

APPENDIX A - EXPLORATORY STUDY RESPONSES

- Data gathered in the exploratory study is provided in Appendix A on the CD.
- An example of the ethical procedure followed is provided.
- To simplify the reading of the thesis, the summary of the exploratory study's responses is also provided in text.

The following issues or factors were mentioned in an interview with an **executive leader and manager of a division**, situated at another sub-organisation of the same enterprise:

- EA is the alignment of resources with strategy. **Keep the definition and communication language simple.** Resources include everything from finances to roles of people to operations and technology. Alignment means to meet objectives by using resources.
- It is difficult but necessary to **standardise the operations management of business units** in a complex enterprise. The risk of reengineering is too high.
- EA adoption and implementation should be a top-down process. Optimisation of components in the value chain starts with processes and functions. **EA drives processes and IT is the enabler.**
- Projects and processes should be approved by **following standard operations management approaches.**
- **Maturity levels** of processes, projects and humans **are often different.** This results in delays. **EA should address these discrepancies.**
- **EA should be gradually introduced** and implemented through projects and processes. **Practical benefits of EA should be visible throughout.**
- **Alignment of processes, information and applications is seen as vital** for the enterprise.
- At **strategic level**, business strategy and objectives are set. **EA is accepted as long as it adds value.**
- At **management level**, acceptance of EA is important. If people do not **understand the language, grasp the practical benefits** and see regular progress and results, they do not accept the “new” direction.
- It is very important that **stakeholders understand the motives and the essence of the EA operation.**
- **Managers and architects** should share small victories with stakeholders and show the road.

In an interview with a **team member of the technical and information management team** situated at the same sub-organisation as the executive leader, the following factors were highlighted:

- Technical people find it difficult to relate to business architecture when their main concern is solutions architecture. Their “business” is to plan, build and run implementations. Business analysts are mainly responsible for the planning of implementations. They analyse the business and human requirements, identify IT needs and pass it on to the build team. The first step in the building of a solution is to align with business processes. The buy, build and sell phase of supply chain procurement, material

management and service procurement forms part of the next step. In a final step, the system is implemented and maintained.

- In communication the BD & I (business development and implementation) model is used.
- Business analysts, project managers and IT managers make decisions and appoint people to take responsibility and do the work.
- Change management is the important component responsible for the alignment of information management and business principles. They map the process, get support from HR, and inform stakeholders about new directions, processes and ways of work.
- Identify requirements, develop models and assign roles in projects to make sure people understand, accept responsibility and cooperate.
- Change management is responsible for mapping of processes. Using The Zachman Framework for Enterprise Architecture, the change manager decides who is responsible for a task, what are the deliverables, when are the results due and tell stakeholders why it is important to do the work in a specific way.
- In the past the federated model used implied that a business unit could decide on, run and even purchase its own systems. This way problem solving was fast. Presently a process of consolidation and centralisation is in progress. Business units now have to comply with standard proceedings of applying for IT support, which takes longer. Business managers and stakeholders have to be patient.
- Different stakeholders are at different levels of acceptance of new directions and ways of working. Managers risk their positions in an organisation if they do not accept and comply with general proposed change. Resistance and non-compliance to new directions and change occur more at user level.

In an interview with a **production engineer** responsible for management of important business and production projects the following factors were identified:

- Implementation of EA is a long-term process. Identify and start where the need is high. Quickly show return-on-investment.
- Three teams involved: Business unit, project team and IM/IT solutions team. Business unit should take ownership. It is very important that these teams collaborate and communicate well on a frequent basis. Maturity levels should co-inside.
- Understand the ‘as-is’ versus the ‘to-be’ scenario. Vision should be communicated to stakeholders.
- Give frequent feedback of small victories
- Start at the worker level if you want something done. Employees are specialised and knowledgeable of their professions.

In an interview with a **human resources manager** appointed in a section of an organisation responsible for information management affecting the broad enterprise, the plan, build and run model of business and

information management (IM) was explained once again. Roles of different people concerned with implementation of this model were explained as follows:

- Business consultants representing business units are concerned with business plans. A business plan in the format of a business case with a business requirements statement and budget is compiled. Communication of risks, advantages, execution phases and planned actions between business and IT representatives is a very important step in the business and IT integration divide. Only then is a business plan usually registered as a project.
- The build phase normally involves a team consisting of various stakeholders defined by diverse roles. Roles vary and include IT and IM defined, engineering, technical, financial, administrative, quality control, and managerial. It is here where non-technical, human factors affect cooperation and coordination.

Some of the challenges identified are:

- Demand management by IT and IM sections.
Supply according to business needs or what is deserved and not what is demanded.
- Optimization, standardization and saving on equipment and services.
- Communicating the “bigger picture” of the business. Keeping a balance between quality of work and expenditure.
- Keeping track of projects and keeping projects on track.

Local and global business management and IT processes pose its own unique challenges:

- A locally accepted and running IT system is not accepted at another global organisation. Culture differences, systems interfaces and language barriers are some of the global issues to deal with.
- Globalisation, business security and handling of intellectual property are not always understood throughout an enterprise.

Human factors identified as important to manage in the business and IM integration process are:

- Keeping contact.
People concerned about the business of an enterprise and people concerned about the IT and IM of an enterprise should have means of good interaction in place.
- Communication.
Means of good communication should not only be good on horizontal, management level but also vertical up and down – from management to worker and worker to management. Management should use a common language to share information about business strategies and concerns. Stakeholders need good listening skills and have to understand business strategies.
- Ownership.
Management and leaders of business units should take ownership of the unit’s projects - business

strategy and projects, the credibility and value of a project, the IM of the projects and tracking the project. IM is not the responsibility of IT people – business units should accept responsibility for business and IM.

- Skills.
IM people should have innovation skills.
- Patience and perseverance.
The business and IM integration process is long-term.

IT and IM is not considered of strategic value to the company. It is however seen as a ‘nerve’, keeping the company ‘going’. IM is a support system.

APPENDIX B – QUESTIONNAIRE FINDINGS

Questionnaire findings are provided in Appendix B on CD.

APPENDIX C – EVALUATION OF WOLAF FOR EA INTERVIEWS

Data gathered during the presentation of WoLAF for EA to experts and EA stakeholders are provided in Appendix C on CD.

APPENDIX D – CONFERENCE PRESENTATION

Two presentations are provided in Appendix D on CD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACKOFF, R.L. 1971. Towards a system of systems concepts. *Management science*, 17(11):661-671.
- ADAM, R. 2010. Exploring the acceptance of enterprise resource planning systems by small manufacturing enterprises. Pretoria: UNISA. (Dissertation - M.Sc.).
- ADEBESIN, F., KOTZE, P. & GELDERBLUM, H. 2011. Design research as a framework to evaluate the usability and accessibility of the digital doorway. (In DDR 2011. Design, Development and Research. Cape Peninsula University of Technology. p. 310-327).
- AIER, S., GLEICHAUF, B. & WINTER, R. 2011. Understanding enterprise architecture management design - an empirical analysis. (In Wirtschaftsinformatik Proceedings 2011. AIS electronic library. p. 645-654).
- AJZEN, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior & human decision processes*, 50(2):179-211.
- AJZEN, I., CZASCH, C. & FLOOD, M.G. 2009. From intentions to behavior: Implementation intention, commitment, and conscientiousness. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 39(6):1356-1372.
- AJZEN, I. & FISHBEIN, M., eds. 1980. Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 249-259.
- AMOROSO, D.L. 2004. Social issues in organizations: Minitrack introduction. (In HICSS '04. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2004. Track 8. Vol 8. Washington, USA: IEEE Computer Society. p. 80258).
- AMOROSO, D.L. & KNIGHT, M.B. 2007. Social issues in organizations. (In HICSS '07. 40th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, Waikoloa, USA: IEEE Computer Society, p. 245). <http://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109.2007.489>.
- ARGYRIS, C. 2008. Teaching smart people how to learn. (In Harvard Business Review. Boston, USA: Harvard Business Press. p. 1-72).
- ASHBY, W.R. 1952. Design for a brain. NY: Wiley.
- AVISON, D.E. & FITZGERALD, G., eds. 2006. Information systems development : Methodologies, techniques & tools. 4th ed. London, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- BALLANGEE, B. 2010b. Enterprise architecture: Time for IT to break out! (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 147-155).
- BALLANGEE, B. 2010a. Why enterprise architecture matters: Surfing the waves. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 46-51).

- BANBURY, J. 1987. Towards a framework for systems analysis practice. (In Boland, R.J. & Hirschheim, R.A., eds. *Critical issues in information systems research*. Essex, Great Britain: John Wiley & sons. p. 79-96).
- BASSELLIER, G. & BENSABAT, I. 2004. Business competence of information technology professionals: Conceptual development and influence on IT-business partnerships. *MIS quarterly*, 28(4):673-694.
- BAXTER, G. & SOMMERVILLE, I. 2011. Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering. *Interacting with computers*, 234-17.
- BECKHARD, R. & HARRIS, R.T., eds. 1987. *Organizational transitions : Managing complex change*. 2nd ed. Addison-Wesley.
- BEER, S. 1985. *Diagnosing the system for organizations*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & sons.
- BEER, S. 1975. *Platform for change*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & sons.
- BEER, S. 1972. *Brain of the firm - a development in management cybernetics*. New york, USA: Herder and Herder.
- BHATTACHERJEE, A. 2012. *Social science research: Principles, methods and practices*. 2nd ed. Zurich, Switzerland: Creative commons attribution 3.0 license. (The global text project).
- BIERNACKI, P. & WALDORF, D. 1981. Snowball sampling. *Sociological methods & research*, 10(2):141-163.
- BLANCKENBURG, C. 2009. Tweekoppige monster. *Beeld*, By10. 7 Nov.
- BROOKS, F.P. 1995. *The mythical man-month: Essays on software engineering*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- BROWN, S.A., VENKATESH, V., KURUZOVICH, J. & MASSEY, A.P. 2008. Expectation confirmation: An examination of three competing models. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 105(1):52-66.
- BUCKL, S., MATTHES, F. & SCHWEDA, C.M. 2012. Designing enterprise architecture management functions - the interplay of organizational contexts and methods. (In Aier, S., ed. *TEAR 2012 and PRET 2012*. Springer-Verlag Berlin. p. 236-252).
- BUCKL, S., DIERL, T., MATTHES, F. & SCHWEDA, C.M. 2010. Building blocks for enterprise architecture management solutions. (In Harmsen, F.E.A., ed. *PRET 2010*. LNBIP 69. p. 17-46).
- BUCKL, S.M. 2011. *Developing organization-specific enterprise architecture management functions using a method base*. München: Technische Universität München. (Thesis - PhD).
- BURTON, B. & ALLEGA, P. 2010. *Hype cycle for enterprise architecture, 2010*. G00201646. Stamford, USA: Gartner.
- BURTON-JONES, A. & HUBONA, G.S. 2005. Individual differences and usage behavior: Revisiting a technology acceptance model assumption. *SIGMIS*, 36(2): 03/07/2010-58-71.
<http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/1070000/1066155/p58-burton-jones.pdf> Date of access: 04/16. 2010.

- BUSINESS DICTIONARY. 2010. <http://www.businessdictionary.com/framework.html> Date of access: 05/03. 2010.
- CALDWELL, B.S. 2008. Knowledge sharing and expertise coordination of event response in organizations. *Applied ergonomics*, 39:427-438.
- CALLON, M. 1999. Actor-network theory - the market test. (In Law, J. & Hassard, J., eds. Actor-network theory and after. Oxford, UK: Blackwell publishers. p. 181-195).
- CALLON, M. 1986. Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. (In Law, J., ed. Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p. 196-233).
- CALLON, M. & LATOUR, B. 1981. Unscrewing the big Leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. (In Knorr-Cetina, K. & Cicourel, A.V., eds. Advances in social theory and methodology toward and integration of micro- and macro-sociologies. Boston, USA: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p. 277-303).
- CARSTENS, D.S. & ROCKFIELD, S.M. 2009. E-collaboration in organizations. (In IGI Global, ed. Encyclopedia of information science and technology. 2nd ed. USA: IGI Global. p. 1227-1231).
- CHAFFEY, D. & WOOD, S. 2005. Business information management - improving performance using information systems. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
- CHECKLAND, P. & POULTER, J. 2006. Learning for action: A short definitive account of soft systems methodology and its use for practitioners, teachers and students. Chichester, England: John Wiley & sons Ltd.
- CHECKLAND, P. 1999. Systems thinking, systems practice. Chichester, England: John Wiley & sons.
- CHECKLAND, P. & HOLWELL, S., eds. 1998. Information, systems, and information systems : Making sense of the field. Chichester, England: John Wiley & sons.
- CHEN, D., DOUMEINGTS, G. & VERNADAT, F. 2008. Architectures for enterprise integration and interoperability: Past, present and future. *Computers in industry*, 59(7):647-659.
- CHUANG, C. & VAN LOGGERENBERG, J. 2010. Challenges facing enterprise architects: A South African perspective. (In HICSS. 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. Honolulu, HI, USA: IEEE. p. 1-10)
- COETZEE, C. 2007. Optimising equipment utilisation and improve turnaround time. (Unpublished). <http://www.sacea.org.za/%5Cdocs%5COptimising%20equipment%20utilisation%20and%20improve%20turnaround%20time%20v2.pdf>
- COLLINS CONCISE DICTIONARY. 2004. 5th ed. Glasgow, Great Britain: Collins.
- COVEY, S.R. 1989. The 7 habits of highly effective people. London, UK: Simon & Schuster. 340p.

