

## **References and Bibliography**

- Avison, D.E. and Fitzgerald, G., (1988). *Information Systems Development: Methodologies, Techniques and Tools*, Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford.
- Avison, D.E., and Myers, M.D., (1995). Information Systems and Anthropology: an anthropological perspective on IT and organisational culture. *Information Technology & People* , Vol. 8, Iss. 3, pp. 43 - 107.
- Avison, D.E. and Fitzgerald, G., (2003). Where Now for Information Systems Development Methodologies? *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 79 - 82.
- Avgerou, C., (2005). Doing Critical Research in Information Systems: Some Further Thoughts. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 103 -109.
- Bailey, J., (2004). Making Action Research relevant for practice - foreword. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 329 - 335.
- Barrett, M., and Walsham G., (2004). Making Contributions From Interpretive Case Studies: Examining Processes of Construction and Use, in: *Information Systems Research: Relevant Theory and Informed Practice*, Proceedings of the IFIP WG 8.2 Conference, Manchester. pp. 293 – 312.
- Baskerville, R., and Myers, M.D., (2008). First steps in qualitative data analysis: transcribing. *Family Practice*, Vol. 25, pp. 127-131.
- Baskerville, R., Pries-Heje J., and Ramesh B., (2007). The enduring contradictions of new software development approaches: a response to ‘Persistent Problems and Practices in ISD’. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 241- 245.
- Baskerville, R.L., and Wood-Harper, A.T., (2002). A critical perspective on Action Research as a Method for Information Systems Research in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A Reader, Edited by Michael D. Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London*), pp. 129 - 145.

- Baskerville, R., and Pries-Heje, J. (1999). Grounded Action Research: a method for understanding IT in practice. *Accounting, Management, & Information Technologies*, Vol. 9, pp. 1 - 23.
- Baskerville, R., and Wood-Harper, A.T. (1998). Diversity in Information Systems Action Research Methods. *European Journal of Information Systems* , Vol. 7, pp. 90 - 107.
- Baskerville, R., and Wood-Harper, A.T. (1996). A critical perspective on action research as a method for information systems research. *Journal of Information Technology* , Vol. 11, pp. 235-246.
- Baskerville, R., (1993). Semantic Database Prototypes. *Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 3 No. 2, pp. 119-144.
- Benbasat, I., Goldstein, D.K., and Mead, M. (1987). The Case Research Strategy in Studies of Information Systems. *MIS Quarterly*, September, pp. 369-386.
- Beynon-Davies, P., Carne C., Mackay H., and Tudhope D., (1999). Rapid Application Development: an empirical review. *European Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 8, pp. 211- 223.
- Beynon-Davies, P., Carne C., Mackay H., and Tudhope D., (2000). Its lots of bits of paper and ticks and post-it notes and things...: a case study of a rapid application development project. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 8, pp. 211- 223.
- Bødker, S., and Grönbeck, K., (1996). “Users and Designers in mutual activity: An analysis of cooperative activities in systems design”. In Y. Engeström and D. Middleton (Eds), *Cognition and Communication at Work* (pp. 130-158). New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Bondarouk, T.V., (2006). Action-oriented group learning in the implementation of information technologies: results from three case studies. *European Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 15, pp. 42-53.
- Borland, R.J., and Hirschheim, R.A., (1987). *Critical Issues in Information Systems Research*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

- Borland, R.J., (2002). Information System Use as a Hermeneutic Process in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A Reader, Edited by Michael D. Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London*), pp. 226 – 240.
- Botswana , (1997). *Government IT Strategy*. Ministry of Finance and Development Planning. Gaborone, Botswana
- Botswana, (2003). *National Development Plan 9*. Ministry of Finance and Development Planning, Gaborone, Botswana.
- Botswana, (2004). *Project Initiation Document for PEX*. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Botswana, (2004). *SOUR for PEX*. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Botswana, (2004). *Post Implementation Review Findings for PEX*. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Botswana, (2005). *National ICT Policy*. Ministry of Communications, Science and Technology, Gaborone, Botswana.
- Botswana, (2007). *Design and Development Documentation for PEX*. Gaborone, Botswana.
- Boud, D., Keogh R., and Walker D., (1985). *Reflection, Turning Experience into Learning*, Routledge.
- Brown, R.B.K, Hyland P., and Piper I.C. *Eliciting and Specifying Requirements for Highly Interactive Systems using Activity Theory*. Centre for e-Business Applications Research (CeBAR), School of Information Technology and Computer Science, University of Wollongong, Australia.
- Brown, J.S., Collins, A., and Duguid, P., (1989). Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning. *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 32-42.
- Brown, J.S., and Duguid, P., (1991). Organisational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Towards a Unified View of Working, Learning and Innovation. *Organisation Science*, Vol. No. 2 (1), pp. 40-57.
- Brooke, C., (2002). What does it mean to be ‘critical’ in IS research. *Journal of Information Technology*, Vol. 17, pp. 49 - 57.

