to execute the change without problems. This sort of dilemma is most likely common in the industry, which makes the study more representative. There are some particular deviations related to context that we will try to illustrate as to make it easier for the reader to evaluate the generalizability of the study. We will also analyze several projects, both current and past, in order to mitigate any circumstantial evidence.

Affording to the lack of time and choice of strategy our empirical sample size will be relatively small. As we are only taking into account the stories of a few employees, it will be difficult for us to state that the
answers given are true representations of the examined groups. However, while the goal was never to verify the representations, indications is enough, it does imply that that the conclusions of this study should only be seen as guidance for future research and not a perfect interpretation.

2.5 Analysis
In order to answer the research questions, this study will be performed by exploring the relevant theoretical fields and applying an inductive approach coupled with a qualitative design. As we do not strive to confirm any existing theory, and instead seek to form our own idea based on observation, it is implied that triangulation, using multiple sources of information analyzed from different angles, is necessary (Berson, Avolio, & Kahai, 2003b; Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007; Parry, 2003; Urquhart et al., 2010).

We hope to provide transparent descriptions of patterns that will reduce the risk of confusing correlation with causality. In this study, we will strive to achieve a high level of pattern matching (Gibbert et al., 2008) by relating our finding to literature. However, we must also ask some questions related to grounded theory, such as how are we formed by previous concepts? What can we do as not be used by the literature in contrast to using it ourselves? If we use concepts that exist in the literature we have to ask ourselves why we are using the concepts. Are the concepts fully compliant with the findings or are we drawn to them out of previous familiarity? We hope that grounded theory and our previous explanations will support us when it comes to theory triangulation. However, due to researcher bias there is always the possibility that we fail to adopt the correct perspectives that would otherwise enable verification of findings.

During the analysis, we need to pursuit an interpretation of the perspectives groups that gives an indication of interpretations, and which are useful for answering the research questions. While we will listen to what participants tell us about theirs and other groups, their statements will not decide the respective perspectives. Instead, we as researchers will construct an interpretation based on the whole of our observations. We conduct our analysis by going back and forth between empirical data and theoretical literature in the processes of coding.

As we are two researchers we are able to discuss and compare the different perspectives and data found as to, little by little, form our own interpretation of the situation. After each interview we discuss the information presented by the interview participant. At a later date each audio recorded interview is revisited, during which important passages such as valuable information, quotes, or relevant examples are marked using proper software. When the data has been revisited we write down our combined understanding of the interview in a separate document. After all interviews have been revisited in this way, we are able to compare and analyze the answers against each other to seek a deeper pattern. The interviews within each perspective group are compared and analyzed, before being summarized in a document to enable easier comparisons between the different perspective groups. Our results will be formed mainly by this final comparison and analysis.

The grounded theory methodology states that results are heavily influenced by the researchers’ personal way of reasoning (Corbin & Strauss, 2015; Urquhart et al., 2010). As it follows that different researchers might use different way of reasoning and reach different conclusions, replicability of answers is not guaranteed. We will try to mitigate this by allowing the empirical data to guide us and be sure only follow paths for which we see clear casual relationships between data and conclusion. Also,
concepts and interpretations are constructed in a joint effort of both researchers. By discussing observations back and forth we hope to reach a conclusion that is both interesting and credible.

2.6 Ethics
For us as researchers it is important to not abuse the trust granted to us. With regards to the ethics of this study, we are inspired by the standards laid out by Myers & Newman (2007) who discuss the importance of the researcher receiving consent and permission from participant, respecting the time and value information given by participants, while also fulfilling commitments to individuals and organizations.

When obtaining material for use in the paper, for example by performing interviews, we will make sure that the participant is aware of what they are giving us and that we have their permission to use said material. We will also do our utmost to show respect to all people we may encounter in the organization, regardless of their participation in the study. We will respect the time and knowledge of interview participants before, during and after the interviews.

We shall strive to respect the confidence of our interview participants and the host company. A major concern is knowledge or comments that could inflict harm on any individual or the host company. As such, the report will be anonymous and references to individuals will be written as generable as possible. No individuals will be identified by name or position. Instead, in the text and in comments, participants will be identified by their typology affiliation. In the case where there are only a few specific participants that can be identified by a description, extra care will be taken to ensure that any included comments, which might otherwise cause negative repercussions, does not reveal the identity of the participant.

We will respect the time willingly given by interviewees as they participate in this study. We will also respect them by equal value on any information they share with us. As this is a qualitative study we strongly believe that any data received is worth taking into account as it adds to the general views and perspectives. This is important not only from an ethic standpoint, but also from a validity standpoint as to mitigate researcher bias.
3 Literature review

The purpose of this chapter is to give the reader an understanding of the theoretical aspects needed to answer our research questions. We will look at four major subjects. First, what is change, how might it be performed, and how is it perceived by individuals. Second, what is IT-enabled change and what parties are involved during implementation. Third, how is change structured to achieve coordination between multiple interdependent projects within a global organization. Finally, what other aspects are there that can affect successful change implementation that we need to be aware of.

3.1 Types of change

There are many ways to classify change and when analyzing a large organizational change, it can be useful to understand what type of change you are analyzing. In this part, we are focus on different types of change; planned change, unplanned change, evolutionary change, revolutionary change, life cycle change, and dialectic change. We will briefly describe the different types of change. We will describe what they imply. We describe how to relate the types to each other. We describe how and when the types might occur.

Nahavandi (2015) describes different types of changes in her book *The Art and Science of Leadership*. Some changes are carefully planned and executed by leaders that are well prepared beforehand. Other changes catch leaders and employees by surprise and they have to react without any preparation.

Nahavandi (2015) compiled change into four categories:

- **Planned change** is change that occurs when leaders or followers make conscious effort to change in response to a specific intention or problem.
- **Unplanned change** is change that occurs randomly and suddenly without the specific intention of addressing a problem.
- **Evolutionary change** is gradual or incremental change.
- **Revolutionary or frame breaking change** is change that is rapid and dramatic.

Changes can either be slow, and have a minor impact on the organization, or be drastic and mean that the organization have to change the fundamental way they work. Even though many organizations analyze their environment and internal conditions in order to foresee changes and then plan for a specific choice of action they still face changes they did not expect. In addition, both planned and unplanned changes may happen, either gradually or rapidly, and lead to either minor or drastic implications for the organization.

The definitions of planned change and unplanned change are quite straightforward and depend, as the name suggests, on whether the change was planned beforehand. Planned change is preferred as the organization can prepare for the change and the change is therefore more likely to succeed. Van de Ven & Sun (2011) describes in their article *Breakdowns in Implementing Models of Organization Change* planned change, or teleological change theory, as an entity that strives to reach a desired state through an iterative process containing goal formulation, implementation, evaluation, and modification of the goals based on lessons learned or original intentions. There is not necessarily a specific sequence of steps that has to be followed. A teleological viewpoint assumes that people initiate efforts to change when significant opportunities, problems, or threats arises that makes the people unhappy with their current situation. Teleological processes, or planned changes, often fail because not everybody involved...
realizes the need for change, or there is never a consensus about the goals and actions. Planned change is most useful when an organization is moving towards a common goal. It is important to note that even if the set goals are reached during the change, there is nothing that guarantees that the situation will stay as it is (Nahavandi, 2015); Forces from outside, or within, the organization might affect the situation and create a new need for a different change.

While planned and unplanned change describes how the change is initiated, evolutionary change is used to describe how the change is implemented and extends upon the two former types of change. According to Tushman et al. (1986), as they write in their article *Convergence and upheaval: managing the unsteady pace of organizational evolution*, there are two types of evolutionary change. When a company is doing well it focus on working on what they are good at. They do this by either finely adjusting their strategy to fit their mission and their organization, or making incremental adjustments due to changes in the organization’s environment. During evolutionary changes, the organization is experiencing a period of stability, where there is no need for drastic changes in the organization. These periods of stability might be a risk for the company as it could lead to internal forces that strive to keep this stability and make the organization unable to adapt when a need for change arises. Organizational norms, culture, and company history bind the company to traditional patterns and make the company less able to react to changes. According to Van de Ven & Sun (2011) *evolutionary process theory* can be a result of competition between entities, such as different departments, over limited resources.

*Revolutionary change*, on the other hand, is less about making incremental adjustments and more about making quick adjustments. Tushman et al. (1986) mentions three types of backgrounds that might result in a revolutionary change in an organization:

1. Discontinuity in the industry: Larger changes in legal, political or technical preconditions, such as new manufacturing procedures, changes in the legal system, an introduction of new systems, or an economic crisis.
2. Changes in a life-cycle: Different states of a product or systems life-cycle require different strategies.
3. Internal dynamics in the company: If the company’s structure and processes changes radically so it no longer fits the strategy, the strategy needs to change. This might happen because the company is growing and needs a new type of governance or information system, a key person might quit, or the company’s owners changes the portfolio- and corporate strategy so that the organization’s vision, resources or role in the market changes.

A revolutionary change is driven by a change in strategy (Tushman et al., 1986). To keep the strategy congruent with the organization the organizational structures, employees, and processes needs to adapt to this new strategy. Typical revolutionary changes are (Tushman et al., 1986):

- Change in the company mission or core values.
- Change in power balance in the organization.
- Reorganization and changes is structures, system and processes.
- Changes in patterns of interaction.
- New leaders and managers.

According to Tushman et al. (1986), a revolutionary change should be carried out as fast as possible. The authors mention a few key points behind their reasoning that a short change process is to be sought.
First, it restricts the time in which any possible resistance has time to build. Also, the company experience turbulence and instability due to the change during a shorter duration. And finally, the company is faster allowed to find and take advantage of any synergies that might occur between strategy, structures and processes. While Tushman et al. (1986) means that organizations should strive to reduce the duration during which it experiences change, depending on how large the change is and what impact the change has for the organization it is not always possible to implement a major change in a rapid (and qualitative) manner.

Van de Ven & Sun (2011) also describes two more types of change process theories not mentioned by Nahavandi; *Life cycle theory* and *Dialectic theory*. Life cycle theory depicts how an entity changes through a series of phases when each phase builds on the one before. The phases are predetermined through natural, logical, or institutional routines, and these routines are in turn based on earlier experiences and learnings from others. This model is best used when many returning and anticipated changes needs to be implemented effectively. It is common that a life-cycle change breaks down because the preconditions of the change are not interpreted the same way by the people involved in the change. Because of this it is important that both the people planning the change, and the people affected by the change is able to affect the change process. Other breakdowns could be unclear rules and resistance against change.

Dialectic process theory explains change as a result of conflicts between different entities in an organization. Stability and change is explained through the balance of power between these entities. A conflict that leads to a new balance of power results in change. For the change process to be constructive the conflict needs to be solved effective and breakdowns happen because of a defective conflict solving process. There are different models for an organization to manage conflicts: a third party could solve the conflict based on a predetermined set of rules or laws, a third party could mediate to find a common solution, the two parties in conflict can negotiate on their own.

The theories above describe changes as being planned or unplanned, evolutionary or revolutionary, life cycle-dependent, and/or conflict-dependent. The different change process models described by Nahavandi (2015), Tushman et al. (1986), and Van de Ven & Sun (2011) are ideal types and means to emphasize central aspects in complex series of events. As Lychnell (2010) writes in his doctoral thesis, there is often a need to use a combination of theories to give a more comprehensive explanation, especially to explain a large complex change.

### 3.1.1 Change process models

One of the most common theories describing the processes of planned change is Kurt Lewin’s change process theory (Lychnell, 2010). Lewin’s model of planned change includes three stages; the *unfreeze stage*, the *moving stage*, and the *freeze stage* (Lewin, 1947). During the *unfreeze stage* the change agents are preparing themselves and the organization for the coming change. Next, during the *moving stage* the actual change is performed and implemented. It is during this stage that most of the work processes described in project management literature takes place. Finally, during the *freeze stage* the change agents evaluate the performed change and determine if it was successful, as well as try to solidify the effects of the change.

As there are many ways of describing change processes we would like to discuss and relate them to each other to further understand what might be included in a change. Using Lewin’s (1947) three stages as
inspiration, in this study we will discuss the various strategies, tactics, and operational activities to be carried out during a successful change process according to three separate phases. We descriptively label the phases respectively as; 1) pre-implementation, 2) implementation, and 3) post implementation. We draw upon various authors to describe the phases.

3.1.1.1 Pre-Implementation
The first stage is according to Lewin the unfreezing phase, where the existing practices are questioned and a motivation for change is developed. One of the most important tasks for a manager when realizing change is making the employees realize the need for change. In this phase, the stable and inert structures in the organization are broken up, or unfreezed. This is to prepare the organization for the change implementation (Lewin, 1947).

According to Rogers' theory, (as cited by Batras, Duff, & Smith, 2016; Dibra, 2015; Mitchell, 2013), it is important to create awareness of the need for change in the organization. So, employees understand why a change is being implemented.

Both Lewin (1947) and Kotter (1995) then mean that it is very important that the change agents communicate the vision of why the change is implemented and what the change will result in to the organization. This corresponds to Rogers’s theory about creating awareness. Communication the vision is important to consolidate the change in the organization before the implementation starts. By spending time and effort in the pre-implementation phase the change agents can prepare the organization for the change, build up support and reduce opposition (Kotter, 1995; Lewin, 1947).

Before implementing a new change, the situation, eventual problems, and major opportunities need to be analyzed. By analyzing the situation, the change agents can create a sense of urgency (Kotter, 1995).

Before moving on to the implementation phase, Rogers' theory means that the change agents need to reach a decision point if they want to start the implementation of the change or if they need to postpone or reject the change (Batras et al., 2016; Dibra, 2015). The change might not be ready to be implemented or the organization is not ready to implement the change. As Aladwani (2001) writes the timing of the implementation is crucial for the change to succeed.

3.1.1.2 Implementation phase
By analyzing the change and communicate its vision and goals to the employees the change agents can prepare the organization for what Lewin (1947) calls the moving phase. This phase is the change itself, where new practices and processes are learned and new systems are implemented. The leader still needs to give support to the employees, emphasizing the need for change, and correct the course of change if needed.

Lippitt's theory means that the role of the change agents should be selected and clearly understood by all parties so that expectations are clear (Kritsonis, 2005). This coincides with Kotter’s (1995) phase of empowering others to act on the vision. With clearly defined roles and responsibilities the members of the organization can work together to implement the vision of the change. Empowering others to act on the vision also includes removing obstacles for change such as structures and systems that undermine the vision, but perhaps also members of the organization. Encouraging members of the organization to take risks and act on nontraditional ideas the change is another way of empowering others to act on a vision.
When implementing the ideas, strategies and action plans it is important to plan for, and the creating, short term wins. This should be an active process. By creating short term wins and recognizing and acknowledge the employees involved in the change the commitment to the change increases (Kotter, 1995).

During the implementation, Lippitt’s theory, as described in Kritsonis (2005) and Mitchell (2013), implies that it is important to maintaining the change. Communication, feedback, and group coordination are essential elements in this step of the change process. Lippitt’s maintaining the change stage is crucial because successful change can often regress to former, outdated practices (Mitchell, 2013). Kotter (1995) agrees with Lippitt that it is important to maintain, and consolidate, the change during the implementation process. Rogers’s theory, as described in (Mitchell, 2013), means that during the implementation phase the change agents should try to use trials to clarify the change, and then try to create an understanding and broad use of the change in the organization.

3.1.1.3 Post implementation
In the last phase of the change process, the phase that Lewin (1947) called the freezing phase, change agents can consolidate the change in the organization to make sure the change in systems and processes are adapted and properly used (Lewin, 1947). If no effort is spent on consolidating the change there is a risk that the change results in a negative net outcome as it does not produce the results the change agents were planning to achieve. During the freezing phase, the organization is refrozen and returns to its stable equilibrium structure. The processes and practices learned in the previous stage are encouraged and supported to become part of the employees’ routine activities and the organization’s core business (Dibra, 2015). In this stage the leaders provide resources, coaching, training, and appropriate rewards to help solidify the changes that have been implemented. The resources provided, either new or current, should be used to implement the change and freeze it in the organization by providing support both the change and the employees affected by it (Kotter, 1995; Lewin, 1947; Nahavandi, 2015).

It is important that the organizations give employees time to consolidate the change. Employees needs time to practice new behaviors long enough to learn them before something new is introduced (Nahavandi, 2015). Aladwani (2001) also mentions that the timing of introducing a new change is crucial for the outcome of the change.

During the post implementation phase the change agents should gradually terminate from the helping relationship. The change agent should gradually withdraw from their role over time. This will occur when the change becomes part of the organizational culture (Kritsonis, 2005; Mitchell, 2013).

The last step in the planned change process according to Nahavandi (2015), is to evaluate the change process as well as the outcome of the change and see if the intended objectives were met. Knowing the outcome of a change is difficult as it might take time for the gains are visible.