- CPP. 2014. Cognitive process profile. <http://www.jqassociates.com/assessment/tools/cognitive-process-profile.asp#WhatIsTheCPP>.
- CUNNINGHAM, D.J. 1992. Beyond educational psychology: Steps toward an educational semiotic. *Educational psychology review*, 4(2):165.
- DANKOVA, P. 2009. Main aspects of enterprise architecture concept. *Economic alternatives*, (1):102-114.
- DAVENPORT, T.H. 1998. Putting the enterprise into the enterprise system. *Harvard business review*, 76(4):121-131.
- DAVIS, F.D. 1989b. User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management science*, 35(8):982-1003.
- DAVIS, F.D. 1989a. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS quarterly*, 13(3):319-339.
- DAVIS, F.D. & DAVIS, G.B. 2003. User acceptance of IT: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly*, 27(3):425-478.
- DAVIS, F.D. & VENKATESH, V. 2004. Toward preprototype user acceptance testing of new information systems: Implications for software project management. *IEEE transactions on engineering management*, 51(1):31-46.
- DE SOUZA, C.R.B., SHARP, H., SINGER, J., CHENG, L. & VENOLIA, G. 2009. Cooperative and human aspects of software engineering. *IEEE software*, (Nov/Dec):17. <http://www.computer.org/software> Date of access: 11/28. 2009.
- DE VILLIERS, L. 2010. Technology roadmap and strategic plan for ABSA bank. Discussion group: EARF. 24 Nov. <http://earf.meraka.org.za/earfhome>
- DELONE, W.H. & MCLEAN, E.R. 2003. The DeLone and McLean model of information systems success: A ten-year update. *Journal of management information systems*, 19(4):9-30.
- DELONE, W.H. & MCLEAN, E.R. 1992. Information system success: The quest for the dependant variable. *Information systems research*, 3(1):60-95.
- DEMARCO, T. & LISTER, T.R., eds. 1999. Peopleware : Productive projects and teams. 2nd ed. New York, USA: Dorset House.
- DENG, X.X. 2006. Intentional modelling for enterprise architecture. Toronto: University of Toronto. (Thesis - Master of Information Studies).
- DENISE, L. 2004. Collaboration vs. C-three (Cooperation, Coordination and Communication). *Innovating*, 7(3).
- DESANCTIS, G. & POOLE, M.S. 1994. Capturing the complexity in advanced technology use: Adaptive structuration theory. *Organization science*, 5(2):121-147.
- DIETZ, J.L.G. 2010. Enterprise ontology. Delft, The Netherlands: Springer.

- DIETZ, J.L.G. & HOOGERVORST, J.A.P. 2011. A critical investigation of TOGAF - based on the enterprise engineering theory and practice. (In Albani, A. Dietz, J.L.G. Verelst, J., eds. Advances in enterprise engineering V. EEWC 2011, LNBIP. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. 79:76-90).
- DÍEZ, E. & MCINTOSH, B.S. 2009. A review of the factors which influence the use and usefulness of information systems. *Environmental modelling & software*, 24(5):588-602.
- DISC. 2013. DISC profile. <http://www.discprofile.com/what-is-disc/overview>.
- DODAF. 2009. Department of defense architecture framework. <http://cio-nii.defense.gov/sites/dodaf20> Date of access: 03/09. 2010.
- DRUCKER, P.F. 1988. The coming of the new organization. *Harvard business review*, 66(1):45-53.
- DRUCKER, P.F. 1955. The practice of management. 1st ed. London, (1966 printing): Cape Town: Heinemann.
- DU PLOOY, N.F. 1998. An analysis of the human environment for the adoption and use of information technology. Pretoria, RSA: University of Pretoria. (Thesis - PhD).
- EARF. 2009. Enterprise architecture research forum. <http://earf.meraka.org.za/earfhome>.
- ECKEL, C.C., FATAS, E. & WILSON, R. 2010. Cooperation and status in organizations. *Journal of public economic theory*, 12(4):737-762.
- EMERY, F. E. & TRIST, E. L. 1960. Socio-technical systems. *Management Sciences Models and Techniques*, 2.
- FEA. 1999. Federal enterprise architecture. www.cio.gov/documents/fedarch1.pdf.
- FERREIRA, E.J. & ERASMUS, A.W. 2010. Information management. Claremont, RSA: JUTA.
- FINKELSTEIN, C. 2011. Enterprise architecture for integration: Rapid delivery methods and technologies. 2nd ed. Australia: BookPal.
- FINKELSTEIN, C. 1992. Information engineering : Strategic systems development. Sydney, Australia: Addison-Wesley.
- FINKELSTEIN, C. 1989. An introduction to information engineering. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- FISCHER, R., WINTER, R. & AIER, S. 2010. What is enterprise architecture principle? Towards a consolidated definition. (In Lee, R., ed. Computer and Information Science 2010. Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag Berlin. p. 193-205).
- FISHBEIN, M. & AJZEN, I., eds. 1975. Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior : An introduction to theory and research. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley. p. 521-562.
- FRIEDLAND, B. & YAMAUCHI, Y. 2011. Reflexive design thinking: Putting more human in human-centered practices. *Interactions*, 18(2):66-71.

- FRITZ, J.H., O'NEIL, N.B., POPP, A.M., WILLIAMS, C. & ARNETT, R.C. 2013. The influence of supervisory behavioral integrity on intent to comply with organizational ethical standards and organizational commitment. *Journal of business ethics*, 114:251-263.
- GAL, U. & BERENTE, N. 2008. A social representations perspective on information systems implementation. *Information technology & people*, 21(2):133-154.
- GALUP, S.D. & DATTERO, R. 2000. Information engineering methodologies and organizational change: An exploratory study. *Journal of computer information systems*, 41(2):48-51.
- GARCIA, L. & QUEK, F. 1997. Qualitative research in information systems: Time to be subjective? (In Lee, A.S., Liebenau, J. & DeGross, J.I., eds. *Information systems and qualitative research*. Chapman & Hall. p. 444-465).
- GARTNER ANALYSTS. 2010. *Gartner analysts to explore the right approaches to enterprise architecture*. 1358913. Egham, UK: Gartner.
- GERAM. 1999. *Generalised Enterprise Reference Architecture and Methodology*. Version 1.6.3. IFIP-IFAC Taskforce.
- GHARAJEDAGHI, J. 1999. *Systems thinking : Managing chaos and complexity : A platform for designing business architecture*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- GIACHETTY, R.E. 2010. *Design of enterprise systems*. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press.
- GIBLETT, P.B. 2008. Why is enterprise architecture important for the modern organization? Discussion group: Toolbox for IT. <http://it.toolbox.com/blogs/all-blogs>
- GIDDENS, A. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- GIDDENS, A. 1981. Agency, institution, and time-space analysis. (In Knorr-Cetina, K. & Cicourel, A.V., eds. *Advances in social theory and methodology*. Boston, USA: Routledge & Kegan Paul. p. 161-174).
- GILLILAND, S., VAN DER MERWE, A. J. & KOTZÉ, P. 2013. Human factors affecting enterprise architecture acceptance. (In *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Enterprise Systems*. Cape Town, RSA:IEEE).
- GOETHALS, F.G., LEMAHIEU, W., SNOECK, M. & VANDENBULCKE, J.A. 2007. The data building blocks of the enterprise architect. *Future generation computer systems*, 23(2):269-274.
- GOODMAN, L.A. 2011. Comment on respondent-driven sampling and snowball sampling in hard-to-reach populations and snowball sampling not in hard-to-reach populations. (In Liao, T.F., ed. *Sociological methodology*. p. 347-353).
- GORTNER, H.F., MAHLER, J. & NICHOLSON, J.B., eds. 1989. *Organization theory : A public perspective*. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Pub. Co.
- GREEN, M. 2007. *Change management masterclass - a step by step guide to successful change management*. London, UK: Kogan Page.

- GREENFIELD, G. & ROHDE, F. 2009. Technology acceptance: Not all organisations or workers may be the same. *International journal of accounting information systems*, 10(4):263-272.
- GREGOR, S. 2009. Building theory in the sciences of the artificial. (In DESRIST'09. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Design Science Research in Information Systems and Technologies. Malvern, PA, USA: ACM).
- GREGOR, S. & HEVNER, A.R. 2013. Positioning and presenting design science research for maximum impact. *MIS quarterly*, 37(2):337-355.
- GRUBER, T.R. 1995. Toward principles for the design of ontologies used for knowledge sharing? *International journal of human-computer studies*, 43(5-6):907-928.
- GUBA, E.G. & LINCOLN, Y.S. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. (In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. The handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. p. 105-117).
- GUSTAVII, B. 2006. How to write and illustrate a scientific paper. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- HAGAN, P.J. 2004. *Enterprise Architecture Body Of Knowledge*. 04-0104, 04-0105. Virginia, USA: MITRE corporation.
- HAKI, M.K. & LEGNER, C. 2012. New avenues for theoretical contributions in enterprise architecture principles - a literature review. (In Aier, S., ed. TEAR 2012 and PRET 2012. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. p. 182-197).
- HANDLER, R.A. 2007. *Researching the research agenda survey, 2007: Key implications for enterprise architecture*. G00148549. Gartner research series.
- HARMON, L.K. 2005. The system's nature of enterprise architecture. (In IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, Cybernetics. Oct 2005. IEEE Xplore. p. 78-85).
- HAYLES, N.K. 1999. How we became posthuman : Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics. Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press. 323p.
- HBDI. 2012. Hermann brain dominance instrument. <http://www.hbdi.com>.
- HECKATHORN, D.D. 2011. Comment: Snowball versus respondent-driven sampling. *Sociological methodology 2011*, 41:355-366.
- HENNING, E., VAN RENSBURG, W. & SMIT, B. 2004. Finding your way in qualitative research. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- HEVNER, A.R. 2012. Knowledge contributions in design science research. SAICSIT 2012. Irene, RSA. (Unpublished.).
- HEVNER, A.R. & CHATTERJEE, S. 2010. Design research in information systems: Theory and practice. New York, USA: Springer. (Integrated series in information systems.).

- HEVNER, A.R., MARCH, S.T., PARK, J. & RAM, S. 2004. Design science in information systems research. *MIS quarterly*, 28(1):75-105.
- HODDER, I. 1994. The interpretation of documents and material culture. (In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Sage. p. 393-402).
- HOFFER, J.A. 2002. *Modern systems analysis and design*. 3rd ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- HOFSTEDE, G. & HOFSTEDE, G.J. 2005. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- HOFSTEE, E. 2006. *Constructing a good dissertation: A practical guide to finishing a master's, MBA or PhD on schedule*. Johannesburg, South Africa: EPE.
- HOOGERVORST, J.A.P. 2011. *An enterprise engineering based examination of TOGAF*. EARF, Meraka, CSIR, Pretoria: .
- HOOGERVORST, J.A.P. 2009. *Enterprise governance and enterprise engineering*. Diemen, The Netherlands: Springer.
- HORRIGAN, J. 2009. *Wireless internet usage*. 202-419-4500. Washington, USA: Pew Internet & American Life Project.
- HORST, M., KUTTSCHREUTER, M. & GUTTELING, J.M. 2007. Perceived usefulness, personal experiences, risk perception and trust as determinants of adoption of e-government services in the netherlands. *Computers in human behavior*, 23(4):1838-1852.
- HUEBSCH, J.C. 1995. *Kommunikasievaardighede*. Pretoria, RSA: Kagiso Uitgewers.
- IIVARI, J. & VENABLE, J. 2009. Action research and design science research - seemingly similar but decisively dissimilar. (In ECIS 2009. *Proceedings of the 17th European Conference on Information Systems*. Scholarone Manuscript Central. p. 1-13).
- ISO/IEC. 2007. *Standard for systems and software engineering - recommended practice for architectural description of software-intensive systems*. C1 ed. IEEE. 24p.
- JANESICK, V.J. 1994. The dance of qualitative research design. (In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, USA: SAGE. p. 209-219).
- JASPERSON, J.S., CARTER, P.E. & ZMUD, R.W. 2005. A comprehensive conceptualization of post-adoptive behaviors associated with information technology enabled work systems. *MIS quarterly*, 29(3):525-557.
- JEYARAJ, A. & SABHERWAL, R. 2008. Adoption of information systems innovations by individuals: A study of processes involving contextual, adopter, and influencer actions. *Information and organization*, 18(3):205-234.
- JEYARAJ, A., ROTTMAN, J.W. & LACITY, M.C. 2006. A review of the predictors, linkages, and biases in IT innovation adoption research. *Journal of information technology*, 21(1):1-23.

- JONES, M.R. & KARSTEN, H. 2008. Giddens's structuration theory and information systems research. *MIS quarterly*, 32(1):127-157.
- JUHOLIN, E. 2007. New agenda model of communication in work communities. Paper presented at the NordMedia 2007. 18th Nordic Conference for Media and Communication Research. Helsinki, Finland). <http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/comm/fi/english>
- KAGHAN, W.N. & BOWKER, G.C. 2001. Out of machine age?: Complexity, sociotechnical systems and actor network theory. *Journal of engineering and technology management*, 18:253-269.
- KAPPELMAN, L.A. 2010c. Enterprise architecture: Not just another management fad. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 117-121).
- KAPPELMAN, L.A. 2010b. Bridging the chasm. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 35-36).
- KAPPELMAN, L.A. 2010a. The pioneers of enterprise architecture: A panel discussion. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. 1st ed. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 9-26).
- KAPPELMAN, L.A., ed. 2010. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- KHAN, M.T., KHAN, N.A., AHMED, S. & ALI, M. 2012. Connotation of organizational effectiveness and factors affecting it. *International journal of business and behavioral sciences*, 2(9):21-30.
- KIM, T., LEE, S., LEE, J., KIM, K. & KIM, C. 2007. Enterprise architecture framework for agile and interoperable virtual enterprises. (In Saha, P., ed. Handbook of enterprise systems architecture in practice. Hershey, USA: Information Science Reference. p. 62-84).
- KIRKHAUG, R. 2010. Conditions for communication in risk exposed organisations. *Journal of general management*, 36(2):23-36.
- KLEIN, H.K. & HIRSCHHEIM, R. 2008. The structure of the IS discipline reconsidered: Implications and reflections from a community of practice perspective. *Information and organization*, 18(4):280-302.
- KLING, R. 1980. Social analyses of computing: Theoretical perspectives in recent empirical research. *Computing surveys*, 12(1):61-109.
- KNORR-CETINA, K. & CICOUREL, A.V., eds. 1981. Advances in social theory and methodology toward an integration of micro- and macro-sociologies. Boston, USA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- KOLFSCHOTEN, G.L., NIEDERMAN, F., BRIGGS, R.O. & DE VREEDE, G. 2012. Facilitation roles and responsibilities for sustained collaboration support in organizations. *Journal of management information systems*, 28(4):129-161.
- KOONTZ, H., O'DONNELL, C. & WEIHRICH, H. 1980. Management. 7th ed. Tokyo, Japan: McGraw-Hill.
- KORZAAN, M. & MORRIS, S.A. 2009. Individual characteristics and the intention to continue project escalation. *Computers in human behavior*, 25(6):1320-1330.

