This issue of JITTA, 4:3, contains four excellent papers in two pairs. It opens with a paper by Cockcroft and one by Yang and Chiu that together frame the issue of personal privacy and information systems from theoretical and empirical perspectives. The issue continues with a paper by Urquhart, who replies to Bryant’s (2002) research essay in JITTA 4:1, “Regrounding Grounded Theory,” which, in what becomes an exciting dialogue, is followed by a short response from Bryant.

Sophie Cockcroft, in “Gaps between policy and practice in the protection of data privacy,” uses a review of literature across three dimensions, technology, legal framework, and enterprise culture and policy, about privacy and personal data in the organization. Using this review, she develops taxonomy and guidelines for managing information security, then she uses the taxonomy and guidelines to identify gaps in current thinking on the subject and to suggest managerial and technical solutions.

Heng-Li Yang and Hsien-Kuei Chiu, in “Privacy disclosures of web sites in Taiwan,” seek to understand, in depth, the privacy policies of 354 web sites and ISPs in Taiwan and to draw inferences about the efficacy of the self-regulation of privacy protection for the firms’ customers. They also draw comparisons among Taiwanese, US and European policies on these issues, as does Cockcroft.

Together these two papers form the basis for rich discussion about the potential for further research on these issues.

Cathy Urquhart, in “Regrounding grounded theory—or reinforcing old prejudices? A brief reply to Bryant,” replies to Bryant (2002). Is grounded theory method (GTM), in spite of its interpretivist following, actually “positivist?” Is it actually “possible for a theory to be ‘grounded in the data’” or it “naïve inductionism?” Urquhart attempts to deal with these questions as well as the question of whether, if GTM is positivist in origin, it can still be used legitimately for interpretive research.

In a brief response to Urquhart, Antony Bryant, in “Bryant responds: Urquhart offers credence to positivism,” takes issue with Urquhart’s attempts to reconcile GTM’s positive origins with its use in interpretive research. If GTM is inductive, isn’t it, therefore, positivist?

In each of these articles, Urquhart and Bryant suggest that GTM should “emerg[e]…in a different form,” from discussion, leaving it potentially more useful for IS research. These two articles, along with the Bryant’s paper in JITTA 4:2, will, I’m sure, join the list of must read papers for future PhD students and others interested in understanding GTM.
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