3.1.1.4 Summary of change process models
There is no right or wrong theory to change management, but by using a framework for planned change proactively rather than retrospectively can help eliminate some of the potential problems, and address and act on others (Mitchell, 2013). By using a combination of different change models, we hope to have a better theoretical background on which we can base our analysis on. The different models of planned change are depicted below.
### Table 3-1: Comparison of change process models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned change phases</th>
<th>Lewin</th>
<th>Nahavandi</th>
<th>Rogers</th>
<th>Lippitt</th>
<th>Kotter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Implementation</td>
<td>Unfreeze</td>
<td>Recognize need for change</td>
<td>Awareness/Agenda Setting</td>
<td>Diagnose the problem</td>
<td>Establish a sense of urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop ideas for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess motivation and capacity for change</td>
<td>Forming a powerful guiding coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Moving</td>
<td>Adopt one or more idea</td>
<td>Matching</td>
<td>Select progressive change objective</td>
<td>Empowering others to act on the vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement ideas</td>
<td>Evaluation/Redefining</td>
<td>Choose appropriate role of the change agent</td>
<td>Planning for and creating short term wins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trial/Clarifying</td>
<td>Maintain change</td>
<td>Consolidating improvements and producing still more change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-implementation</td>
<td>Freeze</td>
<td>Allocate resources</td>
<td>Adoption/Routinizing</td>
<td>Terminate the helping relationship</td>
<td>Institutionalizing new approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Batras et al., 2016; Dibra, 2015; Kotter, 1995; Kritsonis, 2005; Lewin, 1947; Mitchell, 2013; Nahavandi, 2015

### 3.2 IT-Enabled change

IT-enabled change is a process that crosses several functional lines (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). In this study, we will see IT-enabled change as a change that involves both the IT and business functions of an organization.

IT is not just a tool for automating existing processes (Iveroth, 2012). Instead, IT enables organizational changes that can lead to productivity gains. The rise of IT and globalization enable a company to implement a single Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, or other IT system, in the whole organization and all subsidiaries. This creates possibilities for integration and building a more uniform global company, a “one company” approach.

ERP implementation can result in a uniform database structure, standardization of practices, and vertical and horizontal integration that creates accountability and transparency (Iveroth, 2012). For the ERP system to function, physical activities connected to the ERP system has to be standardized and transformed into formal processes. These processes can then be integrated into the system.

When executing programs that have the purpose of integrating a global organization, IT can therefore be seen as a useful tool and IT-enabled change can be a way of executing the programs.

#### 3.2.1 The difficulties of coordination and cooperation in IT enabled change

Jiang, Chang, Chen, Wang, & Klein (2014) write that it is important when implementing change, to have a consensus among the stakeholders regarding the delivery means. Consensus regarding delivery means is the shared understanding regarding methods and procedures by key project members (Jiang et al., 2014). This can be difficult to achieve in projects with members from different departments that have separate knowledge bases.
As mentioned before, IT-enabled change is a process that crosses several functional lines (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). When the different functions involved in the change cannot reach an agreement regarding who is supposed to do each task, only luck or magic can produce the desired change outcome. In IT-enabled change there is often an emphasis of people focusing on their own prescribed roles. The problem is that people do not always perform their assigned roles in a satisfactory way. For example, line managers who championed the change lack commitment when they meet resistance from their subordinates. IT specialists sometimes steer projects into creating expensive proof-of-concepts for their new technology, even if this is not in line with the organization’s needs. When problems occur strong expectations regarding the roles in the change gets in the way of solving the problem. People keep to their responsibilities and because of “it is not my job” they do not work together to solve the problem. IT-enabled change can fail even if everybody is confident in that they performed their role satisfactorily.

IT-enabled change, in particular the changes involving IT infrastructure, come with expectations that the organization will function better after the change is implemented (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). Unfortunately, IT-enabled changes are often contentious and even laudable goals, such as reducing the total operating costs for the organization, can cause organizational conflicts. IT-enabled changes often fail because managers see IT as a tool that is, and is supposed to be, managed by the IT department (Iveroth, 2010). The principle is that whenever the “IT people” unleashes a new system or technology, change is spread in the organization automatically. Employees then simply adapts to the changes. Managers often think that IT will take care of itself once the IT department has implemented new changes. The thing is, IT is intimately interlinked with the organization and the daily work of its employees. Because of this, IT-enabled change involves managing both the IT itself as well as its social and organizational implications.

Theories regarding change management often remind us that organization’s way of behaving is because they have found that behavior successful in the past (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). Any IT changes that contains an idea of organizational change is therefore seen as a threat. Managers need to understand the needs or processes of the affected organizational members or it can create problems for both implementation and future use (Suchman, 1995; Westelius, 2006b; Westelius & Mårtensson, 2004).

When IT is used as intended it makes it easier for employees to perform using improved work practices, and well-built IT makes it more difficult for employees to use ineffective processes and methods (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). However, IT does not, and cannot, ensure that the employees will use IT as intended. In the end, only end users behaving mindfully can get effective use of IT. It is therefore imperative that the end users understand the need for the IT-enabled change.

IT can be seen as a scapegoat and an excuse by people in the business departments (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). When users understand the idea for the change but do not like it, they can avoid having to confront the issue directly. Instead of criticizing the change plan, and challenging the people that drives and believe in the change which is often management, the can criticize IT itself. Instead of reducing career or income prospects, they can instead say “We’d use this new technology to cut cost if we could, but this software is a real dog. Why do you not give us something that works?” (Markus & Benjamin, 1997, p. 60). They can also say “If you want to cut costs, why are you spending so much money on this useless IT?"
3.2.2 The different knowledge bases of IT enabled change

Within IT transformation projects and programs there is a border between business and IT domains. The two domains can be distinguished by the different knowledge and expertise required (Ko & Kirsch, 2017), as well as by the diverging interests held by members (Gregory et al., 2015).

IT project knowledge has traditionally assumed a clear border between business and IT (Ko & Kirsch, 2017). Managers for IT projects and programs has to frequently face the challenge of resolving business demands and IT requirements as well as to facilitate mutual accommodation of business and IT over time. To resolve demands from both business and IT the manager has to handle activities that require both technical and business knowledge. There is often a pressure on IT managers to meet business goals, which means settling for a “good enough” solution that fulfills short term goals. “Good enough” solutions mean that there is not enough time and resources spent in the project to deliver a long-lasting, high-quality solution.

IT and business people has completely different knowledge bases (Ko & Kirsch, 2017). This can cause problems in IT projects as it will be difficult for people from different organizations to reach a common understanding of the steps and tasks that are needed to complete the project. There might be a need for IT managers to acquire new knowledge to be able to understand the business’s needs and requirements given that the knowledge of business needs and requirements reside with the business community. In the same way, technical knowledge most often reside in the IT department. The people involved in IT projects therefore require context-specific knowledge (or business knowledge) and technology-specific knowledge (or technical knowledge). In a project where the project manager lacks business knowledge bases there will be greater transfer costs associated with moving business knowledge from the users to the project manager. Given that the end users play a significant role in the development process of the final solution, the project manager depends on them to gather and understand business requirements.

To successfully manage IT projects, there is a need for a hybrid project manager that is able to combine knowledge from two different knowledge bases. The picture below is adapted from Ko & Kirsch’s’ (2017) theory.
3.3 Coordination within organizations
Implementing global change in a multinational corporation is not something that happens overnight. Planned, large, and complex organizational changes are often implemented in easier to manage steps using multiple projects. These multiple projects aimed at realizing change can collectively be called a program.

This study revolves around a change where a large organization is changing many of the information systems that are being used in the organization. This involves many implementation projects that are being run in parallel in the organization. The concept of IT transformational programs is complex and in this section we hope to give some clarification.

3.3.1 Program management
Jiang, Chang, Chen, Wang, & Klein (2014) describes in their article Achieving IT Program Goals with Integrative Conflict Management, that traditional project management handles low-ambiguity situations where the deliverables, scope, and other parameters are clearly defined. Program management on the other hand is a methodology that enables organizations to deal with situations with high complexity and increased ambiguity. Ambiguity occurs when large numbers of possible solutions and stakeholders present no clear path on to reach defined business goals. Program management can be used to address this ambiguity to increase effectiveness of project management.

Definitions of programs and program management vary. Programs could be defined as groupings of projects, which may or may not include a coordinated management practice. In Managing successful programmes (The Office of Government Commerce, 2011, Chapter 1.2), programs are defined as a temporary flexible organization created to coordinate, direct and oversee the implementation of a set of
related projects and activities in order to deliver outcomes and benefits related to the organization’s strategic objectives. Programs can also be defined as groupings of projects aimed at focusing all activities to achieve a set of major benefits. These groups of projects are being managed in a coordinated way, to either achieve a common goal, or to create benefits that would not have been created had the projects been managed separately (Turkulainen, Ruuska, Brady, & Artto, 2015; Turner & Speiser, 1992). Program managers also have a more strategic role of providing a vision and leading change, while project managers focus more on directing tasks and reaching set objectives and short term goals (Walenta, 2016).

In this study, we will define program as a set of interrelated projects, which are managed on a global level in a coordinated manner to achieve a common goal and strategic objective which could not be reached if the projects were managed separately. We will also define projects as a temporary endeavor aimed at creating a planned outcome, within the limits of a specific scope.

3.3.2 IT Programs
Information technology (IT) programs are collections of projects to manage the use of technology in an organization and mainly applied to manage complex, ambiguous IT deployments (Jiang et al., 2014). IT transformation programs are aimed to achieve IT based competitiveness by triggering IT-enabled change in the organization. These programs are complex and involve the partnering of IT and business. Within an IT transformation program, prioritization, sequencing, and other types of coordination and control activities help ensure that the IT projects are aligned to the strategic organizational objectives (Gregory et al., 2015).

According to Gregory et al. (2015), IT projects is typically involving a single information system (IS) and most often focused on delivering a defined output while adhering to specific budget and time constraints. IT programs, on the other hand, are broader and typically encompass a coordinated set of interrelate IT projects. Within an IT program, prioritization, sequencing, and other types of coordination and control activities help ensure that the IT projects are aligned to the strategic organizational objectives.

Programs provide a connection between projects and organizational strategy. However, whereas the definition of projects demand accompanying goals to be specified with respect to output and timeline, programs do not necessarily have a clearly defined deliverable or a finite time limit, as written by Turkulainen, Ruuska, Brady, & Artto (2015) in their article Managing project-to-project and project-to-organization interfaces in programs. Programs also typically take longer than projects, their needs and expectations evolve, and therefore require different management practices and logic, as well as more long term goals. Lycett, Rassau, & Danson (2004) wrote in their article Programme management: a critical review, there are sometimes tensions between the inward-focused and task-oriented view of projects and the more strategy-focused and wider organizational view. Program management can help mitigate these tensions.

3.3.3 Coordination of projects within a program
When an organization undertakes multiple projects it raises the risk of a lack of coordination and overall control that could have a negative impact on efficiency and effectiveness of the projects (Lycett et al., 2004). Simultaneous execution of multiple projects can also increase confusion over responsibility. The projects therefore require some form of integration and integration is a fundamental issue in program
management. Information and knowledge sharing across the organization is crucial. In programs, integration is critical in two interfaces: project-to-project and project-to-organization (Lycett et al., 2004; Turkulainen et al., 2015).

Integration of project-to-project interface is required for coordination, efficient and effective resource utilization, transfer of knowledge, and increased effectiveness of communication (Turkulainen et al., 2015). Project-to-project interphase might, without integration, result in inter-project competition which could include rivalry to achieve high prioritization ratings and/or competition regarding valuable resources (Lycett et al., 2004).

The managers of each project require project management skills to manage their project team. However, program management requires managing across teams to both overcome project interdependence, as well as capitalize on it to deliver the promised benefits (Parolia, Chen, Jiang, & Klein, 2015). Program management therefore needs to manage the diverse interests of many teams and the conflicts resulting from the inter-team, instead of intra-team, relationships.

It is difficult to manage the level of control over projects (Gregory et al., 2015; Lycett et al., 2004). Program managers often seek a high level of control over the projects in the program. This sometimes leads to program management being too detailed with negative consequences that follow. There might be an excessive hierarchical bureaucracy and control and it is difficult to balance between excessive control and insufficient control in a multiple-project context. Excessive control can lead to strain in relationship between the project and program managers, and also a diversion of energy from more important tasks. Project workers seek flexibility instead and they want to work on creating deliverables instead of putting time into working on administrative work useful for the program but not the end result of the project.

It is also difficult to find an appropriate level of detail (Lycett et al., 2004). Large integrated plans and networks are difficult to manage and tend to become too complex. If the plans and networks are too complex, program managers might find it difficult to identify issues significant to the program. They should therefore focus on managing the interfaces between the projects.

Integration of project-to-organization interface is required to align the project with the business strategy, utilize resources efficiently and create coherent communication as well as ensuring that knowledge created in project are spread in the organization (Turkulainen et al., 2015). There is a need to shape, embed and align programs with the business environment and let it co-evolve. This is difficult as program management has the role of aligning task-focused projects and the strategic drivers of emergent organization (Lycett et al., 2004).

Program management and managing the project interfaces can help the organization to manage common problem areas. Lycett et al. (2004) mentioned several benefits that an organization can gain from managing project interfaces and working on integrating projects to other projects, the program, and the organization. These benefits are depicted in Figure 3-2 below.
3.3.4 The purpose of programs and projects

The purpose of programs and projects are different. Therefore, the people working on a program, or project level, respectively might have different perspectives. According to Walenta (2016) as written in his article *Projects & programs are two different animals, don't underestimate the gap*, the purpose of project management is to create deliverables based on a predefined scope defined by the requirements of the projects shareholders. The projects need to be delivered in time and on budget. It is not certain that the delivered scope is really contributing the intended benefits.

Program management’s purpose, on the other hand, is to improve the management of isolated projects. While program management creates benefits by better organizing projects, its focus is not to deliver individual project objectives (Lycett et al., 2004). Instead its purpose is to provide a vision to project managers and focus on strategy alignment, benefits management, governance, stakeholder engagement, and program life cycle management (Walenta, 2016).

Programs and projects define success differently (Walenta, 2016). Projects success is being measured by the quality of the delivered outcome, timeliness, budget compliance, and customer satisfaction. Program success, on the other hand, is measured by the degree the program satisfies the organizations needs and the benefits for the business. Because of this, the project managers are not focused on benefits delivery and instead only of predefined deliverables. As Walenta (2016) writes, project can sometimes fail because there is nobody responsible for managing benefits creation. Reaching the
project goals, by creating the predetermined deliverables inside scope, budget, and on time, do not necessarily mean that the project will create the expected benefits. Walenta (2016) illustrated the purpose of program and project management in two goal-triangles, see Figure 3-3 below.

Figure 3-3: Programs and projects have different sets of goals. Adapted from Walenta (2016).

As the purpose of programs is different from the purpose of projects, programs aim to reach a different set of goals. According to Lycett et al. (2004), the goals of program management are:

- **Efficiency and effectiveness goals.** Program managers should strive to increase efficiency and effectiveness of projects by a coordinated management approach.
- **Business-focus goals.** Program managers should work with external alignment of projects with the requirements, goals, drivers, and culture of the wider organization. These goals should define an appropriate direction for the constituent project within the program, as well as for the whole program.

### 3.4 Barriers to implementing change

Lewin mentions that in every organization there are forces for change and forces against change (Lewin, 1947). Only when the forces for change are larger than the forces against change is it possible to implement change successfully and overcome organizational inertia. This means that organizational leaders must either reduce opposition or find a way to increase support for the change. Lippit’s theory, as cited by (as cited by Kritsonis, 2005; Mitchell, 2013) also includes assessing the motivation and capacity for change in the organization, as well as the change agent’s motivation and resources for change. Assessing the change agent also includes assessing the change agent’s commitment to change, power, and stamina (Kritsonis, 2005; Mitchell, 2013).
As mentioned in earlier chapters, in a large complex change that involves individuals from different parts of an organization, there might exist many different perspectives of what a change should include and what the purpose of the change is. As individuals in a large organization might have different views on the change that is happening, understanding the implications of different types of change is also important. Lattuch & Young (2011) writes in their article *Young professionals’ perceptions toward organizational change* that depending on if an individual feel that a change would have a large or small impact on their work they can perceive the change in completely different ways. When individuals holds perspectives diverging enough for cooperation and coordination to be impeded, complications arise that can hinder effective change implementation (Daft & Lengel, 1986).

### 3.4.1 Culture and distance

A key challenge in global software projects is to deal with cultural differences (Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Qureshi, et al., 2016). Different corporate cultures exhibit diverse working practices, values, norms, type of communication, quality standards, patterns of behavior, terminology, types of hierarchy etc. Cultural differences also hinder the organization to swiftly transfer best practices between development sites.

Practice base culture can be defined as “*the way we do things around here*” (Iveroth, 2012, p. 341). Members of an organization is part of a practice based culture when they share a similar practice, they communicate, analyze and use the same work practice. Members of organizations often relate more strongly to practice based cultures than they do to a distant organizational or national culture. Practice based culture is based in networks and therefore affects knowledge sharing, socialization processes and innovations. Practice based cultures create epistemic barriers among communities both within and between organizations.

It is hard for people to build trust towards someone they have never met. In agile development, informal communication is seen as more important than formal communication. Large distances greatly inhibit the possibilities for informal communication (Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Qureshi, et al., 2016). An organizational challenge with projects in multinational companies (MNCs) is that the execution plan partially engages remote virtual teams from other subsidiaries in various stages of project execution (Mossolly, 2015). Virtual teams are groups of geographically, organizationally and/or time dispersed workers brought together by information technologies to accomplish one or more organizational tasks. Efficient global project execution requires the cooperation between dispersed teams, and managing dispersed teams is one of the biggest challenges during global projects.