- Cole, M., (2005). Cultural-Historical Activity Theory in the Family of Socio-Cultural Approaches. *International Society for the Study of Behavioural Development Newsletter*. No 1, Serial No. 47, pp 1-29.
- Cole, M., (1996). *Cultural Psychology: A Once and a Future Discipline*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Collins, K., (2006). Connecting work and learning: design engineers learning at work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 18 (7/8), pp. 404-413.
- Bugelski B. R., (1956). *The Psychology of Learning*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc, New York.
- Daniels, H., and Warmington, P., (2007). Analysing third generation activity systems: labour-power, subject position and personal transformation. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 19 No.6, pp. 377–391.
- Daniels, H., Leadbetter, J., Warmington, P., Edwards, A., Martin, D., Popova, A., Apostolov, A., Middleton, D., Brown, S., (2007). Learning in and for multi-agency working. *Oxford Review of Education*, Vol. 33 (4), pp. 521–538.
- Dayton, D. *Activity Theory: A Versatile Framework for Workplace Research*. [ddayton@caribe.net](mailto:ddayton@caribe.net), Project Web site: <http://english.ttu.edu/dayton/>, May 2006.
- Davydov, V. V., (1999). *What is Real Learning Activity?* In Hedegarrd, M. & Lompscher, J. (Eds.) *Learning Activity and Development*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, pp. 123-138.
- Dewey, J., (1933). *How We Think. A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process* (Revised edition.), Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Dube', L., and Pare', G. (2003). Rigor in Information Systems Positivist Case Research: Current Practices, Trends, and Recommendations. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 37 No. 4 December, pp. 597-635.
- Dwyer, S.Y., and Buckle, J. L., (2003). On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research (2009). *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 54-63.
- Engeström, Y., (1987). *Learning by Expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.

- Engeström, Y., (1990). “Developmental Work Research as Activity Theory in Practice: Analysing the Work of General Practitioners”. In Y. Engeström, *Learning, Working and Imagining* (pp. 69-106). Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y., (1990). “Constructing the Object in the Work Activity of Primary Care Physicians”. In Y. Engeström, *Learning, Working and Imagining* (pp. 107-154). Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y., (1990). “When is a Tool? Multiple Meanings of Artefacts in Human Activity”. In Y. Engeström, *Learning, Working and Imagining* (pp. 171-195). Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y., (1990). “Organisational Forgetting: An Activity Theoretical Perspective”. In Y. Engeström, *Learning, Working and Imagining* (pp. 196-226). Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.
- Engeström, Y., and Miettinen, R., (1999). “Introduction”. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, and R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory* (pp. 1-16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y., (1999). “Activity Theory and the individual and individual and social transformation”. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, and R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory* (pp. 19-38). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y., (1999). “Innovative learning in work teams: Analysing cycles of knowledge creation in practice”. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, and R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory* (pp.377-404). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y., and Miettinen, R., (1999). *Activity Theory: A well kept secret in Perspectives on Activity Theory*, Engeström Y., Miettinen, R., and Punamki xx, (eds), pp.1 – 15.
- Engeström, Y., (2001). Expansive Learning at work: toward an activity theoretical reconceptualisation. *Journal of Education and Work*. Vol. 14 (1), pp. 133-156.
- Engeström, Y., (2004). New forms of learning in co-configuration work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*. Vol. 16 (1/2), pp. 11-12.

