

management was made aware of the technological issues, the deputy department head commented: *“If you turn one stone, you have to turn them all.”* This meant scope creep and a more comprehensive change than initially anticipated, but also a change of priorities. As a consequence, the aforementioned list of requirements remained unknown to the lead in-house technician till one of the researchers presented it to him after the end of the project. The end-users realized a dawning failure based on the results they perceived in their daily work. A content manager commented: *“It became evident during the run of the project that our [the content management] team’s wishes [...] were difficult to implement.”* The content management team reacted with not focusing on the wishes and expectations anymore. This can be described as the mechanism of **inherent fatalism** of end-users. Instead, they realized that the renewal project was a threat for their productivity. Overcoming the threat and the difficult phase was therefore a great success. According to a team lead, the new attitude to the project became: *“It simply had to be done.”* She described their experience with the adversity as a *“state of war”*. She went on to say: *„It is a positive experience to go through such difficult periods. It is an opportunity to grow personally and to see what you are capable of.“* We interpret the described personal growth and experience of performing against the odds as the seed for the perception of success that end-users reported. This appears to be at the heart of their sensemaking process. It overshadows the project and its original purpose over time. The other team lead stated in the third rounds of interviews: *“I do not know [how many requirements were met]. I have no idea. [...] You get used to situations and if something is suddenly missing from the tools that you use, you find other ways. [...] Whenever you get used to something you stop questioning it. Hence, I do not know what can be improved at the moment.”* The hallmark of success in such a scenario became reaching the previous level of performance and they abandoned the goal of renewal. As a group, the users at FASHION developed a reliable system, similar to those described in the literature [23], to cope with the adversity that they perceived because of the technological glitches in their work environment. Overcoming the situation as a group also gave them a collective mind and a collective feeling of success. This finding adds to previous research which has identified the importance of organizational culture for IS project success in general [33]. Aspects of inherent fatalism as a mindset, its antecedents, and its consequences have featured in previous research. For instance, research on perceived organizational support and psychological contracts of employees with their employer [36] has investigated conditions that might lead to inherent fatalism on the part of the employees. Part of the process to readily accept the situation in the workplace is the rationalization process of individual end-users. More specifically, motivated reasoning [37, 38], which is the reliance on a biased set of cognitive processes, is likely to be important for explaining end-users ability to focus on the aspects under their control. The end-users could have been motivated to avoid a reasoning that would stain the embraced narrative of success of FASHION. As a consequence, such an approach allows them to remain motivated to work [39] at FASHION. The organization relied on the described combination of mechanisms, which has its roots in the instilled organizational narrative of dynamism and success, to motivate users to overcome the problems in daily use. As a result, the deputy department head believed that all people involved were satisfied and summarized: *“The users found ways to deal with the performance problems.”*

6 Conclusion

A CR approach enabled us to develop a better nascent theory for the understanding of various perceptions and evaluations of success of IS projects in organizations. Our explanation of the link between the mechanisms identified above is the main contribution of our study. We use them to explain the discrepancy between end-users' perception and real renewal project success: For *end-users*, the perceived success of overcoming the adversity of the renewal project was a good match with the overall groupthink, and the predominant organizational narrative. They perceived themselves as the group of people that was working in a dynamic market environment and as those who successfully struggle with its dynamism. Overall, their sensemaking of the situation had a fit with FASHION's organizational narrative. From this, we draw the conclusion that overcoming the adversity of a project's ramifications is a big factor in the perception of successful projects by end-users. This creates a feeling of unity and resolve in good teams. The greater purpose of being part of something interesting (a growing and dynamic business – fitting the organizational narrative) is also an important aspect. For *management*, the resilience of end-users, who are motivated in such a way, is crucial to ensure relative success to their adjusted objectives. As observed in our case, managers seem to adapt their level of perceived success based on the information they receive from the technicians, who are closest to the matter at hand, but are not necessarily aware about the overall story that has been told by management about the project they are working on. Thus, there is a wider disconnection in the sensemaking of individuals in an organization about the success of a project. As long as management dominates the perception of the business environment and end-users buy into the derived organizational narrative, it is likely to influence the sensemaking process of end-users. In our case, this means that the adversity of the initially *planned* technological change is seen as inevitable on the level of end-users. End-users seem to consider the greater cause inherent in the organizational narrative and respond with a fatalistic and resilient attitude and form a reliable system, which allows them to cope with the adversity related to technology project in their organization. For *technicians*, this means that their sensemaking is constrained by time pressure and in our case the inevitable lack of experience with the PIMS. In this situation, they had to make sense on the fly. Furthermore, they did not feel empowered to manage relationships with end-users and expectation management on their own. Overall, this led to the described situation in which the perception of the business environment and the resulting organizational narrative dominated the perception of a project's success. We think that this theoretical understanding is generalizable as the organizational narrative, which informs perception, is likely to depend on the organizational environment.

A possible limitation of a single case study is always generalizability. We deem a single case as appropriate for exploratory research and aim to challenge generalizability of our results on the basis of multiple cases in future research. It is a practical implication of this paper that managers should make sure that they actively nominate someone, who plays the role of a devil's advocate [22] to manage the expectations related to a synchronized plan. This will alleviate the problem of groupthink based on a similar perception of the environment and the resulting organizational narrative. In our particular case, the common believe led to a lowering

of expectations which allowed to reinterpret failure as success in meeting adjusted expectations. This is a benevolent outcome. It is also possible, that the organizational narrative further aggravates end-users. A narrative told to motivate employees can ring hollow if it is not backed up by reality. Thus, management and technicians should communicate more directly and more transparently with end-users about the underlying technology. Even if they do not understand the technology in detail, they are likely to welcome the gesture of inclusion and the possibility to participate. In a different environment as in our case, users can resort to adverse behavior such as user resistance [40, 41]. The circumstances of this can be at the center of future research.

References

1. Manager-Magazin, <http://www.manager-magazin.de/magazin/artikel/a-891269-3.html> (Accessed: 02.11.2016)
2. Andersen, E.S.: Toward A Project Management Theory for Renewal Projects. *Proj. Manag. J.* 37, 15–31 (2006).
3. Atkinson, R.: Project Management: Cost, Time and Quality, Two Best Guesses and A Phenomenon, Its Time to Accept Other Success Criteria. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* 17, 337–342 (1999).
4. Lech, P.: Time, Budget, And Functionality? - IT Project Success Criteria Revised. *Inf. Syst. Manag.* 30, 263–275 (2013).
5. Thomas, G., Fernández, W.: Success in IT Projects: A Matter of Definition? *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* 26, 733–742 (2008).
6. Basten, D., Joosten, D., Mellis, W.: Managers' Perceptions of Information System Project Success. *J. Comput. Inf. Syst.* 52, 12–21 (2011).
7. Bala, H., Venkatesh, V.: Changes in Employees' Job Characteristics During an Enterprise System Implementation: A Latent Growth Modeling Perspective. *MIS Q.* 37, 1113 - 1140 (2013).
8. Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., Kautz, K., Abrahall, R.: Reframing Success and Failure of Information Systems: A Performative Perspective. *MIS Q.* 38, 561–588 (2014).
9. Wynn, D., Williams, C.: Principles for Conducting Critical Realist Case Study Research in Information Systems. *MIS Q.* 36, 787–810 (2012).
10. Gregor, S.: The Nature of Theory in Information Systems. *MIS Q.* 30, 611–642 (2006).
11. Doherty, N.F., Ashurst, C., Peppard, J.: Factors Affecting the Successful Realisation of Benefits from Systems Development Projects: Findings from Three Case Studies. *J. Inf. Technol.* 27, 1–16 (2011).
12. Ewusimensah, K., Przasnyski, Z.H.: Factors Contributing to the Abandonment of Information-Systems-Development-Projects. *J. Inf. Technol.* 9, 185–201 (1994).
13. Fincham, R.: Narratives of Success and Failure in Systems Development, *Brit. J. Mgmt.* 13, 1–14, (2002).
14. de Wit, A.: Measurement of Project Success. *Int. J. Proj. Manag.* 6, 164–170 (1988).
15. Lech, P.: Time, Budget, And Functionality? - IT Project Success Criteria Revised. *Inf. Syst. Manag.* 30, 263–275 (2013).
16. Byrd, T.A., Thrasher, E.H., Lang, T., Davidson, N.W.: A Process-Oriented Perspective of IS Success: Examining the Impact of IS on Operational Cost. *Omega.* 34, 448–460 (2006).
17. Nicolaou, A.I., Masoner, M.M., Welker, R.B.: Intent to Enhance Information Systems as a Function of System Success. *J. Inf. Syst.* 9, 93–108 (1995).

18. Masoner, M.M., Lang, S.S., Melcher, A.J.: A Meta-Analysis of Information System Success: A Reconsideration of Its Dimensionality. *Int. J. Account. Inf. Syst.* 12, 136–141 (2011).
19. Lyytinen, K.: Expectation Failure Concept and Systems Analysts' View of Information System Failures: Results of an Exploratory Study. *Inf. Manag.* 14, 45–56 (1988).
20. Weick, K.E., Sutcliffe, K.M., Obstfeld, D.: Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Org. Sci.* 16, 409–421 (2005).
21. Huczynski, A.A., Buchanan, D.A.: *Organizational Behavior - An Introductory Text*. Prentice-Hall, London, UK (1991).
22. McAvoy, J., Butler, T.: The Role of Project Management in Ineffective Decision Making Within Agile Software Development Projects. *Eur. J. Inf. Syst.* 18, 372–383 (2009).
23. Weick, K.E., Roberts, K.H.: Collective Mind in Organizations: Heedful Interrelating on Flight Decks. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 38, 357–381 (1993).
24. Yin, R.K.: *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. (2009).
25. Myers, M.D.: *Qualitative Research in Business & Management*. Sage Publications, London, UK (2009).
26. Lawrence, M., Low, G.: Exploring Individual User Satisfaction within User-Led Development. *MIS Q.* 17, 195–208 (1993).
27. Myers, M.D., Newman, M.: The Qualitative Interview in IS Research: Examining the Craft. *Inf. Organ.* 17, 2–26 (2007).
28. Bhattacharjee, A., Lin, C.-P.: A Unified Model of IT Continuance: Three Complementary Perspectives and Crossover Effects. *Eur. J. Inf. Syst.* 24, 1–10 (2014).
29. Dubé, L., Paré, G.: Rigor in Information Systems Positivist Case Research: Current Practices, Trends, and Recommendations. *MIS Q.* 27, 597–636 (2003).
30. Spradley, J.P.: *Participant Observation*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York (1980).
31. Zachariadis, M., Scott, S., Barrett, M.: Methodological Implications of Critical Realism for Mixed-Methods Research. *MIS Q.* 37, 855–879 (2013).
32. Mingers, J.: Realizing Information Systems: Critical Realism as an Underpinning Philosophy for Information Systems. *Inf. Organ.* 14, 87–103 (2004).
33. Jackson, S.: Organizational Culture and Information Systems Adoption: A Three-Perspective Approach. *Inf. Organ.* 21, 57–83 (2011).
34. Brown, A.D., Jones, M.R.: Doomed to Failure: Narratives of Inevitability and Conspiracy in a Failed IS Project. *Organ. Stud.* 19, 73–88 (1998).
35. Janis, I.L.: *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Houghton and Mifflin, Oxford, England (1972).
36. Aselage, J., Eisenberger, R.: Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Contracts: A Theoretical Integration. *J. Organ. Behav.* 24, 491–509 (2003).
37. Kunda, Z.: The Case for Motivated Reasoning. *Psychol. Bull.* 108, 480–498 (1990).
38. Rousseau, D.M., Tijoriwala, S. a.: What's a Good Reason to Change? Motivated Reasoning and Social Accounts in Promoting Organizational Change. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 84, 514–528 (1999).
39. Gagne, M., Deci, E.L.: Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation. *J. Organ. Behav.* 26, 331–362 (2005).
40. Kim, H.-W., Kankanhalli, A.: Investigating User Resistance to Implementation: a Status Quo Bias Perspective. *MIS Q.* 33, 567–582 (2009).
41. Rivard, S., Lapointe, L.: Information Technology Implementers' Responses to User Resistance: Nature and Effects. *MIS Q.* 36, 897–920 (2012).