Communication is important as the development sites are spread across a large geographical distance. A lack of face-to-face communication increases the risks of misunderstandings and a lack of trust in the management and the project. Documented types of communication are especially important and a means of control for the project management team. This includes communication to all team regarding availability of training and help documents for the entire project and documentation of meetings and project progress (Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Qureshi, et al., 2016).

### 3.4.2 Aligning program goals

In a program, viewpoints and goals can differ between the program and the projects, as well as between projects within the program (Gregory et al., 2015). Fighting the tendency towards focusing on executing the individual projects requires recurrently finding the balance between the program and project
interests. This in turn requires a significant coordinative effort that tributes to the complexity of executing IT programs.

Projects can fail because of a lack of alignment with organizational strategies, a lack of organizational agility, and a lack of strategy execution (Walenta, 2016). These reasons are not the responsibilities of project managers. They are related to the organizational development and strategy and the responsibilities of middle management and program managers.

The complex relationships among projects and stakeholders still present a barrier for successful program implementation (Parolia et al., 2015). The relationships are complex due to multiple interdependent projects with distinct managers, requirements, resource limitations, differing and sometimes even conflicting needs, emergent inputs and conditions affecting the processes, and increased ambiguity.

Each project within a program will have its own goals that each project team will be motivated to achieve (Gregory et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2014). These project goals are independent from, and not always in line with, the program goals that are established to serve the program. Goal interdependence in the program means that if a single project fails to achieve the established program goals it may affect the ability to achieve the goals for all other projects in the program (Jiang et al., 2014). A program requires each project to have a high priority on the program goals to have a successful program completion, as well as to achieve the individual project goals. According to Jiang et al. (2014) there are theories that advocates that a shared understanding of clearly formulated IT program goals and commitment from key members of the program are necessary for effective program implementation. There must be an early agreement among project leaders on the implementation means and approaches that impact the ability to integrate the deliverables into a common program outcome.

Challenges in IT programs include conflicts among interdependent project teams, failure to gain commitment to the program goals, failure to coordinate projects, and a lack of consensus regarding processes (Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Riaz, et al., 2016). Programs are formed of discrete projects. These projects have their own unique requirements and features that may or may not mesh with the other projects in the program and can even cause conflicts (Gregory et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2014). The projects diverse requirements and system features, as well as multiple perspectives of implementation means lead to conflicts across projects and increase the complexity of managing them as a collective program to create the expected benefits. This means that, in addition to common goals, implementations’ means and approaches among these identified projects must be compatible to enable integrate the deliverables from the projects.

An IT program must resolve any differences among projects that might impede the overall goals and reduce the organizations ability to realize business potential through technology. This might be problematic as the projects are interdependent and the means that each project team uses to reach their own set of goals are different.

3.4.3 Aligning a global organization

When managing global programs and local project, managers need to take different goals, viewpoints, and perceptions from different stakeholders into account. For global program managers one of the biggest challenges in managing global projects is managing not just the dispersed project teams but also the stakeholders such as the local governments, local content demand, local authorities, local industry and lack of support from the base organization and management (Mossolly, 2015). (Gregory et al., 2015)
that to implement a successful IT transformation program there is a need to balance “local” need at the IT project level and “global” needs at the IT program level. Chang, Jiang, Klein, & Wang (2014) mentions that when executing IT programs and projects, there is a need to balance the local operational needs, at the project level, with the global systematic needs, at the strategic IT program level. At the global level, organizational leaders have set strategic goals for the program that coincide with the organizational goals of the organization. At the local level, the project leaders, and local leaders in the subsidiaries, have their own needs and goals. Local demands at the project level contrast with the global demands on the program level and can lead to conflicts within the program’s organization (Chang et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2015).

When implementing global change, strategic managers and people involved in the program, on all levels of the organization, should make sure that the strategic goals on all levels of the organization, from the top corporate management level down to the subsidiary level, are aligned (Bokovec, Damij, & Rajkovič, 2015; Chang et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2015). Without alignment, the expectations will differ and might lead to conflicts.
4 Empirical findings
In this chapter, we will present our understanding of the company based on interviews as well as internal documents and websites. We will give a brief description of the Company and the change program they are implementing which is has been the focus of this study.

4.1 About the company
We were invited by the IT department of a large multinational company to write our master thesis with them. The company develops, manufactures, and sells industrial goods on several markets. Each country the company is active in houses a sale subsidiary while development and manufacturing is focused to a few locations in Europe and North America. The decentralized operations are spread out on all continents, putting pressure on how management coordinate the work of the around 16'000 global employees. Regardless of coordination issues the Company has managed to keep a positive revenue throughout the years and continues to grow. As such, there is no acute need for organization wide reform to counter failing results.

The corporation is spread across the globe with the Company’s headquarters in the US where the top management group is located. The various subsidiaries and departments focused on product development, manufacturing and sales are structured within different divisions according to their related business segment. Subsidiaries within the different commercial divisions are also administered within regional groups, each head by a director. This dual administration creates a matrix structure with the regional lines supplying the workforce for the business divisions. Support functions such as IT, finance, and legal departments are part of the regional lines but outside of the respective business divisions.

The corporate strategy is decided by the top managers at headquarters, with local departments, such as the IT department in Sweden, having minor influence on the decisions. The subsidiaries located around the world also have very minor influence over the IT strategy. At the same time, the can influence the start date of implementation projects of which they are recipients.

What might set this particular company aside from other similar organization is that the local subsidiaries have historically had a lot of power. This is because the Company has historically grown through acquisitions. The subsidiaries have after being acquired been allowed to retain relatively independent decision power pertaining to how they act in their respective markets. There organization have been decentralized with the subsidiaries used to taking their own decisions based on what is suitable for the market.

4.2 IT change
In its various subsidiaries, the Company employs several hundred different IT systems, e.g. Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), Customer Relationship Management (CRM), Configure Price Quote (CPQ), and Service Management Systems (SMS). Many of The Company's sales companies currently operate on uncommon, legacy and non- or partially integrated ERP systems. The variety of systems employed prompt the working processes throughout the corporation to be inconsistent with each other, causing problems for management and slowing the spread of efficient working routines between subsidiaries. There are also issues related to data reconciliation.
Some years back a business division started changing their CRM systems to tackle problems and hopefully improve performance. A standard system was chosen and subsidiaries were mandated to switch to the new system. At the same time as the CRM change was presented, the CIO put forward a parallel proposal for corporate wide systems changes of not only the CRM system but also ERP, CPQ, SMS and server systems. The ambition for the CIO proposal was that through standardization of systems technical risks and costs could be lowered and business processes be made uniform. Integrating the systems would also allow the corporation to collect data necessary for business intelligence (BI) activities. The proposal was accepted and the Company created a global IT strategy that we in this study call the Company Integrated Systems (CIS). The CRM system change started by a business division was incorporated within this strategy.

The vision of the CIS states that every subsidiary within the corporation shall use the same IT systems, and that the systems will be integrated and interact through a hub. The five systems chosen to be the standard systems were the ones that had the highest current usage rate in the organization in order to minimize cost. As the systems are to be integrated, each implementation becomes further technically advanced to execute as there is additional requirements and conditions to fulfil. Even though the goal is that every subsidiary will use the same set of systems, upper management acknowledge that they did not have the resources necessary to change the systems simultaneously throughout the organization. The IT department was tasked with overseeing the successive implementations and together with the business divisions prioritize where to implement the systems. The subsidiaries would have to ask to get the systems implemented.

The company is set to implement five types of systems – four business related systems for ERP, SMS, CRM and CPQ, and one database system for integration. The implementation is structured so that there is one subprogram for each system, meaning that there are five subprograms within the greater CIS program. Each implementation of a system within the scope of a subprogram is performed as a separate project. And as certain end users might require the use of more than one system, it is possible that a single subsidiary have several projects running parallel to each other.

The IT department is internally structured partially according to subprogram. Most often employees are tasked with rolling out a specific system, but there is some overlap in assignments.
The CIS also includes a governance framework detailing future IT decision principles and processes. On the highest level, the framework sets guidelines for how changes to the respective solutions and systems should be carried out. The framework calls for the creation of committees to steer the development of respective system. There are seven groups and committees in total, for of which are designated core committees; senior leadership team, business process committees, end user committee, and project management office. For each project, there are two committees supporting the CIS; project steering committee and project team. There is also a supporting capital allocation team. The different groups and committees are summarized in Table 4-1.
Table 4-1: The various core and supporting committees described in the governance framework. Descriptions have been gathered from documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Members include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leadership team (SLT)</td>
<td>“Provides oversight to ensure that the business policies, processes and the IT investments are aligned with business goals”.</td>
<td>Senior management representing each operational or functional organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Process Committee (BPC)</td>
<td>“Reviews and gains consensus support for standardized business policies and processes related to the system and validated that all regional requirements are addressed”.</td>
<td>Business process experts. Business process coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End User Committee (EUC)</td>
<td>“Shares knowledge, experiences and expertise with products and services. Makes decisions and sets priorities for system features of minimal impact and effort”.</td>
<td>Business process experts from subsidiaries. Business process coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project management office (PMO)</td>
<td>“Monitors approved projects to ensure conformance to common methodology, high quality deliverables and proactive project, risk and change management”.</td>
<td>Project methodology managers and experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting committees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project steering committee (PSC)</td>
<td>“Provides oversight on strategy, alignment with the overall business direction, optimization of resources and costs, and management of risks for critical projects”.</td>
<td>Core team managers. SLT member(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project team (PT)</td>
<td>“Each project approved by a BPC will have an assigned project team accountable for successful execution of their assigned initiative. The project team will provide both strategic and tactical subject matter expertise to inform requirements, solutions and implementation”.</td>
<td>Project managers. Core team members. Extended team members. End users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital allocation team</td>
<td>“Develops and drives a disciplined process to differentially allocate capital and resources to maximize the likelihood of achieving”.</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CIS governance framework also includes a project methodology that is supposed to be used in the projects. The project methodology applies the use of stage gate reviews and has a set of guidelines describing responsibilities and work processes.

Each system is set to be outlined in a collection of standardized documents, which is here labeled as *global template*. The global template includes instructions and guides, both for technical specialists and end users. The technical instructions, if applied on a newly formed subsidiary, would act as a template that tells the technical specialist how to set up the system. For the end user, the relevant material includes educational material, instructions for reports, and user guides that together lay out the proper business processes applicable with the system.

When applied to an existing subsidiary the implementation of the global template includes the installation and configuration of different software program that need to work together as a system. Subsidiaries also have to change their working processes according to the standardized processes outlined by the global template.
4.3 Brief timeline of change program

The CIS is not being rolled out on a broad front to all subsidiaries at the same time. The Company has instead opted to create an implementation project for each subsidiary and system to minimize disturbance to daily work. This means that there are some subsidiaries have implemented new systems, and are working according to the CIS, and some that have not. The different front-end subprograms are at different stages of roll-out. The CRM system has come the furthest and has been rolled out to a large part of subsidiaries. The ERP system has previously been rolled out to several subsidiaries and there is currently several projects being implemented. The SMS system has had some difficulties in getting started, and has only recently started being implemented in a few subsidiaries.

Systems have been partially rolled out to the organization, but the results vary between subsidiaries. In the early stages of the CIS, coordination between involved stakeholders had yet to be fully structured. Also, at the outset the global template was not complete. This meant that the first projects acted as a test bed that contributed to the formulation of the governance framework. The global template has also evolved over time as best practices have been collected from various subsidiaries. The first projects were also chosen partly due to how necessary a change was, as some older systems were in need of acute replacement due to expiring or non-existent support. Business partners in more recent projects have not seen the same urgency for system change.

While the global template for the different systems has been continuously updated as new projects are completed, the updates have not been applied in all subsidiaries. So, while the subsidiaries that recently implemented a system have one version of the global template, subsidiaries that received a previous implementation use a different configuration of system and business processes.
5 Perspective typology

The main focus of this study is to understand a change, more specifically, to answer the question of how perspectives affect change. We hope to understand some part of these struggles by looking at various perspectives and mind sets held by individuals within the company. However, as analyzing and comparing each individual’s perspective relative to others makes for a rather complex study, we must find a way to order and group our findings.

Related to the change are many different groups and individuals. The CIO and IT department are responsible for overseeing the projects and executing technical aspects while the business divisions and their subsidiaries are responsible for business processes.

The CIS can be viewed as a program that contains several implementation projects of several systems in different subsidiaries. Each project has its members and project leaders. At the same time, overall integration and standardization have to be managed at the program level.

We will use two overlapping dimensions. One dimension is program affiliation of members who either work with activities related to program coordination or in direct contact with the individual implementation projects. The other dimension is organizational affiliation of members who are employed either by the IT department or by a Business division. The final typology is depicted in Figure 5-1.

![Figure 5-1: Perspective group typology.](image)

This division of perspective groups is intuitive for us and based foremost on the empirical data and further defined by the literature review. The internal communities are varied but overall, we’ve found this division of perspectives to be the most useful for understanding the different priorities, backgrounds and communities. Further description of how perspectives are related to individuals is illustrated in Table 5-1.
Table 5-1: Description of perspective groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective group</th>
<th>Activities related to</th>
<th>Members include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGIT Program IT</td>
<td>Coordination of projects, technical processes and overarching changes.</td>
<td>CIO, project management office members, middle management, technical coordination officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJIT Project IT</td>
<td>Directly involved in project either as technical expert or project leader employed by IT department.</td>
<td>Project leaders, technical experts, IT engineers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGB Program Business</td>
<td>Coordination of projects, business processes and overarching changes.</td>
<td>Core committee members. Process coordinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJB Project Business</td>
<td>Directly involved in project. Employed by local subsidiary.</td>
<td>Business Project leaders, business process experts, end users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1 Program and Project
An individual is assigned program/project affiliation according to their mission and responsibilities with regards to the change. Individuals whose main objective is to coordinate the work and information of several projects were linked to program, while those whose work focused on completing objectives within the scope of certain project were linked to project. Also, those who participated in several projects were linked to the project perspective group, as long as their own work description focused on objectives in the separate projects themselves, in contrast to coordination. Members of EUC are difficult to place as they are strongly linked to local subsidiaries. However, their prime involvement pertaining to the CIS is the global standards which will unite more than one project.

5.1.2 IT and Business
In organizations individuals create a community centered around technical expertise. In this organization, there is also a structural separation as IT is not part of the business divisions, but rather a separate supporting function. Regardless if they are working on a specific project or coordinating major changes members of IT often communicate with employees from different business divisions.

Business is often associated with strategic or sales departments within an organization, but in this paper the term business will correspond to a variety of subsections within an organization depending on which group is on the receiving end of an implementation. Members of business are the internal customers of the IT program being implemented, and over time as different department of groups undergo the change, the fabric that makes up the members can vary.

Within organizations, the IT department is often analogous with IT support, but depending on the industry, IT can also indicate research or product development. However, as this paper is concerned with IT-enabled change, the term IT consists of groups and individuals whose primary function is to further the technical aspects within an IT-enabled change project or program. The individuals can be spread out on several departments, making the domain cross-sectional in nature. Also, the members must not be working on active implementation projects, as part of a program implementation can include post-project implementation support.

Usually, organizations structure their department to correspond to something similar to the definition above. The IT department might take the sole responsibility of the technical aspects of the
implementation and support, while the business department, e.g. sales, are both receiver and enablers of the change as they take responsibility for furthering non-technical aspects necessary for the change to take place. For example, the IT department will install new software and the sales department will perform the training necessary for its members to both be able to use the software, as well as change the processes as to become more efficient in their work (if that is the aim of the program).
6 Empirical findings from interviews
In this chapter, we will present our findings using the perspective groups as lens. The data presented in the section is taken from interviews, and depicts opinions and reflections of interview participants compiled within the representations of the perspective groups. The empirical data is structured to create a narrative, beginning with how the perspective groups perceive the CIS change program and what its purpose is. This is followed by the initial priorities and knowledge regarding IT change goals and processes. Next follows an account of how the respective perspective groups perceived how collaboration, coordination, and communication were carried out during the various change projects. Finally, upper management involvement in the projects and the thoughts of perspective groups regarding this matter is described.

6.1 Initial ambitions and expectations
Generally, almost all participants included standardization of systems in their description of the CIS. However, other descriptions of other parts of the CIS, such as the focus and benefit of the CIS, varied between groups. It is interesting to note that every perspective group gave a description that in some ways was grounded in their own work. This is to be expected, but the general description given was a clue as how to separate individuals into different perspective groups. Opinions also differed about who the main benefactors should be. The very nature of the CIS was also explained differently by the group members.

6.1.1 Purpose of CIS
We noted the most clear-cut and extensive descriptions regarding the purpose of CIS from members of the PGIT perspective group. This is to be expected as they coordinate different projects, enabling them a broad spectrum of insights. It was generally agreed that the CIS should in the first hand be about making more money for the Company by increasing efficiency in the organization as there are possibilities to find best practices, savings, synergy effects and other benefits of economies of scale. Individuals in the PGIT perspective group often talked about how the CIS was supposed to enable the business. Some members of PGIT also focused on how the CIS would make the IT department's work easier and more efficient as the increased standardization would also support IT in their daily responsibilities of developing, managing, supporting and securing the systems, as a less diverse set of tools require less effort to manage.