- Engeström, Y., and Sannino, A., (2010). Studies of expansive learning: Foundations, findings and future challenges. *Educational Research Review*, Vol. 5, pp.1 – 24.
- Fitzgerald, B., (1996). Formalised systems development methodologies: a critical perspective. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 6, pp. 3-23.
- Fitzgerald, B., (1997). The use of systems development methodologies in practice: a field study. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 201 -212.
- Fleck, J., (1994). Learning by trying: the implementation of configurational technology. *Research Policy*, Vol. 23, pp. 637-652.
- Galliers, R.D., and Land, F.F., (2002). Choosing Appropriate Information Systems Research Methodologies in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A Reader, Edited by Michael D. Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London*), pp. 13 - 17
- Glass, R.L., (2004). Matching Methodology to Problem Domain: Soliciting advice on choosing and applying appropriate software development methodologies. *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 47 No. 5, pp. 19 -21.
- Goulielmos, M., (2004). Systems development approach: transcending methodology. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 14, pp. 363-386.
- Hartely, J., (1998). *Learning and Studying: A Research Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Hasu, M., (2000). Blind Men and the Elephant: Implementation of a New Artefact as an Expansive Possibility. *Outlines*, Vol. 2, pp. 5-41.
- Hasu, M., and Engeström, Y., (2000). Measurement in action: an activity-theoretical perspective on producer-user interaction. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, Vol. 53, pp. 61-81.
- Hasu, M., (2001). Critical Transition from Users to Developers: Activity-Theoretical Studies of Interaction and Learning in the Innovation Process. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Hatch E., (1978). *Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hergenhahn, B.R. and Olson, M.H., (1997). *An Introduction to Theories of Learning* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Routledge.

- Hill, R., Capper, P., Wilson, K., Whatman, R., and Wong, K., (2007). Workplace learning in the New Zealand apple industry network: A new co-design method for government “practice making”. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 359–376.
- Hirschheim, R., and Newman, M., (2002). Symbolism and Information Systems Development: Myth, Metaphor and Magic in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A Reader*, Edited by Michael D. Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London), pp. 241 - 274
- Hirschheim, R., and Klein H.K., (1989). Four paradigms of information systems development. *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 32 No. 10, pp. 1199 - 1217.
- Hirschheim, R., Iivari J., and Klein H.K., (1997). A comparison of five alternative approaches to systems development. *Australian Journal of Information Systems*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 3 - 29.
- Hutchins, E., (1993). *Learning to navigate* in Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context, Seth Chaiklin and Jean Lave eds. Cambridge University Press: Canada, pp. 35-63.
- Hyysalo, S., (2009). Learning for learning economy and social learning. *Research Policy*, Vol. 38, pp. 726-735.
- Hyysalo, S., (2006). The Role of Learning-by-Using in the Design of Health Care Technologies: A Case Study. *The Information Society*, Vol. 22, pp. 89-99.
- Hyysalo, S., (2005). Objects and Motives in a Product Design Process. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, Vol. 12 (1), pp. 19-36.
- Iivari, J., Hirschheim R., and Klein H.K., (2000). A Dynamic Framework for Classifying Information Systems Development Methodologies and Approaches. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 179 - 218.
- Iversen, J.H., Mathiassen, L., and Neilson, P.A., (2004). Managing Risk in Software Process Improvement: An Action Research Approach. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 435 - 472.
- Jarvis, P., (2004). *Adult Education & Lifelong Learning: Theory and Practice*, Routledge Falmer, London, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.

- Jonassen, D.H, and Rohrer-Murvey L., (1999). Activity Theory as a Framework for Designing Constructivist Environments. *ETR&D*, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 61-79 ISSN 1042-1629.
- Joyce, B., Calhoun, E., and Hopkins, D., (2002). *Models of Learning – tools for teaching*, Open University Press, Buckingham, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.
- Kautz, K., Madson, S., and Norbjerg J., (2007). Persist Problems and practices in information systems development. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 217-239.
- Kautz, K., Madson, S., and Norbjerg J., (2007). Continuing the debate: a response to a response - persist problems and practices in Information Systems Development. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 17, pp. 247-249.
- Keller, C., and Keller, J.D., (1993). *Thinking and acting with iron* in Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context, Seth Chaiklin and Jean Lave eds. Cambridge University Press: Canada, pp. 125 – 134.
- Kerosuo, H., and Engeström, Y., (2003). Boundary crossing and learning in creation of new work practice. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 15 No. 7/8, pp. 345–351.
- Kerosuo, H., (2006). Boundaries in Action: An activity-theoretical study of Development, Learning and Change in Health Care for Patients with Multiple and Chronic illnesses. PhD Thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Klein, H. K. and Myers, M.D., (1999). A Set of Principles for Conducting and Evaluating Interpretive Field Studies in Information Systems. *MIS Quarterly* Vol. 23 1, pp. 67-93.
- Korpela, M., (1994). *Nigerian Practice in Computer Systems Development: A multidisciplinary Theoretical Framework, Applied to Health Informatics*. Dissertation. Helsinki University of Technology.
- Korpela, M., Mursu, A., and Soriyan H.A., (2002). Information Systems Development as an Activity. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, Vol 11, pp. 111-128.
- Korpela, M., Mursu, A., Soriyan A., Eerola A., Hakkinen H., and Toiviainen M., (2005?). *Information Systems Research and Development By Activity Analysis and Development: Dead Horse or Next Wave?*. Conference Paper, pp. 453 – 471.



