

# Chapter 4.1

## Levels of Adoption in Organizational Implementation of E-Collaboration Technologies

**Bjørn Erik Munkvold**  
*University of Agder, Norway*

### INTRODUCTION

While the e-collaboration term only dates back a few years, its roots can be traced back at least two decades to the research and development in areas such as groupware, computer supported cooperative work (CSCW), group support systems (GSS), and computer-mediated communication (CMC). As defined by Kock (2005), the e-collaboration term can be seen to encompass a wide range of technologies supporting collaboration among individuals engaged in a common task. In this article, the e-collaboration term thus incorporates previous research and practice within the areas mentioned above. The term organizational implementation is used to denote the process of introducing the technology in an organizational setting (Walsham, 1993).

Ever since the first organizational applications of e-collaboration technologies, such as videoconferencing and group decision support systems,

there has been a focus on the process related to how organizations and user communities adopt these technologies. Early research pointed to how adoption of e-collaboration technologies may be more challenging than other types of IT, as the effects and benefits from its use are dependent on the common adoption and use among all members of a group or user community (Grudin, 1989). Over the years, a rich base of empirical studies has developed, illustrating the complexity often involved in the process of organizational implementation of e-collaboration (see Munkvold, 2003, for a review of this research). Examples of issues influencing this process include the potential disparity in work and benefit among different adopters (Grudin, 1989), the users' mental models of the technology (Orlikowski, 1992), the need for a supportive technological and behavioral infrastructure (Palen & Grudin, 2003), and user training that also emphasizes the collaborative nature of the technology (Orlikowski, 1992).

A problem with accumulating and comparing the findings from the research on organizational implementation of e-collaboration technologies is that these studies may include adoption at various levels: individual, group, organizational, and even interorganizational. As such, e-collaboration practices may cover the whole span from two persons collaborating on a joint document, collaboration in teams and projects, enterprise-wide collaboration, and interorganizational collaboration as in virtual supply chains. Illustrating this problem, an analysis of 36 studies of e-collaboration published in seven information systems (IS) journals during the period 1999-2003 found that over two-thirds of the studies contained one or more problems of levels incongruence related to the level of the theory, the level of the data analysis, and the unit of analysis (Gallivan & Benbunan-Fich, 2005). Adding to this complexity is also the wide range of e-collaboration technologies and applications possibly incorporated within the e-collaboration term (Munkvold, 2003), and the potentially inherent flexibility in use of these. Finally, the multi-disciplinary nature of the e-collaboration area also implies challenges in developing a common terminology for describing phenomena related to e-collaboration adoption and use.

This article defines and discusses key concepts related to implementation of e-collaboration technologies in organizations, with main focus on the different levels of adoption that can be identified in this process. The aim is thus to contribute to a shared vocabulary and understanding of different adoption levels in organizational implementation of e-collaboration.

## **BACKGROUND**

The term implementation is used differently in different research communities. In areas such as computer science, human-computer interaction (HCI), and software engineering, this term basically refers to the actual coding of the system,

while in IS research and practice the term denotes the process of introducing the technology in an organizational setting. Grudin (1993) discusses how differences in terminology may constitute a barrier to effective communication between these communities.

In the research on information technology (IT) implementation, one of the most influential perspectives has been the Diffusion of Innovations (DOI) theory (Fichman, 2000; Rogers, 1995). Diffusion is here defined as “the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among the members of a social system” (Rogers, 1995, p. 5). In the context of e-collaboration technologies, this refers to the process by which the adoption and use of the technology spreads throughout an organization, both as a result of planned distribution as well as emerging social mechanisms such as peer pressure. According to DOI theory, different attributes of an innovation may affect the rate of adoption. Examples of such attributes are relative advantage (the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes), and compatibility (the degree to which an innovation is perceived as being consistent with the existing values, past experiences, and needs of potential adopters) (Rogers, 1995, p. 15). Another important term related to adoption and diffusion of e-collaboration technologies is critical mass, denoting the number of users that have to adopt a technology before the adoption of the technology becomes self-sustaining (Markus, 1987). Before a critical mass of users is reached the benefit from the system for the individual user will be limited, thus implying a risk that the early adopters may discontinue its use.

Based on the DOI perspective, Cooper and Zmud (1990) introduced a model for the IT implementation process covering all stages from project initiation and acquisition of a new technology (through purchase or in-house development) to the final stage where the technology is “internalized” in the daily work practices and full benefits from

6 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/levels-adoption-organizational-implementation-collaboration/8818](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/levels-adoption-organizational-implementation-collaboration/8818)

## Related Content

---

### The Relationship Between e-Collaboration and Cognition

Stephen C. Hayne and C.A.P. Smith (2005). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 17-34).

[www.irma-international.org/article/relationship-between-collaboration-cognition/1933](http://www.irma-international.org/article/relationship-between-collaboration-cognition/1933)

### Millennial Teamwork and Technical Proficiency's Impact on Virtual Team Effectiveness: Implications for Business Educators and Leaders

C. Matt Graham, Harold Daniel and Brian Doore (2016). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 34-50).

[www.irma-international.org/article/millennial-teamwork-and-technical-proficiencys-impact-on-virtual-team-effectiveness/163228](http://www.irma-international.org/article/millennial-teamwork-and-technical-proficiencys-impact-on-virtual-team-effectiveness/163228)

### Virtual Group Strategic Decision Making Using Structured Conflict and Consensus Approaches

Jerry Fjermestad (2005). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 43-61).

[www.irma-international.org/article/virtual-group-strategic-decision-making/1928](http://www.irma-international.org/article/virtual-group-strategic-decision-making/1928)

### Overcoming Barriers in the Planning of a Virtual Library: Recognising Organisational and Cultural Change Agents

Ardis Hanson (2002). *Collaborative Information Technologies* (pp. 228-238).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/overcoming-barriers-planning-virtual-library/6681](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/overcoming-barriers-planning-virtual-library/6681)

### Crowdsourcing and Living Labs in Support of Smart Cities' Development

Chrysaida-Aliki Papadopoulou and Maria Giaoutzi (2018). *E-Planning and Collaboration: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 364-381).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/crowdsourcing-and-living-labs-in-support-of-smart-cities-development/206012](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/crowdsourcing-and-living-labs-in-support-of-smart-cities-development/206012)