A few individuals in the PGIT perspective group described how the CIS is there to help them follow a "one company approach" and become one operating company. One company approach means that they will operate with standardized systems and processes and behave in the same way wherever the Company is located, making away with the, for the Company, historical barriers between subsidiaries. However, the one company approach is something that we heard only from members at the program level and the term was rare even there.

Within the PJIT perspective group it was described how the standardization of systems would help the IT department manage and support systems, and reduce cost to manage the IT infrastructure. While these responds closely resemble the answers we’ve heard from PGIT, members of PJIT were less pronounced in their explanations, often highlighting only a few points before moving on. There was a less pronounced concern pertaining to the benefits other departments might receive from the program.
From our interviews with members of the PGB perspective group four main areas of focus emerged – aligning business processes, improving the customer journey, improving work related to customer relationship, and spreading costs. The four areas are linked and PGB described the CIS as a way to help them manage their customer relationships and enable the customer journey by aligning business processes across subsidiaries, e.g. reports would be handled in same way to properly manage data and there would be one unified way of behaving towards customers. There would be one way of reporting with the added benefit of taking away local interpretation. The costs for IT would also be spread across multiple subsidiaries as the same systems would be used regardless of division affiliation.

The PJB perspective group focused on how the systems should be complete solutions that are fully supported from IT, further explaining that the most important aspect of the CIS systems is that they work and enable the subsidiaries to properly manage their business. Furthermore, members of PJB anticipated that the connected and integrated systems could increase the functionality of the individual system and that new supported systems would also reduce the risk of the system crashing. From a PJB perspective, it is not important that the different divisions and subsidiaries are using the same systems and processes, but that the CIS solution involves integrated systems that in turn can provide the end users with the information they need when they need it. As one employee said, “We do not care how it works, just that it works”. While integration seems to have been one of the key aspects of the CIS solution, it has not yet been properly achieved. According to the PJB perspective group the solutions seems to be not nearly as integrated as they need to be for them to be able to extract useful data.

When we ask the participants about the purpose of the CIS we get a multitude of varying answers. We can see clear distinctions between groups regarding width of their scope and focus, however, even the opinions in the same perspective group sometimes seem to differ about what the CIS is supposed to achieve. Everyone mentioned standardization as a main feature of the CIS. However, there were differences in description of the focus of standardization, both of what is included and what is most important to achieve. Members from the IT department had a clear focus on systems – how to manage them and how they enable the business. Members of business had a more pronounced focus on the customer and how the new CIS strategy would affect them in making sales.

6.1.2 Strategy or concept
In both the PGIT and the PGB perspective groups the CIS was described as “a vision”. Beyond the purpose of the CIS, the PGIT perspective group also discusses how the CIS is there to help the organization manage programs and implementation projects. According to PGIT, the CIS is more than just a strategy as it also consists of an overarching governance and change management structure, packaged in the related CIS Governance Framework.

According to PGIT, all projects should comply with the Governance Framework, and it contains projects management structures together with committees and structures to drive forward the overarching strategy. The governance is supposed to support the management of projects and increase transparency of related processes. Members of PGIT described how the CIS strategy would also help them to manage their systems portfolio.

Contrary to the descriptions given by PGIT members, PGB states the CIS is generally not seen as a central strategy for everyone to follow. Some members of PJB are unaware of the term and it is not used to describe the changes taking place. Members of both PGB and PJB see the CIS as a brand of IT that is also
being driven forward by the IT department and there seem to be a consensus among all groups in the different perspective groups that the CIS is an IT forum and an IT strategy that is being implemented top down in the organization.

The people in the program level, which are responsible for managing and implementing the program, had a much clearer understanding of what the CIS is. This is not that surprising but is still something the program management needs to be aware of. At the project level, both in the IT and business departments, the CIS is unclear and not a term that is used in the day-to-day business. Some individuals of PJB and PJIT had not even heard of it (they did not recognize the term “CIS”), even if the work they do every day is related to the strategy. In the PJB perspective group there is some consensus that having standardized systems and processes is good for the organization, the feeling was that "it seems like a good idea" as described by one individual, but they are not sure on exactly what the CIS contains.

6.1.3 Scope of benefactors
The members of PGIT could give a clear explanation about what the strategy encompasses and that it is there to benefit both the business and the IT part of the organization. Some individuals talk about how the strategy is there to enable the business functions and the foremost purpose is to save or make more money. Some individuals spoke about how the standardization of the systems could help IT support and manage the IT infrastructure. Others spoke about how the purpose of the strategy is to help them become better at managing projects. It was anticipated that IT would not be able to find benefits from economy of scale before a large part of the organization has changed to the standardized systems and processes – in the early parts of the program the business subsidiaries should get the bulk of the benefits.

Even though every perspective group described the CIS as a strategy or concept created by IT, the people on the program level, both in the business and IT departments, seem to agree that the CIS needs to involve a partnership between the IT and business departments to be successful. It is therefore interesting to note that the IT department, both on a program and on a project level, show awareness of that this strategy is there to not only help the IT department manage the IT infrastructure but also to enable the business functions, which is described by several individuals described as the primary focus of the CIS strategy. In the business departments however, there seemed to be little concern towards what the new systems would mean for the IT department. Instead there seems to be a customer – supplier relationship where the IT department is only there to satisfy their needs.

PJB expected finished systems and processes and was not expecting having to help developing a completely new system and new processes. In one project, PJB expected to get an update of their old system but it turned out that the project would build a new system and the effort was much larger than they first expected, hinting that the initial expectations of projects usually is that they will quickly be finished. However, while the CIS is striving to achieve standardization of both systems and processes, there was also a wish to fulfil the individual needs of the different subsidiaries, many of which do not necessarily operate according to the same standard process.

From a PJB perspective the global solutions are often unusable but the program management, and especially IT, seems to be afraid of having excessive local variation. The PJB perspective group argues that the Company is too global an organization to have a single standardized solution. They would rather have individual solutions that work the way they want them to, regardless of standardization. One
individual told us that the end users do not always understand the benefits of the new systems and especially not what benefits the organization will get from them changing to a new system. Some members of PJIT even state that sometimes standardized processes and systems are not the best choice. From what we can garner, employees of the Company seemed to have a difficult time deciding how standardized they should, or are able to, become.

Something noteworthy is that three of the perspective groups, namely PGIT, PGB, and PJIT had some understanding of what this strategy would mean for the global organization. At a program level, this is to be expected as the individuals in those perspective groups manage global programs that involve multiple projects all over the world. What was interesting was to see that also in the PJIT perspective group the individuals were aware how the strategy affected the global organization, an awareness that was absent among their business counterpart. Our reasoning is that this is because in the PJIT perspective group many individuals are involved in multiple projects and are also involved in managing and supporting systems all over the world. In the PJB perspective group however, when asked about the purpose behind the strategy there was little to no talk about what it would mean for the whole organization. Instead the focus was on how the strategy would affect their own businesses.

According to PGIT, the local subsidiaries does not seem to care about the benefits the program will have for the organization and instead only cares for what benefits the new system will have for them, with one individual explaining that, “The local subsidiaries often wants their own specific solutions that are not applicable anywhere else”. The view among PGIT was that subsidiaries do not like to have to subservient to the standardized systems and processes found in the CIS. PGIT also explain that it is generally deemed difficult to get end users to agree that while some subsidiaries might receive systems and processes that, compared to their old systems and processes, are not fully compliant with the needs of their local operations, there are program benefits to be gained at an organizational level which will outweigh the drawbacks at a local level. As one individual said, “Sometimes the individual that has controlled his own destiny won’t get what they wish, because that might not be the best for the greater whole”. Members of PGIT also disclosed that they need to be better at talking about benefits, especially by using business cases, and that employees in the organization are not aware of how the CIS program will help them further the business and increase sales.

One individual in the PGB perspective group mentioned that it would have been a good idea to have had a wider business perspective and bring more parties from other business areas into the program in the beginning to get different viewpoints. It was not a global business perspective in the beginning, or perhaps only a global business perspective from a single perspective. We were also told by a separate PGB member that the different business units have different ways of looking at systems, the processes, and different problems. The individual further explained that some business divisions focused on speed of the processes and therefore wanted to remove steps in the process, while other business divisions were more focused on improving the clarity of data which would require a more detailed process. We were finally told that some issues implicated huge problems for one division while not even being recognized as a blip on the radar for another division.

6.1.4 Strategy is open for interpretation
One of the first questions asked of the participants was how they would describe the CIS strategy. What we found was that there was a large discrepancy in the answers. During the interviews, it became clear the purpose of the CIS is not universally defined and agreed upon, or at least not properly
communicated to the whole organization. The opinions even in the same perspective group seem to differ about what is the actual purpose of the CIS.

Among the different perspective groups there was a general consensus that the CIS can sometimes be abstract or that it needs to be communicated better. According to some members of PGIT, the CIS is in some ways abstract and there is room for different interpretation. This is echoed by members of PGB whom find that the explanation of the CIS provided by IT is too abstract, stating that IT was not able to clearly draw a bigger picture of how everything would connect. Furthermore, some members of PGB told us that the CIS concept was not finished when it was revealed and subsequently started. As a consequence, some members explained that they found it very difficult to communicate the CIS to others within the organization.

Members of PGIT told us that it is important for the program managers in the IT department to decide how much is feasible to deliver in the projects, as it is not possible to reach a 100 % standardized processes within the company. For example, not everyone in the global organization can use the same type of keyboard (because of language differences). Members of both PGIT and PGB assumed that the organization's top management often believes that you can reach further than what is actually realistic, but asserted that somewhere you have to reach a decision saying, "this is good enough". One member of PGB told us that "If you always have to get everybody aligned before you take the first step, you’ll never take the first step". The employee continued by saying, “It shouldn’t be a struggle between perfect world, always doing everything perfectly with no mistakes and no misunderstandings versus going out with your guns blazing and doing whatever you want. It should be some balance between the two”.

It is clear that program management has not been able to convince the whole organization to fully support the one company approach.

6.2 Delivery means understanding

When it comes to delivery means, we found the focus of the various groups to be linked to their priorities. There were varying degrees of previous knowledge and understanding of the project processes. The consensus of delivery means varied accordingly.

6.2.1 Delivery priorities

PGIT and PGB both agree that change should not disturb day-to-day operations. However, according to the PJB perspective group, the projects are too IT-oriented and the program leaders have not taken into consideration how the projects and the different solutions would affect the local subsidiaries. Members of PJB proceed to point out that compared to members of other groups the individual projects directly impact their daily work as they have had to apply drastic changes to both employed systems and processes. So, while there is top management support for a non-disruptive change, the solution being implemented might, according to PJB, not be such a change.

According to the PGIT perspective group, it is not IT driving the solutions to the business and telling them what to do – it is the people that use the systems on a daily basis that makes the decisions. However, some members of PJB state that the project goals communicated to them principally followed the theme that it just should be done.

Both PJB and PJIT call for decisions made closer to the actual projects while differing in their respective opinions of what is important to pursuit. And while the focus of PJIT seems to be project processes and
execution, there is a general agreement within the group that it is important to correctly implement business processes.

When describing the purpose of the projects in the CIS, PGIT told that it is vital to succeed with the delivery – in time, within scope, on budget, and with the right quality. Descriptions given by individuals participating in projects, those from PJB and PJIT, are formulated towards results focus including success of implementing, switching, or changing a system. The focus in the PJIT perspective group is to create deliverables and finish the projects, and some members disclose that the goals communicated from IT management seems to be in line with “just out with it, so that we can show that something is finished” as one individual expressed it as.

According to one employee in the PGB perspective group, organizational change is either changing IT infrastructure or business processes, and that right now the organization is focusing on changing the infrastructure before implementing standard processes. Some members of PGIT state that standardized systems should not have been selected and developed before standardized processes, and that currently there is no connection between the development of systems and processes. It is further explained that IT is implementing standardized systems before business has finished developing standardized processes.

6.2.2 Knowledge and understanding
The importance and practical implications of changing both business processes and IT application is understood differently by the different perspective groups. The CIS program is driven by the IT department, and this has meant that the solutions have been delivered using the IT department’s project processes and governance frameworks, procedures that might not be commonplace within the business structures.

Both PGB and PGIT admit that business processes are important, but largely fail to mention the practical efforts involved. However, some members of PGIT admit that the IT department lacks competence to review business processes and that there is a general lack of individuals that understand both business and IT aspects of a change.

Members from PGB note that IT and business handle projects differently, and that while IT perform projects according to procedures laid out by the CIS Governance Framework, business seems to have no project structure of their own and only slightly comply with the many committees described by the CIS Governance Framework. Some PGIT members note that the local subsidiaries are not always ready to receive a new system, and that they do not understand what it means to implement a completely new information system, for example a new ERP system.

Project members from Business say that they were previously unaware of the project processes of IT projects, noting that in the beginning of an implementation project, the IT department gives a high-level introduction regarding the projects delivery process and how everything is managed. Information that is delivered in this kind of high level presentation is something that has been called the “PowerPoint-level”, as explained by one member of PGB:

*It is difficult to understand on what level you should be acting. When IT explained the plan for the CIS, they had some form of slides about the roadmap of the program, but they never got to*
the substance level in the planning stage. This meant that the business leaders did not feel a sense of ownership of the strategy.

On the PJB side we heard a similar train of thought expressed:

*The project process was presented in a PowerPoint but not really more than that.*

The PJB perspective group asserted that they need more information than was received to be able to fully understand and feel like they can sign off on the project process. For example, one individual from PJB say they were not ready for the project to disband shortly after the system had gone live, implying a lack of knowledge of how the projects was to be ended and what would happen thereafter.

Members of both PGB and PGIT say that the IT department was unaware of how much variation there was in the organization, with some members of PGIT explaining that on a high level the different local subsidiaries seemed to work in the same way, but that the opposite was evident when they further explored the day-to-day operations.

Another part of this work is getting the requirements set. However, PGIT states that business processes have not been properly documented, and that members of business lack knowledge of their own processes, as well as how to write requirements and a good test case. PJIT agree in this description saying that they do not believe business have a good understanding of how to write requirements. However, members of PJB say that they are at a disadvantage from the outset as they have no understanding of what the new system can do which in turn leads to less detailed requirements.

6.3 Delivery means consensus

There seems to be a distinct lack of consensus regarding the delivery means of the projects and different groups have different expectations of how an implementation project is supposed to be carried out; what the roles and processes involved are, and how responsibilities are distributed.

The PGIT perspective group seems to agree with the PGB and PJB perspective groups that the program should be driven by the business instead of IT but they also mean that the conflicts and lack of consensus regarding delivery means are a result of different agendas in the IT and business departments.

Compared to business, IT has a pronounced focus on adhering to proper project processes, and it seems that members of business, both program and project, does not share in the clear descriptions of project process with their IT colleagues.

6.3.1 Responsibilities

Compared to members of Business, members of IT have clearer preconceptions of how responsibilities are to be divided and what the change processes will imply. However, even members of PGIT report that some of the responsibilities in the CIS program are unclear.

From members of PJIT we heard that the organization and the CIS program does not focus on processes, explaining that some manual processes are not supported by the CIS systems and that when the system functions are tested these processes are not being considered. Members of PJIT also assert that the expectations are being misaligned as the end users do not understand how these unaccounted processes should be managed together with the systems. Furthermore, members of PJIT told us that
neither do they know what to do as these processes are not their responsibility, nor do they know whose responsibility it is.

One of the goals of the CIS program was to integrate all systems in the organization. This has unfortunately not been as successful as the program management had hoped. Some PGB members told us that they are asking for an integration coordinator as they today do not know who is responsible for the technical integration of systems. One employee said, “We have this CIS and the ‘I’ stands for integration, but no one knows who owns the ‘I’”. It was also expressed that there is a lack of understanding of how the system and processes should be connected. Today, the Company lacks a plan of how to integrate IT with the business to make it all happen.

6.3.2 Coordination of projects and subprograms

We are told by members of PGIT that employees working in one subprogram have a very limited understanding of what is happening in the other subprograms, and that the same could be said of different projects within a subprogram. It is further elaborated that the lack of coordination sometimes results in that different projects are competing for the same resources from IT or from the local subsidiaries.

According to members of PGIT, they currently lack the capability and competence required to handle implementation projects that requires the coordination and integration of multiple systems – they are not able to manage the projects collectively. This assertion is supported by members of PJIT, who tell us there is little talk about coordination between projects. And while we are told that in the IT department they have created a group that includes people from different projects to discuss project plans and immediate pain points, the discussions principally concern surface issues and the real problems shows themselves at a more detailed level. According to PJIT there is also a need for better resource allocation systems within the program, further explaining that sometimes different projects can borrow resources from other projects it is unclear how it affects the time plan in the project that provide access to resources.

Lack of coordination is not an opinion exclusive to the IT department. Members of PGB witness that employees within the organization are so focused on the vertical cooperation, between projects and subprogram, causing them to forget about the horizontal coordination between groupings such as divisions and subprograms. We are told by members of PGB that they should not have seen the implementation of the different systems as separate sub-programs, and that while there have been some efforts made to coordinate processes between different business divisions these efforts have not been enough.

On the higher program level of the organization the business and IT leaders have weekly meetings where they discuss their respective pain points and red flags that has come up in the various subprograms. There was some disagreement in the PGB perspective group regarding how much they discuss cooperation and coordination issues between sub-programs. Some individuals mentioned that those issues were resolved at the weekly meeting while others said that they did not discuss cooperation and coordination nearly enough and that there was too much focus on more specific pain points. Nevertheless, there is still much to be done regarding the cooperation and coordination aspects in the CIS program. One employee asked “How can a corporation as large as ours, cooperate and coordinate as well as a start-up company does?”
6.3.3 Requirements

Some members of PJIT states that there is currently no good way of handling process requirements within the organization, and while the project process put the responsibility of documenting process requirements on business members, PJIT has also had to puzzle together process requirements themselves. The feat to try to figure out, during the development phase, how different processes are supposed to be handled is made more difficult as there is a lack of understanding of business processes among IT people.

We were told by PJB members that nobody in the local subsidiaries were aware of how important the pre-study phase of the project was. They also started from a blank paper without understanding of what the new systems could do, which meant that the requirements were not detailed enough. PJB members assert that the project team should be aware of the basic requirements before the project even starts.

There exists a consensus among all interview participants that the pre-study phases have not been performed as well as it should have. Members of PJIT state that they start projects without everyone being in agreement regarding the requirements. Further explaining that the individuals involved in projects need to spend more time in the first stages of a project to produce good estimates about what needed to be done and how long it would take to do it. PGB say they needed to spend more time in the pre-study phase of the projects to align the expectations between the divisions and the subsidiaries, as it otherwise leads to scope creep as new requirements are added to the project. We have heard evidence of scope creep from multiple sources in this empirical study.

During the beginning of the projects, it is very difficult to create a set of requirements that everyone understands and can sign off on. Both the IT project team and the local business want to move straight on to the execution phase. The partnership during the creation of the requirements could definitively be better. During the projects, there is a lot of scope creep as the scope expands during the projects. This in turn means that it is difficult to finish the project with the original budget and project plan.

Members of PJIT, PGIT, and PGB state that they in retrospect should not have given in so easily to the subsidiaries, and only have adapted the solutions if there was a legal requirement for doing so. One person told us that they gave subsidiaries too much choice and they (everyone besides the subsidiaries) were not assertive enough. However, the sales companies were given the right to veto things which, in the opinion of some non-PJB members, was not necessarily the best solution. It was also explained to us that the subsidiaries are very influential as management do not want to disrupt the daily business. One subsidiary even developed their own solution that differ from the CIS system because of apparent lack of control, but it was allowed to do it in order to keep the subsidiary working towards finishing the CIS projects.

6.3.4 Testing

Business is mainly responsible for testing and requirement elicitation, with testing processes being detailed in many IT project manuals adhered to by IT. PJIT describe instances during which PJB has asked IT to implement functions without PJB actually testing them, but as the CIS Governance Framework required acceptance testing to be part of the processes IT could not allow the functions to be implemented. PJB on the other hand witnessed that in at least one instance has the system tested by users not been the same system that went live. For members of PJB it seemed like IT had reversed some versions and that some problems that had disappeared when they tested the system was back when the
system went live. PJIT told us that this is not uncommon as they are fixing one problem, another one that is similar to a previously fixed problem can show up. PJB also state that test cases that were generated from real world situations were not able to be replicated in the test environment.

6.3.5 Post live
Member of PJB are of the impression that the subsidiaries are left alone after the system is live. According to the PJB perspective group the IT department gave them a sense of “It is your system, it is up to you to manage it”, something we were told the subsidiaries were often not ready to do. PJIT agree with this description saying that the systems are usually not finished when the projects are done, and that the general support function, a separate function from the implementation team, takes responsibility for any future changes and fixes.

Members of both PJIT and PJB were of the impression that the project team should handle education of end users related to the new systems. We were told by PJIT that there was no current focus on tuition in project teams, and that unclear instruction can lead to problems, for example the instructions of how to delete orders was not correct and this meant massive problems. The more local variations the systems have the more difficult it is to educate the users. We heard something similar from the PJB which stated that if the local businesses have more than one geographical location in a region, different users can be taught different things at different location, as the tuition is not centralized:

After the system is live it takes a long time to get the employees to use the system efficiently. If there was a better, centralized tuition about the new systems during the projects it would be a lot easier to go live with the system. There was really a need of somebody to teach the users about the system and what processes were best. Even if the local subsidiaries figure out how to do something in the new system, they are not certain that that process is the best that is available.

6.4 Communication
Even with the CIS Governance Framework in use members from both the PGB and the PJB perspective groups complain about the lack of transparency in the communication with the IT department. We are told by members of the PGIT that all decision regarding priorities and changes are made together with the business partners. However, one individual from the PGB perspective group gave an example when there was an apparent lack of consultation:

The business program leaders are asking for more updates than they are getting so that they can plan and coordinate their projects but they do not receive the necessary information from the IT development teams. The IT department is by themselves prioritizing functions and request without letting the business departments know. This has led to conflicts between the IT department and the business divisions. Only when they stopped development to get together and agree on a set of priorities and a time scale could the conflicts be mitigated.

Members of PGB routinely work with upper management sections of the CIS Governance Framework as they take part in the committees. However, contrary to the expectation given by PGIT, some members of PGB have expressed concerns that there is a lack of transparency between IT development teams and members of PGB. Some members of PGB state that the CIS Governance Framework is seen as complicated and confusing by many, PGB further articulating that IT and Business handle projects differently. Some members of PGIT also raised concern over that some members of PJB sometimes
would ignore certain processes that by them are deemed unnecessary. Some members of the PJIT expressed concern over decision processes being slowed down as certain decision are no longer made in-house and decision makers always have to take the global organizations needs in mind. Nonetheless, while raising concerns over that the CIS governance framework might bring about higher inertia to performing change, we are told by PJIT members that it hopefully leads to better decisions regarding end results.

Both PGIT and PGB are, as previously discussed, of the opinion that upper management does not want to disturb the day-to-day operations, hinting at weaker support for drastic changes. Both PGIT and PGB have also expressed frustration with PJB gaining much power from being able to veto certain decisions, which, combined with the cautious approach from top management, has created an influence that has opened up for projects to adapt local variations of the software. PJB on the other hand are of the impression that they are not being listened to. As one individual of PGIT told us, this power balance can sometimes put the IT department in quite a bind, as depicted below:

For the IT department, some (local) resources are hard to come by and there is a distinct lack of motivation for the program in the business departments. When IT is requiring answers from the business side they sometimes find it hard to get the answers they need. The business is not always sure on what they want, or how their own processes work, and it is therefore hard to create the requirements that IT needs and answer IT’s questions. One example of this is when the IT department had over 40 report changes that were sitting with business users to be approved. They had been waiting for feedback sometimes 6-8 months and no matter how many emails they sent, they couldn’t get business users to sign off of the changes. The result of this is that the projects are delayed. There is quite a lot of pressure from both business and IT management on the delays.

There are two general aspects that are raised by PGIT with regards to this issue – commitment to the project and communication between parties.

6.4.1 Commitment
It was noted by some members of PGIT that PJB in particular is usually not committed to the CIS Governance Framework. When asked about this, members of PJB discuss motivation and work load:

The end users are often not committed to the projects. There is a sense in the local subsidiaries of that they are changing to systems that are not as good as the ones that already exist. Nobody has a good understanding of what the benefits is to change to the new systems. They have to change the fundamental way they work.

We are also told by PJB that the subsidiaries have not been able to offload the increased work that the projects bring with them. This means that project members from subsidiaries must manage their project activities in addition to their regular tasks in the subsidiaries. We are told that there is not enough time and resources available to manage both the daily business as well as the projects. As they are not able to have dedicated teams to manage the projects and coordinate with the IT project team, it is possible that they are viewed by other parties as having a lack of commitment.
6.4.2 Understanding
Why is it that IT and business doesn’t always see eye to eye in communication with each other? According to PJB the top management seems more focused on rolling out new implementation and not interested in how the new implementations actually work. The local subsidiaries were not informed about what functions is being developed and prioritized and when they can expect to see finished results. This means that from an end user perspective getting a new system does not necessitate an improvement compared the system currently in use. Ultimately this mismatch of understanding is contributing to a growing mistrust towards the IT department within the business divisions, as explained by one PJB member;

*There is a lot of mistrust towards the IT department, and requests are either not solved at all or solved slowly with bad quality. It seems like the IT department is prioritizing speed and budget before quality.*

At the same time, PJB find that there are at times problems in communications between PJB and PJIT, stating that the two groups speak different professional languages, with many of the end users not always being sure of the meaning of certain technical terms. They describe that it takes a lot of time to explain their own processes to the IT project team and that they sometimes feel that the IT project team does not understand the local processes.

The PGB perspective group expresses that the cooperation in the organization is functioning well, especially in the respective sub-programs such as the CRM or ERP sub-program. There are however cooperation difficulties between the IT department and business divisions. The sense is that each division is focused on doing their own mission and *"running their own thing"*. PGB also states that it is at times difficult to cooperate with IT, much because they are focused on their own mission.

Even with decisions taken according to the framework, it would seem like the IT department has a difficult time appeasing their business counterparts. We heard from one in PGB that any bad choices are blamed on the business divisions;

*IT is then saying, “Don’t blame IT, you made the decision yourself”. This is a nice protection for IT to say that they do everything for the business and cannot be blamed for the decisions.*

However, we heard from members of PGIT that as the CIS program is being driven and led by IT, it is the IT department that is blamed if there are any delays. Giving the impression that business is blamed when there is a lack of quality, while IT is blamed for any delays to the timetable.

6.5 Upper management involvement
When it comes to leadership involvement at different levels there are various aspects too look at. One thing to notice is that there seem to be a general consensus that upper management needs to support the changes for them to be implemented successfully. However, the definition of what is the correct change to support differs between groups. PJB is of the opinion that top management seems to be more focused on rolling out new implementations in contrast to understanding how the new systems will perform in reality, explaining that top management does not seem to listen to the users need. PJB would rather see more support and interest for the latter. On the other hand, both PGIT and PJIT state that it is difficult to push through standardized solutions without the support of top management, showing an inclination towards implementation support.
There are similarities between groups regarding opinions on how decisions are made and if the individuals taking certain decisions are adequately involved in grasping the needs and problems. According to PGB there are some leaders that try to be involved at several levels of decisions. PGIT agree with PGB saying that sometimes people without detailed knowledge about projects set arbitrary deadlines. With one individual from PGIT explaining that:

*Some people that are not involved in the projects have unreasonable high expectations that are very difficult for the project teams to meet. One example of this is that it is often people without detailed knowledge about the projects that are setting the deadlines. These deadlines are very difficult for the project teams to meet.*

PJIT expand upon previous assessments stating that the Project Steering Committee (PSC) is located high in the organization and not knowledgeable enough about the projects. This PSC usually have many opinions but lack the necessary knowledge to discuss problems and that the committee has to involve employees from a couple levels down in the organization.

Members of all perspective groups, except PJB, expressed in various wordings that there is a need for strong management. As the projects that were driven by strong leaders that drove their solutions top down have had a better success. However, we were also told by PGIT that some problems and conflicts often have to travel to the top level of the organization before they reach a manager that can take a decision and resolve them, which means long discussions and that conflicts are cemented. On the other hand, while PGB and PGIT point out a few problems related to high level decisions, there is little else that would lead us to believe that they disapprove of the current processes.
7 Analysis

In this chapter, we will compare the empirical data with our theoretical findings to understand how different perspectives in an organization can affect an IT-enabled change program. We will do this by analyzing how the different perspective groups differ in opinion and nature. First, we will look at the perspective groups’ perception of the program and its purpose. Next, we will look at how the perceptions of type of change vary. This is followed by an analysis of the difference in what is perceived to be the proper way to execute the change, and finally a look at the differences between parties that affect IT and business cooperation.

7.1 Diverging perceptions of program purpose

There are some things in an organization that all individuals agree on. On the highest level there is a consensus about what the mission of the Company is. You would also be hard pressed to find someone in the organization that does not agree on that the organization should work efficiently to make a profit.

When we asked members of the organization about the CIS change program, there were still things that everybody agreed on. There seemed to be a consensus that it is a logical idea that the organization should strive work efficiently, using the same systems and processes. There also seemed to be a consensus in the organization that IT is there to enable the business. During implementation of change disruption to the business should be kept to a minimum to allow the daily operations to continue.

We believe common understanding of what the change program is, what the goals are, and what the organization should strive to achieve is critical for reaching program success. We therefore tried to get a grasp how well versed the individuals in the organization were when it came to the definition and purpose of the change program and what benefits they strived to create.

Something we discovered when conducting our interviews is that the organizational members sometimes thought they were striving towards the same goals and could agree on how they should do it, but this turned out to not always be the case. Individuals in different perspectives could agree on what the goal of the change is, but have different perceptions of what the goal actually implies.

7.1.1 Lack of common goal perception

First of all, we discovered that the different perspective groups had different levels of understanding regarding how the CIS is supposed to be implemented, and what it is supposed to achieve. There are individuals in the PJIT perspective group whose daily work is directly related to the CIS change program that do not know what it is and does not recognize the term when we ask about it. This indicates that the CIS strategy has not been properly communicated to organization members, and also that the CIS is not consolidated in the organization.

Successful consolidation of the need for change is, according to Lewin (1947), the first stage in managing a successful change process. Without communicating, explaining, and building motivation for the change program, there is a high risk of facing resistance towards the change (Kotter, 1995; Lewin, 1947). This is something that has happened in this case as well and it might be because the leaders high up in the organization are not aware that the people lower down in the organization does not understand the change and what it entails.

The CIS is seen as an abstract vision that is open for interpretation by most individuals. As the strategy has not been interpreted in the same way by all perspective groups there is the possibility that problems related to goal alignment will arise. As Van de Ven & Sun (2011) writes, planned change is most useful
when the organization is striving towards a common goal and as Jiang, Chang, Chen, Wang, & Klein (2014) writes, shared understanding of clearly formulated goals are necessary for effective program implementation. We therefore believe that if there is a difference of viewpoints in what the strategy is and what it is supposed to achieve, there is the possibility that the people involved will strive to achieve different goals. When they try to reach different goals, there is a risk of not reaching every goal or even none at all. The program managers therefore need to strive towards aligning the goals of the program stakeholders. Different views on the strategy and the goals involved can also result in a misalignment of expectations of what the program will result in (Chang et al., 2014). As Jiang et al. (2014) writes, the program stakeholders need to work towards a set of agreed upon goals as this would help to align the expectation in the program. If the expected result is not reached it will give rise to dissatisfaction in the organization.

Each individual project in a program will have their own individual goals and the same can be said for the stakeholders that are involved in the projects (Gregory et al., 2015). However, the goals of the individual projects are not always aligned with the program goal, and as the projects in a program are interdependent it is necessary to align the goals of the projects, otherwise the failure of one project can impede the other projects in a program. For example, if one project fails to implement a new system in time at a subsidiary it affects all other projects that planned to implement another system, which would be integrated with the first system, at that same subsidiary. Program managers therefore needs to manage diverse interests of multiple teams to manage conflicts between projects (Parolia et al., 2015). Members of PGIT, PJIT, and PGB have mentioned that there has been little pressure or direct coordination from program management that is supposed to manage communication between projects.

When implementing global change, strategic managers and people involved in the program, on all levels of the organization, should make sure that the strategic goals on all levels of the organization are aligned (Bokovec et al., 2015; Chang et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2015). If individuals’ viewpoints are diverging enough it might impede coordination and cooperation (Daft & Lengel, 1986), and without alignment the expectations will differ and might lead to conflicts. The CIS was initiated before it was completely finalized and before every stakeholder was aligned with the program. Members of the program management mean that it is impossible to get everybody to be completely aligned. As one employee said, “If you always have to get everybody aligned before you take the first step, you’ll never take the first step”. However, starting the change program before the key stakeholders were aligned and committed to the program meant that the program managers had to push out the program and continuously work on building commitment and motivation for the program. Unfortunately, from what we have gathered, there is not enough work being done to consolidate the CIS in the organization and aligning goals. As a result, different expectations exist in the organization and this has led to misunderstandings and in some cases conflicts.

7.1.2 Lack of outcome consensus
In the organization, the different perspective groups have different opinions of how much they should standardize the solutions that are being rolled out in the organization. The IT department, and primarily individuals on the program level, has the mission to standardize the IT infrastructure and create solutions that involves the standardization of business processes. They want to create a global template that includes standardized processes and standardized systems and they focus especially on the systems. By doing this they mean that they can simplify their work of managing and supporting the IT infrastructure as well as increase the efficiency of the organization.
The business department on the other hand focuses less on the systems and instead more on the customer and how they can manage their customer relationships. Higher up in the business departments, at a program level, the business managers expressed a desire to make it easier to manage customer relationships, improving the customer journey, and simplifying data management to improve sales and increase profit. To do that they want to create standardized processes that follow the best practices to enable the customer experience. PGB expresses that the standardization of systems and processes should provide the commercial teams with increased capabilities to manage their businesses. The organization is now, according to individuals in the PGB, prioritizing changing the structure of the IT infrastructure before focusing on changing the processes. This tells us that there is some misalignment between the focus of the business department and the current focus of the program. It is important to note that the misalignment is with the current focus and not the end goal of the CIS, which is to create an organization that uses the global standardized solutions.

The IT project team has a mission of implementing the projects and creating deliverables inside of the determined scope of the project. As the IT department is tasked with driving the CIS program, they are also the ones responsible for keeping to the time plan and the budget. Therefore, they want to avoid any changes to the scope that can cause delays. Keeping the solutions as close as possible to the global standardized solution makes it easier for them to deliver the projects inside scope and in time.

PJB are the one perspective group that would rather avoid the standardized solutions and instead they are opting for solutions that are more adapted to their needs. They see the CIS solution as a step back. One individual even said, “the global solution is, as it is now, unusable”. They therefore require solutions that are adapted to their specific needs and markets. There is less of a concern in the local businesses about what specific systems they use, and if it is a standardized system that is used in the whole organization. As one individual said, “we do not care how it works, just that it works”. The subsidiaries traditionally have had large power inside the organization and dissatisfaction would rise if they are not able to affect how the solutions would be designed.

The different perspective groups did have different opinions of how standardized the solutions should be. Without aligning the organization about what they are supposed to achieve with the projects, we believe the different perspectives will affect how the CIS program is implemented as well as the outcome.

7.1.3 Lack of recognition of the need for change
As individuals in the organization is lacking understanding of what the purpose of the CIS is, they also lack understanding of what benefits the CIS will bring. There is a difference of expectations between stakeholders of what benefits can be created by implementing standardized systems and processes. Commonly, it is program management’s mission to make sure that people understand what benefits can be created with the program, as people are most motivated when they have specific expectations (Jiang et al., 2014). However, when asked about the benefits of the CIS program, each perspective group focused on the benefits that are most relevant to their own mission and did not fully understand what benefits other perspective groups would gain.

What is clear is that not everybody involved in the program, especially not on a project level, understands what the benefits would be for the global organization if they implement completely standardized systems and processes. What happens then is that the local subsidiaries only accept
solutions that would give them clear benefits and will oppose solutions that includes drawbacks or are not as good as the ones they currently use. They view changes that affect their businesses negatively as something to avoid even if it will bring long term benefits for the whole organization.

The program IT perspective group is the only group that has some form of holistic view of what the strategy benefits are. If the other perspective groups are not aware of the benefits that they are supposed to reach there is little probability that they will be able to reach them. Especially on the project level it is important that the project member, both on the IT side and the business side, are more aware of what benefits they can expect from the projects.

If the local subsidiaries does not understand the benefits the global organization would receive from the change program, what can happen is that they sees the IT as a scapegoat (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). When the end users are dissatisfied with the results of a project, instead of criticizing the CIS program and the managers that drives it, they can put the blame on IT, either the department or the systems. As we heard from the business department, they view the CIS change program like a good idea and to have standardized systems and processes seems logical, the problem is that the solutions that exists now are not good enough. This is a good example of when lack of mutual understanding regarding the program’s benefits creates strain in the relationship between the perspective groups.

During the interviews we gathered that it became easier to implement the projects when the subsidiary is asking for a new system because they themselves feel a need. When the subsidiaries are asking for a new system, they have a higher motivation and commitment to the project, which increases the chance for a successful implementation project. During the early stages of the program, the Company focused on implementing new systems where there was a demand for a new solution and the implementation was not so complicated, and they had a chance of creating easy wins. This is a good idea as easy wins is a good way of building motivation for a change (Kotter, 1995).

The data we gathered during interviews suggest that not everyone involved in, or affected by, the change program has been fully committed to implementing the change. This lack of commitment might be a result of that people are often content with the way they are currently working and see no reason to change (Lewin, 1947). The Company is doing quite well right now which might affect the perceived need for change. As Van de Ven & Sun (2011) writes, planned changes often break down if people do not realize the need for change and see the benefits, so management need to be aware of this. Organizations often act the way they do because they have found that way of behaving to be successful in the past. Any changes that affect their way of behaving, for example new IT systems, is therefore seen as a threat (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). Tushman et al. (1986) mean that periods of financial stability are a good time to implement incremental changes to prepare for the future. However, unwillingness to accept change in times when the business is doing well might impede their ability to handle times when the market is failing as periods of stability leads to forces in the organization that tries to keep this stability (Tushman et al., 1986). This can be a reason for the resistance towards change that we have found to exist in the organization.

During interviews with people from the PGB perspective group we heard that the business side of the organization does not feel a sense of ownership over the CIS and with this follows a lack of commitment for the change program, especially lower down in the organization. The lack of commitment in subsidiaries is something that we have also heard from multiple sources in the organization, either explicit or implicit, and one reason that was brought up was that the business side was not involved as
much as they would have liked to in the initial planning of the program. The CIS is seen as a strategy and a change program that originates in and is being pushed out by the IT department, which in turn affects the business side’s sense of ownership over the changes. What we have seen corresponds with Shao, Feng, & Hu (2017) that says that having a sense of ownership encourages employees to embrace the new solutions.

As we heard from individuals in the program level perspective groups, it is difficult to explain to the subsidiaries that even if the CIS solution is not perfect it gives larger benefits for the whole organization that outweigh the drawbacks the local subsidiaries experience. As Markus & Benjamin (1997) writes, IT-enabled change comes with the expectation that the organization will function better after the change has been implemented. The local subsidiaries therefore expect the project to deliver benefits for their own businesses and request solutions with a lot of customization that does not conform to the global template that were created in the beginning of the program. This in turn mean that the efficiency gains and benefits from economics of scale that program management counted on in the beginning might not be created.

There is a need to understand that the global solution will not fit perfectly everywhere in a global organization and it is therefore necessary to adapt to local stakeholders (Mossolly, 2015). As Gregory et al. (2015) mentions, it is necessary to balance the needs of the global organization as well as the local subsidiaries. Managers need to understand the needs or processes of the affected organizational members, otherwise it can create problems for both project implementation and future use of the solutions (Suchman, 1995; Westelius, 2006b; Westelius & Mårtensson, 2004). Balancing the needs of the organization with the needs of the local subsidiaries, and the affected organizational members, is difficult and if the Company is not careful they will end up with a multitude of different solutions in the organization, which was what they wanted to avoid by implementing the CIS strategy.

7.2 Diverging perceptions of the type of change

As mentioned, it is important that expectations in the organization is aligned, otherwise dissatisfaction and a lack of motivation might arise. One reason for the lack of motivation that we have seen in the organization, especially at a lower level, might be that the CIS was not finished when it was first rolled out into the organization. One of the purposes of the CIS that we heard from the PGIT was that the CIS would help them become better at managing projects, in particular by using their governance framework. We also got the impression that they wanted to improve the CIS over time by continuously learning from each project, which can be seen as a continuous improvement approach. For the senior management team members it is not upsetting as they are aware that not everything is finished at the start of the program roll-out. However, this setup is upsetting for the subsidiaries as they expected a finished platform and instead they received unfinished processes and a global template that was not fully developed.

One clear example of when the expectations of the stakeholders were not aligned was the subsidiaries expectations of how much effort the project would require during project roll-out. We heard from the local subsidiaries that their expectations of the project were that it would give them a new system and help them improve on their processes. They also expected that the global template solution was finalized and ready to be implemented. What happened instead was that they had to put a lot of effort into helping the IT department create a new solution and this often involved implementing completely new processes. As one individual said, “We thought it would be a small upgrade, but it turned out that
we had to change the way we work. If we knew how much effort it would take we would not have accepted the project”. This meant that the local subsidiary expected a small incremental change, but instead it turned out to be a drastic, revolutionary change that they were not ready for. Reorganization and changes to structures, systems and processes are, according to Tushman et al. (1986), examples of revolutionary changes. A revolutionary change requires more motivation and commitment than smaller incremental changes (Tushman et al., 1986). However, in this case the recipients of the change did not receive enough information to align their expectation with others, which affected their motivation and commitment.

For the organization as a whole, the CIS change program can be seen as a change that is being implemented incrementally with a few parallel projects at a time. However, the subsidiaries are just involved in one or a few projects that are just a small part of the total number of projects implemented in the organization. This disproportional involvement in the projects means that the impact of each given project is much larger on the PJB perspective group, at least in the short term, compared to that of the other perspective groups. As Lattuch & Young (2011) writes, depending on if an individual feel that a change would have a small or large impact on their work, they perceive the change in completely different ways. This is something that program management needs to be aware of. Since members from all perspective groups, aside from PJB, work continuously with the program they are therefore more used to the changes that are associated with the projects. They can therefore view the CIS change program as a life-cycle change process in which they continuously work and learn from each implementation project. On the other hand, this is not the case for the PJB perspective group which we believe views the change as more of a revolutionary, drastic change. As Van de Ven & Sun (2011) writes, when implementing life-cycle changes both the people driving the change and the people affected by the change needs to see the change in the same way. This has not been the case in the CIS change program.

### 7.3 Diverging perceptions of program execution

Between the perspective groups, there exist various opinions of how the program and projects should be implemented, especially regarding how they should reach the expected benefits.

#### 7.3.1 Program control and benefit realization

During the interviews, we heard that three of the four perspective groups, namely the PGIT, PGB and PJIT, expressing that the projects are more successful when the leaders are more authoritarian. Having a stricter control over project execution means that they are able to push out the agreed upon, standardized solution without having to adapt it according to local subsidiary requests. This might help program management to reach project outcomes which are more in line with the original program goals, but it might also invoke dissatisfaction in the subsidiaries and lead to conflicts.

PJIT means that by being authoritarian and not having to adapt too much to the subsidiaries request, they are more likely to finish the project in time and inside scope, as the scope does not change in the later stages of the project. They focus on reaching project success goals, which according to Walenta (2016) means creating the deliverables inside the determined scope. As Walenta (2016) also writes, even if they deliver the project inside budget and on time, they can fail to create the expected benefits. It is unclear of how the Company measures the success of the program and, as we heard during the interviews, they are not completely aware of how successful the projects are and if they succeed in creating the desired program benefits.
Being authoritarian and pushing the standardized solutions can be likened to a total optimization approach where the total performance of the organization is how success is measured. By using a total optimization approach, it will mean that some local subsidiaries will receive a solution that is not as functional as the one they currently use, but it will improve the total performance of the organization. However, trying to implement the solution without disrupting daily operations while also focusing on enabling the business by adapting the systems and processes can instead be viewed as more similar to a continuous improvement (CI) approach. According to a CI approach, with each implemented project, a single subsidiary will operate a bit better and the organization will gain from that. However, the organization will not be able to gain as much program benefits for the global organization when there are many customized solutions in the organization. As stated by Gregory et al. (2015), it is difficult to create a solution design that both invites “harmonization and consistent use of IT” (Gregory et al., 2015, p. 64), and “customization and flexible adaption of IT to business needs” (Gregory et al., 2015, p. 64).

For the PJB the CIS change program can be viewed as a revolutionary change that involves changing their work practices and their tools. As Tushman et al. (1986) says, revolutionary changes should be implemented quickly to reduce the time the organization is in a period of instability and it also reduces the time that forces of resistance have to build up. In this case authoritarian leadership can be helpful in implementing the project in a short period of time.

The mission on a program level should be to control, govern and coordinate projects to align them towards the organization’s strategic goals (Walenta, 2016). As Lycett, Rassau, & Danson (2004) writes, effective coordination of projects can help an organization become more efficient and also help them reach business-focused goals. If the program management do not control and coordinate the projects there can be issues such as the projects not being aligned with the strategic program goals or the projects have to compete with other project regarding the use of the same resources (Lycett et al., 2004; Turkulainen et al., 2015). As Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Qureshi, et al. (2016) mentioned, it is difficult to balance the level of control. Program managers should often seek a high level of control over the project, but too excessive control over the projects can mean that there is a lack of flexibility in the projects (Gregory et al., 2015). This might cause irritation towards the governing systems, especially if the project members do not see benefits of strict control (Lycett et al., 2004). This was the case in our study where the Company had implemented a new governance framework that included documentation, much of which the project members saw as excessive and unnecessary. Project members wanted to work on creating deliverables instead of putting time into administrative work that might be useful for the program but not the end result of the project. The difference in the perspective groups’ views on the proper level of control can cause strain in the relationship between project members and program management.

7.3.2 Implementation speed and project requirements
It is difficult for the organization as a whole to benefit from each subsidiary using the standardized solutions until a large part of the organization has implemented the CIS solutions. As a consequence, at program level the focus is to roll out the program as quickly as possible to the organization to reach those program benefits. Until then, the only benefits that can be found are the benefits the subsidiaries get by implementing new systems and standardized processes.

Trying to implement a large change program quickly can have implications for the organization. As Aladwani (2001) writes, the timing of introducing a new system is critical for the chance of succeeding.
The change recipients, in this case the subsidiaries, also need to be ready to receive the change. In a change program, such as the CIS, where multiple systems will be implemented, it can be an idea to pace the implementation to let the new systems and processes take hold before implementing a new one (Nahavandi, 2015). This increases the need for coordination between sub-programs, but it might be necessary to increase the chance of success of the projects. Even if the program managers want to implement the CIS program as fast as possible, they need to take the subsidiaries needs into account and pace the program accordingly.

Performing implementation in a hurried fashion will limit time available for consolidating the changes, both before and after an implementation project. It will also mean, as we heard from many employees in the organization, that there is not enough time to reach a consensus regarding requirements and delivery means in the beginning of the projects. The IT project team wants to get on with the project to keep up the strict time plans, however their business counterparts are unfamiliar with IT project processes and are also unaware how important the pre-study phase is and how much time they should spend there. This means that the IT project team and the local subsidiary do not reach a consensus regarding the requirements before the start of project execution.

When the IT project teams fail to reach a consensus and a common understanding with the local subsidiary members regarding requirements, there will be a need for the local subsidiaries to add additional requirements late in the projects to get the functionality that they see as vital. We have found many instances of in this study, and it has resulted in project scope creep and delays. The IT department is responsible for delivering the project within set time plan and predetermined scope, and it is also the perception of the IT department members that they would be the ones being reprimanded if they cannot deliver the project in time, even if it was because of changing requirements from the business side. This has meant that the IT project team has pushed harder to reach the project goals, which as we have seen can lead to conflicts and a strained relationship between the IT and business project teams. Within projects, there is a need for stakeholders to reach a mutual consensus regarding the project scope, project requirements, and if they want to start the implementation or if they need to postpone or reject the change (Batras et al., 2016; Dibra, 2015). There is awareness among employees that they are often lacking a requirement consensus in projects.

7.4  Diverging perceptions of IT and Business cooperation
IT-enabled change is difficult to implement and requires the cooperation of both IT and business individuals (Ko & Kirsch, 2017). These individuals are often working according to different missions, and they are in possession of disparate knowledge bases and experiences. Altogether, this affects how efficiently they are able to cooperate when implementing change.

7.4.1  Lack of delivery means consensus
As the project is driven by IT, it follows their project processes and governance framework that the local subsidiary employees are often unfamiliar with. The projects are initiated with a presentation from the IT project team, to the subsidiary that will receive the new system, about the purpose and delivery means of the project. This presentation, according to people in the PJB, is on a high level and does not go into enough specifics regarding the project processes and the responsibilities of the stakeholders in the project. As we have come to understand it, the abstract presentation makes it difficult for the people in the business department to understand the project processes and to feel a sense of ownership of the projects. The project execution is then initiated before the IT project team and the local business
employees have reached a consensus regarding the project delivery means. Consensus regarding delivery means is the shared understanding regarding methods and procedures by key project members (Jiang et al., 2014).

The lack of consensus regarding project delivery means and the project processes is a large problem for the program organization. As Markus & Benjamin (1997) writes, when the different functions involved in the change cannot reach an agreement regarding who is supposed to do each task, only luck or magic can produce the desired change outcome. Mutual understanding pertaining to the responsibilities of individuals involved in the change is also critical to align expectations (Kritsonis, 2005). What we have found is that without there being a consensus regarding the projects processes and responsibilities before the projects start, there is bound to be confusion during the projects execution. The project members will disagree on what the next steps should be and in order to resolve these issues regarding the project process, they will have to have lengthy discussions. In this study, conflicts often had to travel high in the organization before they could be resolved by a senior manager, and the conflict resolving process took a long time and caused delays to the project. It is important to note that a project is not guaranteed to reach the desired results even if everyone performs their role satisfactory (Markus & Benjamin, 1997).

Regarding the project processes and delivery means, the IT project members were better informed than the business project members. This imbalance meant that there was some confusion in the subsidiaries regarding how the projects were supposed to be carried out. As mentioned by Jiang et al. (2014), a delivery means consensus also includes a task agreement between involved parties and requires commitment. We believe that by not fully understanding, or having a sense of ownership of, the project processes it was difficult for the business project members to feel motivated and committed to spend effort on the project. According to members of the IT department, the level of commitment felt among people in the local subsidiaries towards the CIS was lower than that among members of the IT department. Members of the IT department meant that the business project members did not spend enough resources on the project, which created some irritation among IT employees. The business project members on the other hand meant that it is hard to be motivated and committed when there is a lack of transparency in communication from the IT people.