- Korpela, M., Soriyan H.A., and Olufokunbi (2000). Activity Analysis as a method for Information Systems Development: General Introduction and Experiments from Nigeria and Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems*, Vol 12, pp. 191-210.
- Krashen, S.D., (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Kuutti, K., (1999). "Activity Theory, transformation of work, and information systems design". In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen and R. Punamaki (Eds), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 360-376). New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., (1996). Teaching, as Learning, in Practice. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, Vol. 3 No.3, pp. 33-50.
- Lave, J., (1993). "The Practice of Learning". In S. Chaiklin and J. Lave (Eds), *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context* (pp.3-32). Canada: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., (1988). *Cognition in Practice*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- Lee, A. S., (1989). A Scientific Methodology for MIS Case Studies. *MIS Quarterly*, March, pp. 149-164.
- Leontiev, A.N., (1981). *Problems of the Development of the Mind*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Lindgren, R., Henfridsson, O., and Schultze, U., (2004). Design Principles for Competence Management Systems: A Synthesis of an Action Research Study. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 435 - 472.
- Lyytinen, K., and Robey, D., (1999). Learning Failure in Information Systems Development. *Information System Journal*, Vol. 9, pp. 85-101.
- Lyytinen, K., Rose, G., and Welke, R., (1998). The Brave New World of Development in the Inter-network Computing Architecture (InterNCA): Or how Distributed Computing Platforms Will Change Systems Development. *Information System Journal*, Vol 8, no.3, pp. 241-253.

- Malcolm, J., Hodkinson, P., and Colley, H., (2003). The interrelationships between informal and formal learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 15, No. 7/8, pp. 313-318.
- Markus, M. L. (1983). Power, Politics and MIS Implementation. *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 26 No.6, pp 430-444.
- Martensson, P., and Lee, S., (2004). Dialogical Action Research at Omega Corporation. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 435 - 472.
- Mathiassen, L., and Puro S., (2002). Educating reflective systems developers. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 12, pp. 81-102.
- Mathiassen, L., (2002). Collaborative Practice Research. *Scandinavian Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 14, pp. 57-73.
- Mathiassen, L., (1998). Reflective Systems Development. *Scandinavian Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 10 (1&2), pp. 67-118.
- McGrath, K., (2005). Doing Critical Research in Information Systems: A Case of Theory and Practice not informing each other. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 85-101.
- Merriam, S.B., and Cafarella, R.S, (1991). *Learning in Adulthood: A Comprehensive Guide*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, California.
- Miettinen, R., (1998). Object Construction and Networks in Research Work: The Case of Research on Cellulose-Degrading Enzymes. *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 28(3), pp. 423-463.
- Miettinen, R., Lehenkari, J., and Tuunainen, J., (2008). Learning and Network Collaboration in Product Development: How Things Work for Human Use. *Management Learning*, Vol. 39 (2), pp. 203–219.
- Miettinen, R., (2005). Object of Activity and Individual Motivation. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, Vol. 12(1), pp. 52–69.
- Minick, N., (1997). “The early history of the Vygotskian school: the relationship between mind and activity”. In M. Cole, Y. Engeström, and O. Vasquez (Eds.), *Mind, culture, and activity*:

- Seminal papers from the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition* (pp. 117-127).  
Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mumford, E., (2001). Advice for an Action Researcher. *Information Technology and People*,  
Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 12-27.
- Mursu, A., (2002). *Information Systems Development in Developing Countries: Risk  
Management and Sustainability Analysis in Nigerian Software Companies*. Dissertation.  
University of Jyvaskyla.
- Myers, M.D., and Avison, D.E., (2002). An Introduction to Qualitative Research in Information  
Systems in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A Reader, Edited by Michael D.  
Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London*), pp. 3 – 12
- Myers, M. D., (1999). Investigating Information Systems with Ethnographic Research.  
*Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 2, pp. 2-20.
- Myers, M.D.,(1997). *Qualitative Research in Information Systems*,  
<http://www.qual.auckland.ac.nz> , 28 March 2006.
- Orlikowski, W.J., and Baroudi, J.J., (2002). Studying Information Technology in Organisations:  
Research Approaches and Assumptions in (*Qualitative Research in Information Systems – A  
Reader, Edited by Michael D. Myers and David Avison, SAGE Publications, London*), pp. 52  
- 77
- Orlikowski, W.J., (1991). Integrated Information Environment or Matrix Control? The  
Contradictory Implications of Information Technology. *Accounting, Management and  
Information Technologies*, Vol 1. No. 1, pp. 9-42.
- Palmius, J., (2007). Criteria for measuring and comparing information systems. *Proceedings of  
the 30<sup>th</sup> Information Systems Research Seminar in Scandinavia IRIS 2007*.
- Pare', G., (2004). Investigating Information Systems with Positivist Case Study Research.  
*Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, Vol. 13, pp. 233-264.

- Paviainen, P., Tihinen, M., Lormas, M., and van Solingen, R., (2004). *Requirements Engineering: Dealing with the Complexity of Sociotechnical Systems Development*. VTT Publications. Espoo.
- Pihlaja, J., (2005). *Learning in and for Production: An Activity-Theoretical Study of the Historical Development of Distributed Systems of Generalisation*. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Pozzebon, M., (2002). *Conducting and Evaluating Critical Interpretive Research: Examining Criteria as a Key Component in Building a Research Tradition*. HEC Montreal.
- Rockart, J. F., "Chief executives define their own data needs", *Harvard Business Review* 1979 (2), pp. 81-93.
- Rogers, A., (2003). *What is the Difference? A new critique of adult learning and teaching*, NIACE Publishers, Leicester, England.
- Rogers, C.R., (1969). *Freedom to Learn*, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio.
- Rogoff, B., and Lave, J., (1984). *Everyday Cognition: It's Development in Social Context*. Harvard University Press: USA.
- Roode, J.D., (1993). "Implications for Teaching of a Process-Based Research Framework for Information Systems". In *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the International Academy for Information Management*, Orlando, Florida, pp. 61 – 78.
- Schulz, K., (2005). Learning in complex organisations as practicing and reflecting: A model development and application from a theory of practice perspective. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 17 No. 8, pp. 493-507.
- Roth, W., and Lee, Y., (2007). Vygotsky's Neglected Legacy: Cultural-Historical Activity Theory. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol 77 No. 2, pp. 186-232.
- Schon, D., (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Profession*. Jossey-Boss Publishers: San Francisco.

- Schulz, K., (2005). Learning in complex organisations as practicing and reflecting: A model development and application from a theory of practice perspective. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 17 No. 8, pp. 493-507.
- Sfrad, A., (1998). On Two Metaphors for Learning and the Dangers of Choosing Just One. *Educational Researcher*, Vol.27, No.2, pp. 4-13.
- Smith, M. K., (1999) 'Learning theory', the encyclopaedia of informal education, [www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm), Last update: 03 September 2009
- Smith, M. K., (1999) 'The social / situational orientation to learning', the *encyclopaedia of informal education*, [www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-learn.htm), Last update: 03 September 2009
- Stowell F., (1995). *Information Systems Provision: The contribution of Soft Systems Methodology (Soft Systems Methodology and its Relevance to the Development of Information Systems by Peter Checkland)*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Suchman, L. A., and Trigg, R.H., (1993). *Artificial Intelligence as Craftwork* in Understanding Practice: Perspectives on activity and context, Seth Chaiklin and Jean Lave eds. Cambridge University Press: Canada.
- Tilley, S.A., (2003). "Challenging" research practices: turning a critical lens on the work of transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 9, pp. 750-773.
- Toiviainen, H., (2003). Learning across levels: Challenges of Collaboration in a Small-Firm Network. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Toiviainen, H., (2007). Inter-organisational learning across levels: an object-oriented approach. *Journal of Workplace and Learning*, Vol. 19 No.6, pp. 343-358.
- Tuunainen, J., (2004). Hybrid Practices: The Dynamics of University Research and Emergence of a Biotechnology Company. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.
- Vickers, M.H., (1999). Information technology development methodologies: Towards a non-positivist, developmental paradigm. *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 255 -272.
- Victor, B., and Boynton, A.C., (1998). *Invented here: Maximising your organisation's internal growth and profitability*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

- Vidgen, R., (1997). Stakeholders, soft systems and technology: separation and mediation in the analysis of information system requirements. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 21-46.
- Virkkunen, J., and Kuutti, K., (2000). Understanding organisational learning by focusing on “activity systems”. *Accounting Management and Information Technologies*, Vol. 10, p 291-319.
- Vygotsky, L.S., (1962). *Thought and Language*. E. Hanfmann, and G. Vakar (Eds). Massachusetts, USA: The M.I.T. Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S., (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, and E. Souberman (Eds). Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Walsham, G., (2005). