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Abstract

A study is reported into strategic IS planning (SISP) in UK organisations. The core data is derived from 70 UK organisations across private and public sectors. The study developed prior work by Earl (1993) and Segars & Grover (1999) who found that organisations used a small number of SISP approaches each with differing levels of success. This study broadly confirmed these earlier findings but suggested that SISP approaches are evolving. Cluster analysis revealed that the UK organisations surveyed currently employ five broad approaches to SISP, 1) Administrative, 2) Technological, 3) IS Function Led, 4) Organisational, and 5) Comprehensive. The first four approaches were identified in a similar form by the prior research. A fifth approach labelled methods driven was not found in this study and is assumed to have waned in usage. This study found a new comprehensive approach that combines and balances other SISP approaches and delivers higher levels of SISP success. Earl had proposed that were organisations to employ such an approach that superior results could result and this proposition is supported. This finding is important for research and emphasises the need to continue to investigate the SISP field to capture changes in practice. For practitioners, it provides early evidence of another approach for IS strategy formulation that is capable of delivering superior levels of success.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Strategic IS planning (SISP) is the process of deciding objectives, policies, strategies and plans for an organisation’s use and management of information and networking technologies. SISP includes identifying IS applications, developments to IT infrastructures and improvements to the management of the IS/IT functions and the sourcing of IT resources (Lederer & Sethi, 1988).

Strategic IS planning has received significant research attention, with over 200 research studies completed over the last three decades (Warr, 2004), yet remains one of the major challenges for the management of information systems. Consequently it continues to be a major issue for CIOs and IT Directors who invest significant amounts of their own time, and that of their organisations, in addressing it. Despite these efforts the success that organisations achieve varies greatly for both their SISP activities and the IS strategies that are developed. This applies irrespective of sector and geography. It is easy, therefore, to argue that SISP research remains important from both a theoretical perspective and to support the efforts of IS practitioners (Watson et al., 1997)

A key theme running through SISP research has been the investigation of the way that organisations carry out SISP, described as the ‘approach’ to SISP. This concept is more than the processes or methods; instead it aims to encapsulate the full richness of SISP as an organisational endeavour. Earl (1993) provided a description of SISP approach that illustrates this,
An approach may comprise a mix of procedures, techniques, user-IS interactions, special analyses and random discoveries. There are likely to be some formal activities and some informal behaviour. Sometimes IS planning is a special endeavour and sometimes it is part of business planning at large. However, when members of the organisation describe how decisions on IS strategy are initiated and made, a coherent picture is gradually painted where the underpinning philosophy, emphasis, and influences stand out. These are the principal distinguishing features of an approach.” (p7)

The SISP literature reveals that SISP has evolved substantially since its inception. During the 1950s and 1960s the SISP techniques used by early pioneers of business computing borrowed from general management the approaches used for other major business development investments (Osborne, 1956; Taylor & Dean, 1966). During the 1970s a set of proprietary methodologies (i.e. privately developed and owned) emerged such as Business Systems Planning (IBM, 1975), Information Engineering (Finkelstein 1981) and Method/1 (Lederer & Sethi, 1988) along with planning approaches from academics such as the Stages of Growth framework (Nolan, 1979) and Critical Success Factors (CSF) analysis (Rockart, 1979). These methodologies and planning frameworks proved influential and popular with the majority of firms adopting them. However by the mid 1980s firms began to increasingly adopt approaches developed in house. A study by Earl (1993) of UK firms demonstrated that proprietary methodologies had become a minority approach with the majority of firms using in house approaches. Further, these approaches had evolved into five types of approach. Segars & Grover (1999) also found in a study of US firms in the mid 1990s, both the wane of proprietary consultancy methods and the same five broad approaches. Both studies found that different approaches had different levels of success and Earl suggested that combining approaches might lead to higher levels success.

This research report is an empirical study of SISP in UK organisations that develops the works of Earl (1993) and Segars & Grover (1999) in the field of SISP approaches.

The research questions explored in this paper are:

Q1. Does strategic IS planning continue to be pursued by organisations using the five approaches identified by prior research?

Q2. Do the levels of success achieved by SISP approaches continue to differ?

Q3. Are organisations combining approaches to achieve even higher levels of SISP success?

These are important questions for SISP research. For theoretical developments, the continuous evolution of approaches over the last three decades emphasises the need to continue the research to ensure developments in practice are being reflected in theory. For research validity, more confirmatory research is needed to add weight to the existing body of research. For practitioners, studies such as Earl’s and that of Segars & Grover need to be taken further to provide the granularity needed by IS/IT managers and consultants.

2 THE FIVE APPROACHES TO STRATEGIC IS PLANNING

The works of Earl (1993) and Segars & Grover (1999) together provide a taxonomy of SISP approaches. Although the findings of the two studies revealed a very similar taxonomy, they did so by employing different constructs, construct measures, research methods and geographies. This provides measurement and methodological triangulation and adds to the robustness of the joint taxonomy. Both studies found that the success of SISP varied with some approaches being more successful than others. Table 1 summarises these SISP approaches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SISP Approaches from Earl</th>
<th>Some Characteristics of this Approach</th>
<th>Relative Level of Success from Earl</th>
<th>SISP Approaches from Segars &amp; Grover</th>
<th>Relative Level of Success from Segars &amp; Grover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>The allocation of IS resources to business needs using formal mechanisms typically using steering or IS investment committees. Decisions are often superficially rational with organisational power and influence playing an important role and perspectives being dominated by internal knowledge &amp; interests. Legitimacy for the strategic IS plan is from organisational power.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business-Led</td>
<td>Deriving IS requirements from the business strategy and operational imperatives of the organisation. Decision-making is by senior managers. Legitimacy is from the business strategy and business objectives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods-Driven</td>
<td>The best methods are sought, often proprietary methods from external organisations. These are used to find tangible, strategic positions through the use of high-level technology and planning tools and models. Legitimacy is from the claimed best practice.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positioning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Detailed technical analyses and planning are used to produce portfolios, architectures and implementation plans using prescribed and structured formats. Analysts and technologists dominate these activities. Legitimacy is from analysis and technology knowledge.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Involvement and participation are emphasised using techniques such as workshops and two-way communication. The result is organisational learning about problems and opportunities and the IT contribution across the organisations. The strategic IS plan emerges and is often defined as a set of themes. Legitimacy arises from the support of the organisation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Success is relative to the other approaches in the framework with 1 being lowest and 5 highest]

*Table 1. The five approaches to SISP found by Earl (1993) and Segars & Grover (1999)*

Earl (1993) called for “additional studies … to further validate and then perhaps develop these findings.” Segars & Grover’s research can be viewed as doing this for the US geography, but no studies have responded to this for UK organisations. It also seems possible – even likely – that the approaches being used for SISP have continued to change or evolve.

In commenting on the implications for practitioners of the taxonomy of approaches, Earl (1993) also commented that, “It may be possible to design a more effective hybrid (approach)”. He proposed that by combining the five SISP approaches identified on a “mix and match” basis, even higher levels of SISP success might be achievable than those available from individual approaches alone.
3 CONSTRUCTS AND MEASURES

The construct measurement strategy was to a) employ updated versions of previously used construct measures to increase rigour and reliability; b) ensure comparability with the prior research that this study was seeking to extend; c) use measures appropriate for a survey of UK public and private sector organisations using IT directors as the informants.

3.1 SISP Approach

A two dimensional, multi-item construct was designed for SISP approach that built on Earl (1993). Earl’s measures were used over that of Segars & Grover as the former had been used for UK organisations and covered more aspects of SISP. In addition Earl’s study used the multiple case study method and the measures emerged from the use of cases. There was therefore an opportunity to develop them further and validate them through a survey. Earl’s measures relate to the behaviours used for SISP – that is the methods, roles, ends and means of SISP. The second dimension employed in this research was that of SISP agendas, which sought to measure the content of SISP. For this dimension the measures developed by Boynton & Zmud (1987) were updated.

3.2 SISP Success

A variety of measures were available and considered. Earl’s case study research had emphasised both ends and means in measuring success. This had been the basis for perhaps the best validated measure of SISP success from Raghunathan and Raghunathan (1994). Their measure employs two, multi-item dimensions of 1) improvement in the capabilities of SISP activities (i.e. means), and 2) fulfilment of key objectives of the SISP activities (i.e. ends). Raghunathan & Raghunathan’s measure was chosen and used over other measures because of the level of construct validation both in the original work and from subsequent use in other studies.

4 RESEARCH METHOD

4.1 Survey

The study employed a mail survey of UK organisations in public and private sectors. The study chose IT directors as the informants due to their privileged position for reporting on SISP. Preparation for the study included a 10 firm exploratory study using the case method that helped inform both the research design and instrument design. For the survey a random sample by sector and size was drawn from a commercial database of IT directors (Grapevine, 2001). A range of other data was collected in the survey instrument on both the organisations and the respondents and this was later used to validate that the sample was representative. The questionnaire was large and so a sophisticated survey protocol was employed based on Chan (1992) to encourage participation in the study. Subsequent to the study a series of case studies have been undertaken to deepen understanding of causality and context, but are not reported here.

4.2 Research Validation

The threat to research validity from construct measurement has been highlighted by several commentators (e.g. Venkatraman & Grant, 1986). To address this, the measures used were grounded in prior studies. The measures were also subjected to peer review by other researchers and a panel of 10 IS professors with publications in SISP was engaged to review both the research design and the detailed construct measures. Their comments resulted in significant improvements.
The survey instrument and survey protocols were validated using a multi-stage process. First two researchers experienced in the survey method reviewed the survey instrument. Then three IT directors were asked to complete the instrument and comment on content, structure and time required to complete. After revision, a further three IT directors completed the questionnaire, this time with no significant difficulties. The questionnaire and survey protocol including letters and reply cards were then validated using two pilot studies. A copy of the questionnaire is published within Warr, 2004.

Common methods bias was recognised as a threat to validity in this study. Common methods bias occurs where the same informant reports on the dependent and independent variables. Most surveys risk this bias. To help avoid it, a number of tactics were employed (Weaver, et al., 1999):

Questions were made as objective as possible.
Instrumentation was designed so as not to reveal the dependent variable.
Senior managers were used as informants as they were expected to be the most objective.

Additionally a component was added to the research design to measure common methods bias. This measured SISP success and SISP approach in the population of senior general managers. This used simpler and higher level measures from Segars & Grover (1999) and was administered to 90 UK business executives. This additional component revealed – albeit with less granularity – the same findings, thus suggesting strongly that the principal informants, IT directors, were not introducing common methods bias into the study.

4.3 Sample Characteristics

The main survey achieved valid responses from 70 UK organisations and a 22% response rate. Table 2 shows the demographics of the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Organisational Size (Revenue or Expenditure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Greater than $1bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$100m – 1bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Less than $100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for Profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>Group IT Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology &amp; Media</td>
<td>IT Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>IT Strategist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>IT Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The demographic characteristics of responding organisations and informants

Non-response bias was measured using the extrapolation method (Armstrong & Overton, 1977) whereby it is assumed that respondents who reply less readily are more like non-respondents. In this method, samples of early and late respondents are compared. No significant differences were found (p<.05) supporting non-response bias as not being significant in this study.

4.4 Refining Measures

Confirmatory factor analysis was applied to the measures used. The thresholds used for judging significance was a factor loading greater than 0.3. Scree tests, percentage of variance explained and the qualitative interpretations of emerging factors were used to develop the underlying factor structure within constructs. This was used to refine the measures originally used. For SISP success the underlying dimensions were confirmed. For SISP agendas the underlying dimensions were revealed. And for SISP behaviours the underlying dimensions were refined.
5 THE DIMENSIONS OF STRATEGIC IS PLANNING

5.1 The Research Model Being Employed in this Study

Figure 1 summarises the constructs into the research model for this paper

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 1. Research model for this study relating the dimensions of SISP approach to those of SISP success.*

The relationship of SISP approach to SISP success and the direction of the relationship are supported in prior research and within this study. This part of the study is described in detail elsewhere (Warr, 2004).

5.2 SISP Behaviours

SISP behaviours describe the way that SISP is carried out. Five dimensions of behaviours were found in this study. These were similar to those proposed by Earl (1993), but not identical. The methods-led behaviours, which emphasise the use of the best methodologies available, were not found to be significant and appear to have waned over time. The consultative behaviours associated with Earl’s organisational approach where workshops of business and IS professionals identify IS/IT strategies and plans appears to have evolved. Two forms of this behaviour have emerged. One, emphasising involvement to identify the business-side needs and requirements from IS/IT – i.e. alignment of IS/IT with business activities. The other form emphasising involvement of business professionals in
evaluating the business potential of IS and IT – i.e. identifying IT-enabled business models and opportunities. In summary the five SISP dimensions found were:

1. **Administrative behaviours** ($\alpha = 0.63$), which relates to the use of administrative techniques such as meetings and committees to identify short-term priorities and resolve issues. Managers and their priorities and perspectives dominate decision-making and the allocation of scarce IS resources drives behaviours.

2. **Technological behaviours** ($\alpha = 0.85$), where tools such as development pipelines, information and technical architectures and infrastructure plans are employed and detailed and rational decision-making is emphasised. Technologists and analyses dominate. Plans are detailed and formal. Technologies and the practices of technologists drive behaviours.

3. **IS function-led behaviours** ($\alpha = 0.75$) which focuses SISP within the IS/IT department and where IS managers are seen as the source of strategic IS plans. Decision-making is primarily by IS managers whose agendas and priorities dominate. The internal operations and needs of the IS/IT department are emphasised.

4. **Business orientated organisational behaviours** ($\alpha = 0.89$) where the focus is on getting the business professionals and IS professionals to work together in identifying the requirements for IS/IT through workshops and consultation. Decision-making is consultative and the focus is on identifying business needs. Business needs and norms drive behaviours.

5. **Technology-orientated organisational behaviours** ($\alpha = 0.88$) where business professionals are involved in decision making on technologies, in particular how to exploit new IT. The behaviour is consultative and multi-disciplined and innovation is emphasised. The focus is on the capabilities of IT to change business processes, products and services. The need for innovation drives behaviours.

The confirmation of the SISP behaviours dimension is an important confirmation of Earl (1993). It also operationalised through a survey, the construct framework proposed by Earl. These dimensions have utility to both researchers and practitioners when considering SISP practices.

5.3 **SISP Agendas**

This construct refers to the content areas within SISP or the areas of focus for the SISP activities. The work of Boynton & Zmud (1987) was employed, validated and updated substantially. Their measure was a single dimension, multi-item measure. This study found four distinct dimensions within the SISP agendas construct:

1. **Providing IS services to business users** ($\alpha = 0.66$). This broad area of content covers the servicing of demand for IS/IT within an organisation. At a day-to-day, operational level this is the core contribution of IS/IT to the organisation. This dimension is emphasising operational demand for IS/IT.

2. **Managing IS resources and risks** ($\alpha = 0.79$). SISP must also cover the stewardship of IS resources – technical and people. A key component of this is the management of risk. This dimension emphasises the challenges of supplying IS/IT and increasing dependence on IS/IT.

3. **Exploiting IT opportunities** ($\alpha = 0.73$). IS/IT is a source of both productivity increases and competitive advantages for organisations. Within SISP this becomes a focus as organisations use SISP to identify ways to enable business strategies though IT and to implement potentially strategic IS opportunities. This dimension is addressing the strategic nature of IS/IT.

4. **Preparing for the future** ($\alpha = 0.85$). There is typically an extended lead-time for major IS/IT developments particularly those parts of IS/IT, like infrastructure, that are built over time. SISP therefore becomes a means by which organisations can look into the future and identify what IS/IT the organisation will need. By preparing for the future, IS/IT investments can be made early so
that the organisation has the infrastructure, applications and IT organisation available ahead of its needs, rather than behind them. This dimension emphasises the desire for futurity in IS/IT decisions.

There was a risk that Boynton & Zmud’s work may no longer apply. This study confirms its continued applicability and provided insights into the underlying structure of SISP agendas. This provides both researchers and practitioners with a useful framework for considering the content of SISP.

5.4 SISP Success

The measures for success used were those developed by Raghunathan & Raghunathan (1994). This two-dimension, multi-item measure was validated further by this study. It confirmed the two dimensions of success:

1. **Fulfilment of SISP objectives** ($\alpha = 0.92$). This refers to a wide set of objectives that organisations have for IS/IT. These are fulfilled through SISP. The greater the level of fulfilment then the greater the perceived success for SISP.

2. **Improvements in SISP capabilities** ($\alpha = 0.91$). This dimension recognises a motivation of organisations to improve SISP and that by undertaking SISP an organisation can improve its capabilities in the various components of SISP. The greater the level of improvement achieved then the greater the perceived success for SISP.

The revalidation of this construct measure through this study is useful. It is the first time it has been used for UK organisations. This two dimensional framework for SISP is useful in enabling researchers and practitioners to move away from crude perceptions of overall success towards a richer and more objective assessment. By emphasising both objectives and capabilities it recognises the ongoing nature of SISP in organisations and the value of SISP capabilities.

6 **THE APPROACHES USED FOR STRATEGIC IS PLANNING AND THEIR SUCCESS**

Cluster analysis on the population of organisations revealed five, broad SISP approaches that UK organisations are pursuing. These are presented in figure 2 below along with their relative levels of SISP success in figure 3. Whilst both Earl and Segars & Grover also found five different approaches, important differences were found in this study suggesting that SISP is continuing to evolve. As Earl predicted there is support for evolution towards approaches that combine earlier efforts on SISP into more comprehensive approaches. The five SISP approaches found were:

**Administrative Approach** ($n=4$). Essentially this is the same approach revealed by Earl (1993) with organisations creating strategic plans for IS that emphasise formal processes involving committees or groups that decide on the allocation of IS resources. Some involvement of the IS function and technological tools were found but the involvement of the general population of business users and managers is minimal. Within decision-making processes, importance is placed on the distribution of power across an organisation over preparing for future IT or managing IT risks. Strategic uses of IT do get attention, but possibly those relating to the interests of powerful groups and individuals. This approach was used by only a few organisations in this study suggesting it is reducing in importance and that organisations are moving to other approaches over time. It is achieving relatively low levels of SISP success with none of the organisations employing it having above average levels of SISP success.
Figure 2. Characteristics of the five clusters of SISP approach along the dimensions of SISP behaviours
Figure 3. SISP approaches related to above-average and below-average levels of SISP success

Technological Approach (n=7). Also essentially the same approach as Earl (1993). An approach that emphasises technical perspectives and the inputs from technologists in the development of strategies and plans for IS/IT. This approach is achieving low levels of success with only a quarter of those employing it able to produce above average levels of SISP success. It is an approach that is also being used less over time.

IS Function Led Approach (n=18). An approach was found that gives the IS function the central role in SISP. This appears to be an evolution of the business led approach of Earl (1993) but with the IS function itself being more able now to interpret the business plans and align strategic IS plans. This approach emphasises the managing of IT resources and preparing for IT futures and pays less attention to organisation power issues and strategic IT. This approach was moderately successful. The increasing role for the IS function in SISP may well be explained by a combination of its increasing capabilities in SISP and the increasing merging of IS and business through technologies such as e-business.

Organisational Approach (n=19). The organisational approach identified by Earl (1993) is still the approach used by many organisations with the superior levels of success continuing over the previous three approaches. However in the 1990s this approach emphasised involvement in identifying opportunities for using IS/IT. The underlying philosophy was to be “business-led” and avoid being “technology-led”. Today the organisational approach additionally involves business users and managers in the evaluation of new technologies to seek out opportunities that are explicitly technology led. This change may have resulted from such technologies as e-business, supply chain integration, collaboration, etc. where the technology itself offers new business models and opportunities.

Comprehensive approach (n=22). This study has highlighted an approach that was not found by Earl (1993) but was predicted along with its superior levels of SISP success. This approach combines all the five dimensions of SISP behaviours equally. To do this, organisations are not able to place as much emphasis on any single dimension as those approaches that major on a single dimension or two. Instead this approach is achieved through balance and as such achieves a “comprehensive” treatment of all the SISP behaviours available to organisations. This approach is able to achieve both a balance across all the SISP behaviours and the highest outcomes on them,
suggesting that the behaviours act in combination to achieve more. This approach was the most successful. However, around a quarter of those organisations that employed the comprehensive approach achieved below average levels of success. This emphasises that other factors also influence success, for example the IS maturity of the organisation (see Warr, 2005).

7 CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

The following table 3 summarises the findings in relation to the research questions for this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Support Found in this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Does strategic IS planning continue to be pursued by organisations using the five approaches identified by prior research?</td>
<td>Not supported. There is support for the SISP approaches having evolved significantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Do the levels of success achieved by SISP approaches continue to differ?</td>
<td>Supported. Different SISP approaches continue to lead to different levels of SISP success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Are organisations combining approaches to achieve even higher levels of SISP success?</td>
<td>Supported. A proportion of UK organisations are combining SISP approaches and the average level of SISP success is higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The findings for each research question

This study provides evidence for the qualification of the specific five approaches identified by Earl (1993) and Segars & Grover (1999). It suggests that both studies captured the approaches being used at the time and that these are continuing to develop, perhaps impacted significantly by the emergence of e-business in the late 1990s and e-government more recently - both having repositioned IS/IT within the business strategies of many organisations.

There is continued support for the previous finding that different levels of SISP success are associated with different SISP approaches.

Most significantly, a comprehensive approach has been identified which combines other approaches and is able to achieve higher levels of SISP success. This confirms a theoretical proposition by Earl (1993). Indeed his suggestion may have influenced the emergence of the comprehensive approach in the UK. Because this approach is achieving the superior levels of SISP success predicted by Earl it is important for both researchers and practitioners that the comprehensive approach receives further attention. The study described here is continuing to draw further insights into the comprehensive approach from the data assembled in this study and through further work employing case studies to examine the usage of this approach in more detail.

A comment is necessary on the limitations of the study. Involving only 70 organisations in the main study (although there are other components to the study) means that caution is needed not to generalise carelessly to the population of all organisations. Also the geography for this study was the UK and it cannot be assumed that the same findings apply in all other geographies.

For practitioners this research confirms the continuing importance of the approach employed for their strategic planning for IS/IT. The comprehensive approach that combines and balances the dimensions of SISP approach appears to be delivering superior levels of success. This contradicts views sometimes found amongst practitioners that it is best to “keep things simple”. Instead, this research
suggests that when it comes to IS strategy formulation the opposite is true and it is best to employ an approach that is as comprehensive as the organisational context permits.

This research also challenges another view common in practice that it is important not to be “technology-led” in strategy activities for IS/IT. This study suggests that whilst it is important for managers and consultants to ensure that IS/IT is aligned behind business goals, it is also important that they ensure that technology-enabled business models and opportunities are also investigated and considered. It would seem that being technology-led is an important component of success in strategic IS planning emphasising that the alignment of IS/IT and business strategy operates in both directions.

References