7.4.2 Lack of common knowledge base
As Ko & Kirsch (2017) writes, individuals from IT and business departments have different knowledge bases, and the difficulties that the IT and business project teams have in reaching a delivery means consensus can in part be traced to this difference. IT and business people will find it difficult to cooperate when they cannot understand each other. Lack of mutual understanding can give rise to communication difficulties and members of PJB mentioned that it was sometimes difficult to understand the IT people because of the technical terminology. It is therefore important for the people in the IT department to be aware that the people in the local subsidiaries cannot be expected to understand IT project processes, and that they need support from the IT project team to handle these processes.

Difficulties to understand each other can also mean that members of different perspective groups can find it hard to grasp what the other groups might gain from the change. Today there is a customer–supplier relationship between business and IT. There is not a partnership between the different departments, even though there seems to be a consensus in the organization that this is needed to reach all program and project benefits. By only focusing on the benefits that are immediately connected
to one’s own work there will be a lack of understanding of why other groups act the way they do. This lack of understanding might lead to mistrust between parties involved in the change and also be a source of conflicts.

As mentioned before, one conflict that exists in this change program is the conflict regarding how much they need to customize each solution to each individual subsidiary. The IT department wants to keep the solutions as standardized as possible, while the local subsidiaries feel that without enough customization the existing solutions are unusable. The local subsidiaries do not seem to place importance on the benefits the IT department will receive and will therefore not care for solutions that provide benefits only for the IT department if that involves drawback for their own businesses. This is understandable, but the subsidiaries expect the IT department to implement systems that are adapted to the local needs even if this solution is more difficult for the IT department to support and manage. As we have understood it, there is little sense of give and take from the local subsidiaries, which makes it harder for the IT and business project teams to cooperate.

The local businesses motives can come from the business individuals’ lack of knowledge and competence in understanding what benefits an IT organization can gain from a standardized IT infrastructure. This is further supported by Ko & Kirsch (2017) who states that business individuals often lack technical understanding and knowledge. The difficulties in cooperation are further increased by the nature of the CIS being a global change program. As Niazi, Mahmood, Alshayeb, Qureshi, et al. (2016) writes, it is difficult to build trust in global projects where the project members do not meet in person. Both IT and business employees have mentioned that they find it easier to cooperate and communicate when they work at the same geographical location.

In a project involving different departments such as IT and business the different competence areas makes it even more difficult to handle good communication. One example of when the PJIT and PJB disagreed on the project processes, which also illustrates the lack of communication, was during acceptance testing of implementation projects. Members of the IT department mentioned that the business project members did not want to spend time doing acceptance tests, for the different functions that were supposed to be implemented, and instead they wanted to start using the functions directly without testing. The IT project members argued that this was not possible as, according to their project methodology, all functions need to be tested by users before they can be implemented. This is evidence of disagreement between the different project members regarding the way the projects should be delivered. We believe this disagreement is also connected to the project members’ different knowledge bases and their respective ways of handling projects.

Our understanding of the empirical data is that the disagreements regarding the test processes lead to delays. According to the IT department, these delays happened because the local businesses were not committed to spend time on the project and also did not understand the practices involved in an IT project. PJB instead meant that testing was ineffective as it was difficult to reproduce real world situations in the testing environment, and when the systems went live there still existed bugs that were discovered in the previous testing phase. People from the IT side explained that some change requests were never implemented, and that the systems were not always completely finished when they went live. However, they did not seem to grasp how this would affect the motivation of the business people. From the IT department, we heard statements such as, “Sometimes you have to decide enough is enough as the end users always want more”. The IT department meant that they had to prioritize what
change requests to implement, and they did this together with the business members at a program level. The problem was that there was not enough transparency and the PJB members were not fully aware of what the final functionality of the delivered system would be. We have seen that dissatisfaction arises when the resulting solution did not match the expectations of the end users.

From the information we gathered during interviews, it is clear that the program organization does not to a proper extent consolidate implementation changes after project completion. Post-project consolidation is just as important as preparing the organization for change before the project starts (Dibra, 2015; Kotter, 1995; Lewin, 1947). During interviews, we heard that after the projects are finished, and the IT project teams have moved on to other projects, the local end users are still not completely familiar with the new systems and processes. As Kritsonis (2005) and Mitchell (2013) writes, the ones implementing a change should gradually terminate the helping relationship. However, this has not been the case and PJB mention that they felt a lack of support from the IT project team as they were left to manage the systems on their own quite abruptly. PJB also mentioned that the new systems were not finished when the projects when shut down, and they therefore had to rely on the IT support function to get the functionality that they felt should have been implemented by the IT project team. The result of this feeling of abandonment was dissatisfaction regarding the project.

When well-built IT is used as intended it makes it easier for employees to increase performance using improved work practices, and make it more difficult for employees to use ineffective processes (Markus & Benjamin, 1997). However, IT cannot ensure that the employees will use the systems in the way IT intended. The only ones that can ensure that the organizations get effective use of IT are the end users. What might happen when the project is not consolidated is that the new systems will not be used in an effective way and that the organization has spent a lot of resources on a project that contributed no real benefits. Without consolidating the change there is not guarantee that the situation will stay as it is after the project is finished (Lewin, 1947; Nahavandi, 2015). One example of this is an implementation project of a new ERP system in a country where, after the system was implemented, the end user preferred to use the old system instead of the new system. A reason for why there might not be enough work being done to consolidate the new systems and processes is, according to Iveroth (2010), that managers see IT as a tool that is, and is supposed to be, managed by the IT department. The belief of business managers is that whenever the IT people unleash a new system or technology, change is spread in the organization automatically and that the employees then simply adapts to the changes. While managers often think that IT will take care of itself once the IT department has implemented new changes, this is not case according to Iveroth (2010).

It is important to note that in an IT-enabled change program, it is not just business people that require technical knowledge, but it is also IT people that require business knowledge (Ko & Kirsch, 2017). One example that depicts how both IT and business lack the required knowledge is the difficulties they face regarding gathering business process requirements as neither group fully understand how the business processes actually work. The business employees are not entirely sure about how they want to use the new system, perhaps because they do not fully understand what they can get out of the software, further adding to the difficulties to create specific requirements. The IT department lacks understanding on how business processes are connected, but still try to puzzle them together by themselves. The final solution might not match the system end users’ operational needs. This is a common problem in IT projects, as illustrated by several authors (Bensaou & Earl, 1998; Gregory et al., 2015; Westelius, 2006a).
8 Concluding analysis

In this chapter, we will answer the research questions, based on the empirical data we have collected through corporate documents and interviews as well as the theoretical data we collected through our literature review.

8.1 The perspective groups and our typology

In a large organizational change, there are many stakeholders that need to be taken into account. Considering the different perspectives that each individual stakeholder has is complex and given the limited time of our study we would not have been able to draw any reliable conclusion regarding how every single individual’s perspective differ and the reasons behind.

With research question 1: What groupings of perspectives can we discern? we wanted to consider IT-enabled change programs and see if we could find a way to group and categorize perspectives to see if we could discern more collective perspectives that exists in the organization.

Perspectives are shared by individuals as a collective mind (Mintzberg, 1987), partly as a consequence of individuals shared community of knowledge (Boland & Tenkasi, 1995). However, during our study we also found that individuals’ mission and responsibilities play a large role in shaping peoples perspectives, see Figure 8-1 below. We would like to argue that during an IT-enabled change program, managers must pay attention to not only respective knowledge bases of individuals, but also of the role they play in the organizational change, to be able to understand their motives and field of vision.

![Figure 8-1: Two factors are key in dividing perspective groups. The respective mission of individuals is shaped by role and responsibility, while knowledge base is shaped by education and experience.](image)

We based our typology, which acts as our basic analysis model, partly on the data we collected during interviews, partly on the theory collected in our literature review. During interviews, the concept of using Business and IT emerged as two separate and complementary groups involved in the ongoing changes within the organization. During interviews, we often heard people talking about “the IT” and “the business” side of the organization. The literature study, pertaining to the topic of IT projects and IT-
enabled change (Chang et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2015; Iveroth, 2012; Ko & Kirsch, 2017; Markus & Benjamin, 1997; Westelius, 2006b), revealed that the notion of discussing involved parties according to business and IT affiliation was indeed common and often used to describe stakeholders in IT-enabled change.

The interviews also revealed that there was a disparity in answers between individuals owing to position within organizational hierarchy and structure. During the literature review we also gained a better understanding of the concept of managing multiple interdependent projects within a program structure (Chang et al., 2014; Gregory et al., 2015; Jiang et al., 2014; Lycett et al., 2004; Turkulainen et al., 2015; Turner & Speiser, 1992; Walenta, 2016), which in combination with successive coding resulted in a second perspective dimension – Program and Project. As the main subject of inquiry of this study is change, or more specifically, a change program involving multiple interdependent projects, extrapolating the perspective groups of program and project respectively is to us a logical separation of individuals with different roles and responsibilities that are engaged in the change.

The boundaries of the Program – Project dimension were not as clearly defined in the empirical data compared to that of the Business – IT dimension. The organization is still working on acquiring knowledge and competence regarding managing projects and employees were not fully acquainted with the concepts of program management. What we could discern was that the different communities of knowledge are not as distinct between individuals in the program and project perspective groups as it was between business and IT.

![Figure 8-2: The perspective group typology](image)

The combination of the two dimensions of IT – Business, and Program – Project presented us with a typology of four perspective groups, which we later used to understand the data from our empirical study.
8.2 Diverging perspectives
The purpose of this study is to understand how different perspectives within an organization affect cooperation and coordination during a global IT-enabled change program. Before we could start any discussion whether or not contradicting perspectives affect cooperation and coordination in an IT-enabled change program, we wanted to discern how the opinions and viewpoints of the different perspectives differ or conform. Using the perspective typology, we can compare perspectives pertaining to relevant issues to answer research question 2: How do the perspectives groups differ?

We conducted interviews with individuals from the different perspective groups to determine if there were any differences in the information and opinions the different perspectives had, or if they all perceived the change program in the same way. What we found was that there were apparent differences between the different perspective groups. Differences include how people perceived the change, what they prioritized, the goals they aimed for, and how well they understood project processes.

8.2.1 Differing and conforming perspectives between IT and business
One of the biggest differences we found between the various perspective groups was the type of knowledge they possessed and how much information they had regarding the change program. Depending on the knowledge base an individual possesses they will have different expectations of the change and knowledge about what is possible to achieve. People in the IT department were in possession of technical knowledge concerning the functionality of systems and how they could be implemented. On the business side, there was a distinct lack of technical knowledge and instead they possessed knowledge regarding the business and how it should be managed. These differences conform to the findings in our literature review which state that IT and business people are in possession of different knowledge bases.

Individuals in the change had different amounts of knowledge regarding how to implement and manage IT-enabled change programs. As the IT department was the ones driving the program, they were more knowledgeable about the program’s purpose, as well as more familiar with the way IT-enabled change programs are implemented. The program was also implemented in a way that was more adapted to the previous experience of IT employees. Because of the business individuals’ lack of familiarity with project processes constructed by IT they did not feel a sense of ownership of the change. Because the change program was IT driven and heavily influenced by IT processes, the business has been a bit of an underdog. The technical terminology employed in the IT-enabled change has made it harder for business individuals to be as assertive as the IT individuals. As this is a program that requires both the participation and commitment of both IT and business, this technical focus might not be ideal for creating a partnership on equal footing.

The IT department wanted to implement their standardized solutions, including systems and processes, in a rapid pace. This standardized solution was aimed to make it easier for the IT department to manage and support the IT infrastructure as well as help the business to become more efficient and reduce cost. The IT department therefore wanted to avoid implementing solutions that are not standardized. They also worked hard to implement the projects according to the predetermined scope, timetable, and budget.
The business side of the organization focused on creating processes that should enable employees in the business to manage their tasks, as well as customer relations, in an efficient manner. The CIS program, and the IT changes it contained, they perceived was meant to open doors and create possibilities for the organization to coordinate different parts of the business and enable a greater degree of cooperation. By using standardized best practices, they could increase efficiency and help them operate in the same manner all over the globe to become "one operating company". Integrated IT systems would also help the Company manage the data that exists in the organization. Altogether, the business side seems to focus more on the functionality and quality of the systems, compared to the IT department that focuses on standardized solutions and implementation speed.

8.2.2 Differing and conforming perspectives between program and project
The largest difference we could find between individuals on the program and the project levels is their view on what the change program should lead to for the organization. The individuals on the program levels have a much wider scope of where benefits will be created for the organization by the change program. This is to say the individuals on the program level focused more on the "everyone" instead of the "us". They wanted to achieve gain from Economics of Scale, which resulted in subsidiaries not always receiving solutions that were always fully adapted to their requirements. On a project level, the individuals were closer connected to the people working in the daily operations of the subsidiaries, and they therefore strived to create solutions that were practical for the end users. However, these solutions often required a high degree of customization and adaption.

The individuals on the program and project levels had a different view on what was possible to achieve with the CIS program. On a program level, there was a sense of, as the people lower down in the organization described it, an optimistic view on what could be done. Individuals on the project level told us that they believe that the people on the program level overestimated how much they would be able to achieve and how fast. What we could see was that the closer one gets to the operational work that is happening in the subsidiaries, the easier it is to understand how much work is required to implement the types of changes.

8.2.3 Difference between change recipient and implementer
There was a consensus in the organization on that the change program should not disrupt the local subsidiaries and that the IT changes were implemented to enable the business. There were therefore conflicting thoughts about how much they needed to adapt and customize each solution, during the implementation projects, to not disrupt the local subsidiaries.

Among the different perspective groups, PJB stood out as most unique. The other perspective groups, PGIT, PJIT, and PGP, were more aware of what the program would give the organization. These perspective groups were more used to the program and how the implementation projects worked. On a program level, the individuals are per definition related to the program. When comparing PJIT with PJB the employees in the PJIT were often involved in continuous projects related to the program. PJIT were therefore more used to this type of change and projects. As the members of the PJB differs from each implementation project, and in large parts the members of the other perspective groups stay the same, it is not strange that their opinions and the information they had differed.

The PJB perspective group is also the recipients of the change, as they are getting new systems and processes, and they are therefore the ones that are the most affected by the change program. From
what we have gathered, PJB sees the program as a drastic change that has a major impact on the way they work and the tools they use. For the other perspective groups, the change does not make them alter the way they perform their work. Also, they are continuously involved in the program which means that every project is not a new experience. When looking at the organization at a whole, the change seems to happen more incrementally, a few implementation projects at a time.

PJB is the most driven to have both functional and practical systems, and consequently they seek non-standard solutions that are adapted to their own current business and operations. The other perspective groups considered it easier to implement standardized solutions if the people managing the projects were more authoritarian and they did not accept all changes to the system that the PJB urged on.

To conclude this section, we want to summarize the key differences that we have found between the different perspective dimensions. These key differences are illustrated in Figure 8-3 below.

---

**Figure 8-3**: Key differences between perspective dimensions. Each difference is rooted in the mission and knowledge base of individuals.

---

### 8.3 Effects of diverging perspectives

Our empirical study has shown that there are certain differences between perspective groups regarding their goals, priorities, and their degree of knowledge and understanding. To reach the purpose of this study, we now relate and discuss the correlations between perspectives’ viewpoints and the various issues and complications that we have found in the empirical setting to answer research questions 3: *How can differences in perspective affect a change?*
8.3.1 IT and business

Business and IT have separate missions that includes different sets of goals. Different sets of goals lead to a different set of priorities, which in turn results in goal misalignment which can have severe negative consequences. Cooperation between the parties can be impeded and partnership might be more difficult to achieve. Resources are also prone to be used less effective than if they were applied towards reaching a common goal. In the end goal misalignment lowers the chances of reaching predetermined goals. When goals are not reached, involved parties will most likely be dissatisfied with the result, which can affect subsequent project collaboration.

Having different sets of knowledge, leads to a discrepancy in understanding of what is possible to achieve and complete with the available resources in an IT-enabled change. Parties might not have the same impression of the amount of resources required for project completion, what solutions are plausible given the available technical systems, or what benefits can be created. If expectations are not aligned, people involved in the projects are due to misunderstand each other and dissatisfaction can arise among projects members whose expectations are not fully met.

Business and IT possess different knowledge bases. For example, in an IT-enabled change, technical expertise and knowledge are held by members of IT, while expertise of business processes and best practices are held by business practitioners. Having separate sets of knowledge makes it more difficult for parties to communicate and create common understanding, which affects their ability to cooperate. Work is therefore needed to increase transparency and communication throughout program and projects.

Having separate communities of knowledge can result in business and IT members having different ideas of how change projects should be managed or executed. It may be difficult for participants to reach a delivery means consensus. If there is no agreement on common procedures it follows that the participants will works and prioritize tasks to different degrees, which is likely to obstruct cooperation and coordination during both program and project execution. This conduct will lead to project completion delays and conflicts among those involved, as well as subsequent irritation and frustration among participants.

We have seen that business individuals often lack previous knowledge of IT project processes. Lack of understanding regarding project processes and delivery means makes it harder to feel a sense of ownership over the program. This leads to lacking motivation and commitment. To feel that other parties does not fully commit to the change can create irritation and frustration and may strain the relationships between business and IT.

8.3.2 Program and project

Depending on where an individual position in the organization – i.e. what mission and responsibilities they hold – the individual’s perceived scope of the purpose of the change differ. As we have observed, individuals on a program level have a wider scope vis-à-vis the view of change program benefits and benefactors, e.g. they have a larger focus on how the change would benefit the global organization. On a project level, the individuals are more focused on creating deliverables and what the projects would signify for the recipients of the projects, in this case the local subsidiaries. The scope of an individual’s perception and understanding of the purpose will affect their expectations of the change’s results. If
there is no perceived need for change, there is a risk that resistance towards the change will form among employees.

The people lower down in the organization, especially on the business side, were not fully aware of the scope of the respective projects. They believed they would receive a simple upgrade of their existing solutions. However, it later became apparent that there was disparity between what the project would entail and what was communicated. There was a misaligned preconception of the amount of effort required to see the project through. In other words, the program was not consolidated in the organization, and this led to issues regarding commitment and motivation among recipients as the reality did not conform to their expectations.

On a program level, there is a focus to implement the projects in a rapid succession to reach benefits that are of use for the organization, which require that standardized solutions have been implemented in a large part of the organization. Implementing the projects in a rapid fashion can however have large consequences. For one, there might not be enough time to consolidate the change program, build motivation and align expectations. Furthermore, the project teams might not be able to spend enough time in the pre-study phase of the project and create detailed requirements that everyone can agree on. There also might not be enough time to reach a consensus regarding the delivery means. To implement the projects in a rapid succession could also mean that the projects are not paced properly and recipients of new systems and corresponding processes will not have enough time to consolidate the changes before another implementation project is started. Consequently, a lack of proper pacing can create resistance towards change as people do not want to be in a state of continuous change.

The closer you get to the projects and the recipients, the better you understand how much they will be affected by the projects and how it will change the way they are managing their businesses. If you only focus on how the program affect the organization, and neglect to consider what it would mean for the recipients of the projects, you will find it difficult to comprehend how considerable recipients regard the impact of the change. If recipients of the change regard it as having a drastic impact on the way they work they will be wary of the change. There is likely to be an imbalance among program stakeholders’ understanding of change impact and consequently their expectation of how easy or difficult the change will be to implement.

We have seen that people on a program level often want a high level of control over the projects. We believe, with the support of previous literature (Gregory et al., 2015; Lycett et al., 2004; Turkulainen et al., 2015), that program managers strive for more control as it facilitates their ability to manage and coordinate subprograms and projects, and in the end, makes it easier to reach desired program goals. However, a higher level of control could mean that decisions are made farther away from the projects by program managers that often lack the knowledge and understanding of daily operations of projects and subsidiaries to make informed decisions. This will inhibit the flexibility of the projects in their work to create deliverables and customized solutions that fulfil the need of end users. Project members can become frustrated with a high level of control and what is in their view excessive required documentation. This discord regarding level of control can strain the relationships between program and project members.

To conclude this section, we want to summarize the relationships between key differences among perspective groups and how these differences affect the program implementation in Table 8-1 below.
Table 8-1: How key differences between perspective groups affect program implementation. The key differences can be seen as root causes of division in understanding. The division causes various effects to take hold that in turn affect the implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root cause of division</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate mission (focus).</td>
<td>Lack of goal alignment.</td>
<td>Goals not reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical understanding.</td>
<td>Lack of understanding what is possible.</td>
<td>Dissatisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of project processes.</td>
<td>No sense of ownership.</td>
<td>Lack of commitment and motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strained IT / business relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of type of change.</td>
<td>Lack of impact understanding.</td>
<td>Expectation of difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of daily operations.</td>
<td>Different opinion of level of control and program coordination.</td>
<td>Frustration among stakeholders. Strained project / program relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Discussion

In this chapter, we will discuss our findings and how these, viewed using certain perspectives, can be of use. We will also highlight differences and similarities with previous research, discuss relationships present in the typology, and discuss possible reasons behind our findings.

9.1 Relevance and validity of the study

The purpose of this study was to explore if different perspectives within an organization affect cooperation and coordination during a global IT-enabled change program. We have succeeded in gaining additional understanding regarding of how different perspectives can affect change through an interaction between empirical and theoretical data, and we can conclude that differences in perspectives can affect cooperation and coordination during a global IT-enabled change program. We have therefore fulfilled the purpose of this study.

We started our study by creating perspective typology that was used to ensure that we gain enough empirical data, as well as our basic analysis model. This typology was useful in categorizing and compiling information and opinions that we had gathered during our interviews with employees. We were then able to compare the information we gathered from individuals, belonging to different perspective groups, to understand how their role in the organization, their mission, and their community of knowledge affect how these individuals perceive the change that was happening in the organization.

This information is useful for companies trying to implement large organizational change programs and/or IT-enabled change. First, it is important to be aware of the different stakeholder and the perspectives they hold. We believe that our study can create awareness between stakeholder that others might have another view of the change which is just as relevant their own. Second, we believe that that our study can give individuals a better understanding of themselves and how they intuitively interact and respond to others. Third, the results of this study can enable stakeholder to create understanding of others and their response, motives, goals, and level of understanding regarding certain matters, as well as highlight key differences between perspectives. This understanding can help explain why complications and conflicts arise. Together, awareness and understanding can help individuals avoid conflicts, as the information can be used to pinpoint where there is most important to educate or what points are important to be extra clear in communications.

We believe it is important for companies to gain an understanding of the perspective groups that exists in their organizations. Before implementing larger changes they should try and find out who the stakeholders of the change are, and what perspective groups exist. They should then try and understand the various perspective groups’ motives, prioritzations, and goals. Involving members from all perspective groups early in the change can enable them align goals and expectations and create a better discussion regarding the how the change should be implemented.

Our typology is not perfect. One difficulty we experienced when using our typology was that it was sometimes difficult to sort people into perspective groups. A reason for this is that individuals in the organization often have more than one role, for example the project managers at the business side often only work part time with project related tasks.
We noticed that the program and project dimension does not present as clearly defined organizational borders as found between IT and business. IT and business individuals often work according to completely different missions and are located in different lines of the organization structure, reporting to different managers. In an organization, there exists a multitude of organizational levels and it is difficult to perfectly define where to draw the line between program and project individuals. We could have separated the different perspectives in greater accordance to organizational levels, but that would have made the dimension more complex as multitude levels would have been included and we wanted to keep the perspective groups relatively simple.

When contemplating the business perspective, we chose not to further divide the perspective into separate business functions, such as sales, finance etc. While such functions may be divided into different communities of knowledge, within the scope of an IT-enabled change program, their role was similar and their knowledge base contrasted that of the IT. Furthermore, the range of business functions a certain company is composed of may greatly differ between companies depending on industry and business model. We therefore chose to keep the different functions clustered within the concept of business.

9.2 Implications for further research
This study can be used to illustrate various perspectives that exist in an IT-enabled change program. We have seen studies that compare the dimensions of IT and business as well as program and project separately. However, we have not come across any previous studies that compare the perspective dimensions together within one typology. This study further illustrates the differences between perspective in a new empirical setting, and we highlight the various goals and motives that different perspectives can hold. We believe our study can give a new point of view on how to depict, illustrate and categorize groupings of perspectives that exists within an IT-enabled change program. Our study can also illustrate in a new way, using new examples, how differences in perspectives can affect change implementation.

These perspective groups we have chosen are just one way of dividing perspectives in an organization. The perspective groups can be further divided into smaller segments to be further studied and more detailed information can be gained although that would increase the complexity of the typology. We have noticed a few groups with diverging perspectives, but we are not certain on what perspectives we might have missed. For example, we have not studied how the perspectives from individuals outside the organization, such as consultants, affect the change program. Another group, that was very influential in the change, was the organization's top management team. The perspective implications of this group would have been interesting to study, but we lack the empirical data to do that. It would be interesting to see how a longitude study could depict the changes to perspective groups over time.

We anticipate that if stakeholders gain further understanding of the perspective groups that exists, the IT-enabled change program implementation would be more successful. It would be interesting to see if our presumption holds true in a larger study.

This study revolves around an empirical setting that involved a change that is being driven by the IT department. It would be interesting to see if our findings hold true in an empirical setting where the change is being driven by the business side.
The Company which is the source of our empirical setting is a traditional production company selling their products B2B. We are not certain that our findings would be applicable in companies with other business models, such as companies within the IT sector. Further validation of our findings should involve such an empirical setting.
10 Conclusion

In this study, we have found that there exist many different perspectives in an organization, each having its own motives, prioritizations, and goals. As trying to take every individual’s perspective into account and satisfying their needs is close to impossible, grouping individuals into different perspective groups can be a useful tool to understand the motives and opinions that exist inside a large organization implementing change. Our typology with four perspective groups – Program IT, Project IT, Program Business, and Project Business – is not perfect division of perspectives, but is fitting as a tool to sort and analyze the data we can observe in our empirical setting, which is an organization undertaking a series of interdependent IT-enabled change projects.

These perspectives will affect any change that is being implemented. The most important factors that we have found to divide groups are their respective missions and knowledge bases. We have seen many instances where misunderstanding arose because the stakeholders involved in the change lack mutual understanding of each other’s perspectives.

When comparing members of IT and business perspectives we found disparities in their 1) mission and corresponding focus on either IT infrastructure or customer related operations respectively, 2) knowledge of technical and business related requirements, and 3) knowledge of IT project processes.

The largest differences found between members of program and project perspectives were in their 1) mission and corresponding perceived scope of benefits and benefactors, 2) perception of type of change, and 3) understanding of daily operations.

Gregory et al. (2015) pointed us towards the difficulties of managing and coordinating projects in an IT related change program. We believe that, just as Gregory et al. (2015) means, that it is critical in a program structure to balance local and global needs. Jiang et al. (2014) and Chang et al. (2014) furthers explained the importance of shared goal understanding, goal commitment, and delivery means consensus and how this can affect cooperation and coordination as well as project outcomes. Ko & Kirsch (2017) elaborated how it is difficult to create shared understanding among organizational members with distinct knowledge bases, such as IT and business members, and that organizations need employees with hybrid knowledge that understand both IT and business related requirements. What we have seen in our empirical study corresponds to the theories of Gregory et al. (2015), Jiang et al. (2014), Chang et al. (2014), and Ko & Kirsch (2017).

IT-enabled change programs have a technical focus by its very nature, especially when driven by IT people. It is therefore important that business, who easily becomes an underdog as they lack the technical understanding to be assertive, are made aware and given knowledge about what benefits they can expect and how the projects are to be implemented. Failing this, the program is likely to have the characteristics of an IT roll-out as opposed to an IT-related organizational change.

We believe that lessons from this paper can be drawn to be of use for organizations whose situation is similar to that of the empirical setting depicted in this paper. Organizations that are large enough to be performing change inside the frame of change programs, and that are new to implementing larger IT-related organizational change, can use this paper to gain understanding regarding the perspectives that exists in their organization. They can also use the empirical description to learn what issues and complications they should strive to avoid.
We believe that the stakeholders involved in an IT-enabled change program must strive to understand each other. Without mutual understanding, the parties involved will struggle to discuss and find consensus regarding matters of the program. If there is no mutual understanding there will exist differences in expectations, goals, and comprehension, that during program implementation will cause issues. These issues are problematic to solve ad hoc, and should be handled before the start of any implementation. Failure to manage said issues induces a high risk of program implementation reaching neither program or project goals as the program will produce benefits for the organization on neither a global or local level.
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# Appendix A  Interview guide

## Brought up before start of interview

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction of us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction about work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>How the interview will be conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>How the information will be used/handled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acceptance of sound recording</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Background

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Who are you, what is your role and responsibilities. Describe your daily work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors and subordinates</td>
<td>Vem är din direkta överordnade och vilka om några, är dina underlydande?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of change program

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define and describe the CIS</td>
<td>How would you describe the CIS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of CIS</td>
<td>How would you describe the purpose behind the CIS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals and effects</td>
<td>What is the CIS supposed to achieve? What goals are there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affects</td>
<td>In what way have you been affected by the CIS / project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Perspective

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own goals</td>
<td>What are your goals/wishes for the CIS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When involved in the program</td>
<td>When did you start participating in the CIS/project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How role is related to program</td>
<td>How do your work, past and present, relate to the CIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (either from others or the interviewee)</td>
<td>How much have the work of implementing the change been prioritized by other parties in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicated goals</td>
<td>What goals have been communicated to you?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Problem and conflicts

| Describe work | How would you describe the work that has been done? | Hur har arbetet gått? |
| Time plan and budget | Have the implantation stuck to the predetermined time-plan and budget? | Har förändringen följt sin tidsplan och hållit sig inom budget? |
| Effects and goals | Have the program reached the desired benefits and goals? | Har förändringen uppnått det den skulle (mål, effekter)? |
| Issues, problem, complications | Can you describe if there has been any specific issues that have arised during the change implementation? | Kan du beskriva vilka svårigheter som uppkommit under projektets gång? |
| Reasons | What are the reasons for these issues? | Vad tror du orsakat svårighet er? |
| Anything to improve | Is there anything that you can become better at regarding the change implementation? | Finns det något som du tror skulle gå att förändra för att förbättra för framtida CIS/projekt? |

### Conflicts of interests

<p>| Changing priorities | How would you describe your priorities over time? | Har vad du har prioriterat förändrats över tid? |
| Same priorities in the organization | Do you believe the priorities are the same at all levels and departments within the organization? | Anser du att alla parter prioriterar samma saker? |
| Conflict interests of interests | Can you describe any conflict of interests related to priorities? | Finns det några intressekonflikter |
| Vilka för/emot CIS | In general and respectively, who are more and less receptive to the change. | Är det några som är starkt för, starkt emot förändringen? |
| Different perspectives | Have you seen any differences in perspectives, priorities, focus inside the organization? | Har du märkt av att det finns olika synsätt/prioriteringar/fokus? (antingen inom olika nivåer eller mellan domäner) |
| Relationships | Describe the relationship/cooperation between IT and business. | Hur är samarbetet/relationen mellan IT och Business? |
| Relationships | Describe the relationship/cooperation between program and project | Hur är samarbetet/relationen mellan program och projekt? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there something you think we should look in to more? Have we missed something?</td>
<td>Vad har vi missat, bör kolla vidare på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who might we contact to learn more?</td>
<td>Vem kan vi kontakta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we contact you in the future if we have questions regarding your answers?</td>
<td>Kan vi kontakta dig igen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to learn more about our results?</td>
<td>Vill du höra hur det gick?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B  List of interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Perspective group</th>
<th>Audio recording</th>
<th>Duration (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project manager IT</td>
<td>2017-01-18</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Project IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprogram manager</td>
<td>2017-01-19</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprogram coordinator</td>
<td>2017-01-23</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology manager</td>
<td>2017-01-27</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management IT</td>
<td>2017-03-14</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprogram manager</td>
<td>2017-03-29</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business process coordinator</td>
<td>2017-03-29</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager</td>
<td>2017-03-30</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project methodology manager</td>
<td>2017-04-03</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprogram coordinator</td>
<td>2017-04-05</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subprogram manager</td>
<td>2017-04-06</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business process expert</td>
<td>2017-04-07</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program manager</td>
<td>2017-04-10</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project member IT</td>
<td>2017-04-11</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Project IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager business</td>
<td>2017-04-11</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Project Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager business</td>
<td>2017-04-18</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Project Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project methodology manager</td>
<td>2017-04-19</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business process expert</td>
<td>2017-04-27</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager IT</td>
<td>2017-04-20</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Project IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business process coordinator</td>
<td>2017-04-21</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager IT</td>
<td>2017-04-21</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Project IT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary manager</td>
<td>2017-04-21</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Project Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager business</td>
<td>2017-04-21</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Project Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business process coordinator</td>
<td>2017-04-25</td>
<td>Teleconference</td>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective group</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program IT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project IT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C  List of internal documents used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of contents</th>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Date of creation</th>
<th>Intended audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outline of vision, division of committees and responsibilities concerning strategic</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>2016-06-11</td>
<td>Employees involved in the CIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture of technical systems.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2013-06-11</td>
<td>Employees involved in the CIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheet describing and informing in brief term the project methodology.</td>
<td>Hand out</td>
<td>2017-01-26</td>
<td>Project members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline and detail description of project methodology processes, stages, and roles.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2017-01-13</td>
<td>Project members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global IT staff meeting presenting and discussing recent developments of CIS.</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>2016-07-14</td>
<td>IT department employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global IT staff meeting presenting and discussing recent developments of CIS.</td>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>2016-10-06</td>
<td>IT department employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of lessons learned from ERP implementation project A.</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>2015-11-10</td>
<td>Employees involved in the CIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of lessons learned from ERP implementation project B.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2017-02-15</td>
<td>Employees involved in the CIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of company strategic direction for IT.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2016-03-17</td>
<td>IT department employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation material used for monthly governance meeting of program management</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2017-01-13</td>
<td>Program management committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee. Includes description of subprogram overview and status, project status, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brief plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2016-12-09</td>
<td>Program management committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2016-11-11</td>
<td>Program management committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as above.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2016-09-11</td>
<td>Program management committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief outline of CIS program status.</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>2015-11-13</td>
<td>Managers involved in the CIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>