- KOSANKE, K., VERNADAT, F. & ZELM, M. 1999. CIMOSA: Enterprise engineering and integration. *Computers in industry*, 40(2-3):83-97.
- KOSFELD, M. & VON SIEMENS, F.A. 2011. Competition, cooperation, and corporate culture. *RAND journal of economics*, 42(1):23-43.
- KUECHLER, W. & VAISHNAVI, V. 2008. Theory development in design science research: Anatomy of a research project. 17:489-504.
- KWON, T.H. & ZMUD, R.W. 1987. Unifying the fragmented models of information systems implementation. (In Boland, R.J. & Hirschheim, R.A., eds. *Critical issues in information systems research*. Chichester, GB: John Wiley & sons. p. 227-251).
- LABUSCHAGNÉ, L. 2010. Verbal communication with author. Meraka, CSIR, Pretoria.
- LAM, A. 1997. Embedded firms, embedded knowledge: Problems of collaboration and knowledge transfer in global cooperative ventures. *Organization studies*, 18(6):973.
- LAMB, R. & KLING, R. 2003. Reconceptualizing users as social actors in information systems research. *MIS quarterly*, 27(2):197-235.
- LANE, M. 2010. To be or not to be: Recognize enterprise architecture as a true profession? (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. *The SIM guide to enterprise architecture*. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 52-60).
- LANGENBERG, K. & WEGMANN, A. 2004. *Enterprise architecture: What aspects is current research targeting?* IC/2004/77. Lausanne, Switzerland: Laboratory of Systemic Modelling.
- LANKHORST M. ET AL., ed. 2009. *Enterprise architecture at work: Modelling, communication and analysis*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- LAPALME, J. 2012. Verbal communication with author. CSIR, Pretoria, RSA.
- LAPALME, J. 2012a. Three schools of thought on enterprise architecture. *IT professional*, 14(6):37-43.
- LAPKIN, A. 2005. *Gartner's enterprise architecture process and framework help meet 21st century challenges*. ID:G00133132. Gartner, Inc.
- LATOUR, B. 1999. On recalling ANT. (In Law, J. & Hassard, J., eds. *Actor-network theory and after*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell publishers. p. 15-25).
- LAUDON, K.C. & LAUDON, J.P. 2011. *Essentials of management information systems*. 9th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- LAUDON, K.C. & LAUDON, J.P. 2007. *Management information systems: Managing the digital firm*. 10th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- LAW, J. 1999. After ANT: Complexity, naming and topology. (In Law, J. & Hassard, J., eds. *Actor-network theory and after*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell publishers. p. 1-14).

- LAWTON, B. 2011. What's in a name? Denotation, Connotation, and "A boy named Sue". *Communication teacher*, 25(3):136-138.
- LAZAR, J., FENG, J.H. & HOCHHEISER, H. 2010. Research methods in human-computer interaction. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & sons.
- LEE, A.S., LIEBENAU, J. & DEGROSS, J.I., eds. 1997. Information systems and qualitative research. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- LEE, Y., KOZAR, K.A. & LARSEN, K.R.T. 2003. The technology acceptance model: Past, present and future. *Communications of the association for information systems*, 12:752-780.
- LEE, S. & KIM, B.G. 2009. Factors affecting the usage of intranet: A confirmatory study. *Computers in human behavior*, 25(1):191-201.
- LEWIN, K. 1952. Group decision and social change. (In Newcombe, T.M. & Hartley, E.L., eds. Readings in social psychology. New york: Henry Holt. p. 459-473).
- LEWIN, K. & CARTWRIGHT, D., eds. 1951. Field theory in social science : Selected theoretical papers. New York, USA: Harper.
- LOH, J., SMITH, J.R. & RESTUBOG, S.L.D. 2010. The role of culture, workgroup membership, and organizational status on cooperation and trust: An experimental investigation. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 40(12):2947-2968.
- LOJESKI, K.S., REILLY, R. & DOMINICK, P. 2006. The role of virtual distance in innovation and success. (In HICSS '06. Proceedings of the 39th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2006. 7-9 Jan. p. 25c).
- LUCOUW, P. 2004. Creating the more - balancing on the tight rope to prosperous existence. Three Rivers, SA: Corals publishers.
- LYYTINEN, K. 1987. A taxonomic perspective of information systems development: Theoretical constructs and recommendations. (In Boland, R.J. & Hirschheim, R.A., eds. Critical issues in information systems research. Chichester, GB: John Wiley & sons. p. 3-41).
- MAGDA, B. 2009. Increasing efficacy of emergency departments through systems analysis of enterprise architecture: Mitigating the impact of technology change. Washington: The George Washington University. (Thesis - Ph.D.)
- MARCH, S.T. & SMITH, G.F. 1995. Design and natural science research on information technology. *Decision support systems*, 15(4):251-266.
- MARKUS, M.L. & TANIS, C. 2000. The enterprise system experience: From adoption to success. (In Anon. Framing the domains of IT management: Projecting the future through the past. Cincinnati: Pinnaflex Educational Resources Inc. p. 173-207).
- MARKUS, L.M. 1983. Power, politics and MIS implementation. *Communications of the ACM*, 26(6):430-444.

- MARSTON, W.M. 1928. Emotions of normal people. New York: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
- MARTIN, J.A. & EISENHARDT, K.M. 2010. Rewiring: Cross-business-unit collaborations in multibusiness organizations. *Academy of management journal*, 53(2):265-301.
- MARTIN, J. 1995. The great transition : Using the seven disciplines of enterprise engineering to align people, technology, and strategy. New York: AMACOM.
- MARTIN, J. 1989. Information engineering I. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- MATHIESON, K. 1991. Predicting user intentions: Comparing the technology acceptance model with the theory of planned behavior. *Information systems research*, 2(3):173-191.
- MATTHEE, M.C., TOBIN, P.K.J. & VAN DER MERWE, P. 2007. The status quo of enterprise architecture implementation in South African financial services companies. *South African journal of business management*, 38(1):11-23.
- MATTHES, F. 2009. Sebis - evolution of EA frameworks. <http://www.matthes.in.tum.de>.
- MAXWELL, J.A. 2005. Qualitative research design : An interactive approach. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- MCGOVERN, J., AMBLER, S.W., STEVENS, M.E., LINN, J., SHARAN, V. & JO, E.K. 2004. A practical guide to enterprise architecture. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- MEADOWS, D.H. 2008. Thinking in systems. White River Junction, USA: Chelsea Green.
- MENGUA, Z., KANG, X. & JINGHUA, X. 2013. Organizational IT culture, a new concept and perspective of relationship of organization and IT. *International journal of computer science and network security*, 13(1):51-54.
- MICHEL, A., STEGMAIER, R. & SONNTAG, K. 2010. I scratch your back - you scratch mine. Do procedural justice and organizational identification matter for employees' cooperation during change? *Journal of change management*, 10(1):41-59.
- MILLER, W.L. & CRABTREE, B.F. 1994. Clinical research. (In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., eds. Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, USA: SAGE. p. 340-352).
- MINOLI, D. 2008. Enterprise architecture A to Z. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press.
- MITEV, N. 2009. In and out of actor-network theory: A necessary but insufficient journey. *Information technology & people*, 22(1):9-25.
- MO, J. 2007. The use of GERAM for design of a virtual enterprise for a ship. (In Saha, P., ed. Handbook of enterprise systems architecture in practice. Hershey, USA: Information Science Reference. p. 351-365).
- MOSCOVICI, S. 2001. The phenomenon of social representations. (In Duveen, G., ed. Social representations: Explorations in social psychology. New York: New York University Press.

- MOULTON, J. 2001. How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies : A South African guide and resource book. Pretoria, RSA: Van Schaik.
- MYERS, M.D. & NEWMAN, M. 2007. The qualitative interview in IS research: Examining the craft. *Information & organization*, 17:2-26.
- MYERS, M.D. 2009. Qualitative research in business & management. London, UK: SAGE.
- MYERS, M.D. 1997. Qualitative research in information systems. *MISQ discovery*, 21(2):241.
- NADLER, D.A. & TUSHMAN, M.L. 1997. Competing by design: The power of organizational architecture. New York: Oxford University Press.
- NADLER, D.A. & TUSHMAN, M.L. 1989. Organizational frame bending: Principles for managing reorientation. *The academy of management executive (1987)*, 3(3):194-204.
- NEEDHAM, W. 2011. GWEA. Discussion group: EARF. 17 Jan. <http://earf.meraka.org.za/earfhome>
- NEMETH, C. 2012. Human systems - not systems with humans. <http://myweb.dal.ca/melhawar/current/from-society-leaders.html> Date of access: 08/29. 2102.
- NONAKA, I. & TAKEUCHI, H. 1995. The knowledge creating company. New York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- NORMAN, D.A. 1993. Things that make us smart : Defending human attributes in the age of the machine. Cambridge, Mass. : Perseus Books.
- NUNAMAKER, J.F., CHEN, M. & PURDIN, T.D.M. 1990-91. Systems development in information systems research. *Journal of information management systems*, 7(3):89-106.
- OATES, B.J. 2006. Researching information systems and computing. London: SAGE.
- OLIVIER, M.S. 2004. Information technology research. Second ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- ONG, C., LAI, J. & WANG, Y. 2004. Factors affecting engineers' acceptance of asynchronous e-learning systems in high-tech companies. *Information & management*, 41(6):795-804.
- OPD. 1979. The Oxford Paperback Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ORLIKOWSKI, W.J. 1993. CASE tools as organizational change: Investigating incremental and radical changes in systems development. *MIS quarterly*, (September):309-340.
- ORLIKOWSKI, W.J. & IACONO, C.S. 2001. Research commentary: Desperately seeking the "IT" in IT research - a call to theorizing the IT artifact. *Information systems research*, 12(2):121-134.
- ORLIKOWSKI, W.J. & HOFMAN, J.D. 1997. An improvisational model of change management: The case of groupware technologies. *Sloan management review*, <http://ccs.mit.edu/CCSWP191/ccswp191.html> Date of access: 2/10. 2012.

- PEFFERS, K., TUUNANEN, T., ROTHENBERGER, M.A. & CHATTERJEE, S. 2008. A design science research methodology for information system research. *Journal of information management systems*, 24(3):45-77.
- PEFFERS, K., TUUNANEN, T., GENGLER, C.E., ROSSI, M., HUI, W., VIRTANEN, V. & BRAGGE, J. 2006. The design science research process: A model for producing and presenting information systems research. (In DESRIST'06. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Design Science Research in Information Systems and Technology. Claremont, CA: CGU. p. 83-106).
- PENROD, J., CAIN, R.E. & STARKS, M.T. 2003. A discussion of chain referral as a method of sampling hard-to-reach populations. *Journal of transcultural nursing*, 14(2):100-107.
- PERKS, C. & BEVERIDGE, T. 2003. Guide to enterprise IT architecture. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- POLANČIČ, G., HERIČKO, M. & ROZMAN, I. 2010. An empirical examination of application frameworks success based on technology acceptance model. *Journal of systems and software*, 83(4):574-584.
- PREMKUMAR, G. & BHATTACHERJEE, A. 2008. Explaining information technology usage: A test of competing models. *Omega*, 36(1):64-75.
- PRIES-HEJE, J. & BASKERVILLE, R. 2008. The design theory nexus. *MIS quarterly*, 32(4):731-755.
- PURAO, S. 2002. Design research in the technology of information systems: Truth or dare. Atlanta: GSU Department of CIS Working Paper.
- RADEKE, F. 2011. Toward understanding enterprise architecture management's role in strategic change: Antecedents, processes, outcomes. (In Wirtschaftsinformatik proceedings 2011. AIS Electronic Library. p. 497-507). <http://aisel.aisnet.org/wi2011/62>
- RAMADIER, T. 2004. Transdisciplinarity and its challenges: The case of urban studies. *Futures*, 36(4):423-439.
- RAMAGE, M.A. & SHIPP, K., eds. 2009. Systems thinkers. London, UK: Springer.
- RAPOPORT, R.N. 1970. Three dilemmas in action research. *Human relations*, 23:499-513.
- RENAUD, K. & VAN BILJON, J. 2008. Predicting technology acceptance and adoption by the elderly: A qualitative study. (In SAICSIT '08. Proceedings of the 2008 Annual Research Conference of the South African Institute of Computer Scientists and Information Technologists. IT Research in developing countries: Riding the wave of technology. New York, USA: ACM. p. 210-219).
- RIEMENSCHNEIDER, C.K., HARDGRAVE, B.C. & DAVIS, F.D. 2002. Explaining software developer acceptance of methodologies: A comparison of five theoretical models. *IEEE transactions on software engineering*, 28(12):1135-1145.
- ROBBINS, S.P. 2004. Organizational behavior. 11th ed. Ney Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- ROBERTS, N. 2011. Beyond smokestacks and silos: Open-source, web-enabled coordination in organizations and networks. *Public administration review*, 71(5):677-693.

- ROBLES, M.M. 2012. Executive perceptions of the top 10 soft skills needed in today's workplace. *Business communication quarterly*, 75(4):453-465.
- ROGERS, Y., SHARP, H. & PREECE, J. 2011. Interaction design. 3rd ed. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & sons.
- ROPOHL, G. 1999. Philosophy of socio-technical systems. *Society for Philosophy and Technology*.
http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/SPT/v4_n3html/ROPOHL.html
- ROSS, J.W., WEILL, P. & ROBERTSON, D.C. 2006. Enterprise architecture as strategy. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- ROSS, S.E., SCHILLING, L.M., FERNALD, D.H., DAVIDSON, A.J. & WEST, D.R. 2010. Health information exchange in small-to-medium sized family medicine practices: Motivators, barriers, and potential facilitators of adoption. *International journal of medical informatics*, 79(2):123-129.
- ROWBOTTOM, R. & BILLIS, D. 1987. Organisational design: The work-levels approach. England: Gower Publishing Co.
- RUBIN, H.J. & RUBIN, I.S. 2005. Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data. 2nd ed. California, USA: SAGE Publications.
- RULE, P. & JOHN, V., eds. 2011. Your guide to case study research. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- SAAB, D.J., TAPIA, A., MAITLAND, C., MALDONADO, E. & NGAMASSI TCHOUAKEU, L. 2013. Inter-organizational coordination in the wild: Trust building and collaboration among field-level ICT workers in humanitarian relief organizations. *Voluntas*, 24:194-213.
- SABHERWAL, R., JEYARAJ, A. & CHOWA, C. 2006. Information system success: Individual and organizational determinants. *Management science*, 52(12):1849-1864.
- SAGE, T.A. 2006. A model of factors affecting business and information technology alignment by enterprise architecture: A structural equation modelling analysis. Capella University. (Thesis - PhD).
- SAHA, P. 2004. Analyzing the open group architecture framework from the GERAM perspective.
www.opengroup.org/architecture/wp/saha/TOGAF_GERAM_Mapping.htm.
- SAHA, P., ed. 2007. Handbook of enterprise systems architecture in practice. Hershey, PA.: Idea Group Reference.
- SANTHIDRAN, S., CHANDRAN, V.G.R. & BORROMEO, J. 2013. Enabling organizational change - leadership, commitment to change and the mediating role of change readiness. *Journal of business economics and management*, 14(2):348-363.
- SAUNDERS, M.N.K., LEWIS, P. & THORNHILL, A. 2009. Research methods for business students. 5th ed. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.
- SCHEIN, E.H. 2004. Organizational culture and leadership. 3rd ed. San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass.

- SCHEKKERMAN, J. 2010. *STREAM: A successful and pragmatic 'Managed Diversity' enterprise architecture approach*. V1.2. Amersfoort, The Netherlands: Institute for Enterprise Architecture Developments/Logica Business Consulting.
- SCHEKKERMAN, J. 2004. A comparative survey of enterprise architecture frameworks. (In The Open Group Enterprise Architecture Practitioners Congress). <http://enterprise-architecture.info>
- SCHEKKERMAN, J. 2004a. How to survive in the jungle of enterprise architecture frameworks: Creating or choosing an enterprise architecture framework. Canada: Trafford Publishing.
- SCHÖENHERR, M. 2009. Towards a common terminology in the discipline of enterprise architecture. (In Feuerlicht, G. & Lamersdorf, W., eds. ICSOC 2008. 2008. Springer-Verlag. p. 400-413).
- SCHUMACHER, E. 1993. *Small is beautiful : A study of economics as if people mattered*. London: Vintage.
- SCHWALBE, K. 2014. *Information technology project management*. 7th ed. USA: Course Technology Cengage Learning.
- SELLEN, A., ROGERS, Y., HARPER, R. & RODDEN, T. 2009. Reflecting human values in the digital age. *Communications of the ACM*, 52(3):58-66.
- SENGE, P.M. 1999b. The discipline of innovation. *Executive excellence*, 16(6):10.
- SENGE, P.M. 1999a. Sharing knowledge. *Executive excellence*, 16(9):6.
- SENGE, P.M. 1999. The discipline of innovation. *Executive excellence*, 16(6):10.
- SENGE, P.M., KLEINER, A., ROBERTS, C., ROSS, R.B. & SMITH, B.J. 1994. *The fifth discipline field book*. Ney York: Currency Doubleday.
- SERBAN, C., XUHUI AO & MINSKY, N. 2001. Establishing enterprise communities. (In EDOC '01. Fifth IEEE International Conference on Enterprise Distributed Object Computing. p. 48-58).
- SESSIONS, R. 2007. A comparison of the top four enterprise architecture methodologies. *MSDN*, 07/09. [http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/bb466232\(printer\).aspx](http://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/bb466232(printer).aspx) .
- SIA, S.K., SOH, C. & WEILL, P. 2010. Global IT management. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(3):59-64.
- SIDEROVA, A. & KAPPELMAN, L.A. 2010. Enterprise architecture as politics: An actor-network theory perspective. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. *The SIM guide to enterprise architecture*. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 70-88).
- SIMON, D., FISHBACH, K. & SCHODER, D. 2013. An exploration of enterprise architecture research. *Communications of the association for information systems*, 32(1):1-72.
- SIMON, H. 1996. *The sciences of the artificial*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- SIMON, H.A. 1988. The science of design: Creating the artificial. *Design issues*, 4(1/2):67-82.

- SIMONS, G.F., KAPPELMAN, L.A. & ZACHMAN, J.A. 2010. Using language to gain control of enterprise architecture: On the verge of major business reengineering. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 127-146).
- STANFORD, N. 2007. Guide to organisation design: Creating high-performing and adaptable enterprises. London, UK: The economist, Profile books.
- STEIN, G. 2010. Managing people and organizations : Peter drucker's legacy. 1st ed. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- STONER, J.L. 2013. Let's stop confusing cooperation and teamwork with collaboration. <http://seapointcenter.com/cooperation-teamwork-and-collaboration> Date of access: 02/18. 2013.
- STRONG, D.M. & VOLKOFF, O. 2010. Understanding organization-enterprise system fit: A path to theorizing the information technology artifact. *MIS quarterly*, 34(4):731-756.
- SUNAGA, S.Y. 2012. Meeting rooms and corridors: How different narratives constitute organizations. Washington, DC. USA: Georgetown University. (Dissertation - M.A. Communication, Culture and Technology) .
- TATNALL, A. & GILDING, A. 1999. Actor-network theory and information system research. (In Proceedings of the 10th Australasian Conference on Information Systems. p. 955-966).
- TAYLOR, S. & TODD, P.A. 1995. Understanding information technology usage: A test of competing models. *Information systems research*, 6(2):144-176.
- TERRE BLANCHE, M.J., DURRHEIM, K., PAINTER, D. & TUSTIN, D.H.M.R.S.C., eds. 2006. Research in practice : Applied methods for the social sciences. 2nd ed. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- THOMPSON, M. 2012. People, practice and technology: Restoring Giddens' broader philosophy to the study of information systems. *Information and organization*, 22(3):188-207.
- TILSON, D., LYYTINEN, K. & SORENSEN, C. 2010. Desperately seeking the infrastructure in IS research: Conceptualization of "digital convergence" as co-evolution of social and technical infrastructures. (In HICSS - 2010. 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. p. 1-10).
- TOGAF. 2009. TOGAF™ Version 9. 9th ed. Amersfoort, Nederland: Van Haren Publishing.
- TOGAF. 2008. A description of enterprise architecture - as context for work on business architecture. <http://www.togaf.org> Date of access: 07/29. 2009.
- TRAUTH, E.M. 1997. Achieving the research goal with qualitative methods: Lessons learned along the way. (In Lee, A.S., Liebenau, J. & DeGross, J.I., eds. Information systems and qualitative research. Chapman & Hall. p. 225-245).
- UARM. 2013. UARM Centre for Applied Risk Management. <http://www.nwu.ac.za/uarm/home>.
- VAISHNAVI, V. & KUECHLER, W. 2013. Design science research in information systems. <http://www.desrist.org/design-research-in-information-systems/> Date of access: 01/11. 2014.

- VENKATESH, V., THONG, J. & XU, X. 2012. Consumer acceptance and use of information technology: Extending the unified theory of acceptance and use of technology. *MIS quarterly*, 36(1):157-178.
- VENKATESH, V. & BALA, H. 2008. Technology acceptance model 3 and a research agenda on interventions. *Decision sciences*, 39(2):273-315.
- VENKATESH, V., MORRIS, M.G., DAVIS, G.B. & DAVIS, F.D. 2003. User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS quarterly*, 27(3):425-478.
- VERNADAT, F. 1996. Enterprise modeling and integration: Principles and applications. London, UK: Chapman & Hall.
- VITHESSONTHI, C. 2009. Corporate ecological sustainability strategy decisions: The role of attitude towards sustainable development. *Journal of organisational transformation & social change*, 6(1):49-64.
- VON BERTALANFFY, L. 1969. General systems theory: Foundations, development, applications. Revised ed. New York, USA: George Braziller.
- VON GRODDECK, V. 2011. Rethinking the role of value communication in business corporations from a sociological perspective: Why organisations need value-based semantics to cope with societal and organisational fuzziness. *Journal of business ethics*, (100):69-84.
- VON KROGH, G. 2009. Individualist and collectivist perspectives on knowledge in organizations: Implications for information systems research. *Journal of strategic information systems*, 18(3):119-129.
- WALLS, J.G., WIDMEYER, G.R. & EL SAWY, O.A. 1992. Building an information system design theory for vigilant EIS. *Information systems research*, 3(1):36-59.
- WALSHAM, G. 2001. Making a world of difference - IT in a global context. New York, USA: John Wiley & sons.
- WALSHAM, G. & WAEMA, T. 1994. Information system strategy and implementation: A case study of a building society. *ACM transactions on information systems*, 12(2):150-173.
- WICKRAMASINGHE, V. & KARUNASEKARA, M. 2012. Impact of ERP systems on work and work life. *Industrial management and data systems*, 112(6):982-1004.
- WIENER, R. 1954. The human use of human beings. USA: Da Capo press. (Da capo series in science.).
- WIENER, N. 1961. Cybernetics, or, control and communication in the animal and the machine. 2nd (1973 printing) ed. Cambridge, MA.: M.I.T. Press.
- WINDSOR, K.R. 2013. Rethinking communication management: The case for change. www.brandadvocat.com Date of access: 07/25. 2013.
- WINTER, R. & FISCHER, R. 2007. Essential layers, artifacts, and dependencies of enterprise architecture. *Journal of enterprise architecture*, 3(2):7-18.

- WONG, I.A. & STEINHOFF, P. 2009. Investigate the social actor model in ICT use in organizations. (In HICSS-42. Proceedings of the 42nd Hawaii International Conference on Systems Sciences. IEEE Xplore. p. 1-8).
- WU, C., CHENG, F., YEN, D.C. & HUANG, Y. 2011. User acceptance of wireless technology in organizations: A comparison of alternative models. *Computer standards & interfaces*, 33(1):50-58.
- YIN, R.K. 2009. Case study research : Design and methods. 4th ed. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications. 193-202p.
- ZACARIAS, M., PINTO, H.S., MAGALHÃES, R. & TRIBOLET, J. 2010. A 'context-aware' and agent-centric perspective for the alignment between individuals and organizations. *Information systems*, 35(4):441-466.
- ZACARIAS, M., CAETANO, A., MAGALHÃES, R., PINTO, H.S. & TRIBOLET, J. 2007. Adding a human perspective to enterprise architectures. (In 18th International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications. IEEE Computer Society. p. 840-844).
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2012. Verbal communication with author. Lecture by John Zachman, Oct 2012, UP.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2011a. The Zachman framework for enterprise architecture 3.0 - the enterprise ontology. www.zachman.com.
- ZACHMAN, J.P. 2011. The Zachman framework evolution. <http://www.zachman.com/ea-articles-reference/54-the-zachman-framework-evolution>.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2010c. Engineering the enterprise - Z101 MasterClass: Framework foundations. <http://Zachmaninternational.com/2/standards.asp>.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2010b. John Zachman's concise definition of the Zachman Framework. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Rotan, USA: CRC Press. p. 61-65).
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2010a. Architecture is architecture is architecture. (In Kappelman, L.A., ed. The SIM guide to enterprise architecture. Boca Raton, USA: CRC Press. p. 37-45).
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2009. Verbal communication with author.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2008c. Enterprise architecture: Issues, inhibitors and incentives. *ZIFA*, 17. www.zifa.com
Date of access: 01/18. 2009.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2008b. Life is a series of trade-offs and change is accelerating. *ZIFA*, 18. www.zifa.com
Date of access: 03/02. 2009.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2008a. John Zachman's concise definition of the enterprise framework. <http://www.zachmaninternational.com/index.php/the-zachman-framework> Date of access: 10/23. 2008.
- ZACHMAN, J.A. 2006. The Zachman Framework for Enterprise Architecture: Primer for enterprise engineering and manufacturing. Canada: Zachman Framework Associates, Metadata Systems Inc.

ZACHMAN, J.A. 1999. A framework for information systems architecture. *IBM systems journal*, 38(2/3):454-470.

ZACHMAN, J.A. 1987. A framework for information systems architecture. *IBM systems journal*, 26(3):276-292.

ZACHMAN, J.A., WOLFF, N., KAPPELMAN, L.A. & ROSS, J.W. 2011. What is enterprise architecture? Discussion group: Information management online.
<http://www.informationmanagement.com/news/enterprise-architecture-ERP-BI-SIM-10021528-1.html>

ZIKMUND, W.G., BABIN, B.J., CARR, J.C. & GRFFIN, M. 2013. Business research methods. 9th ed. USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.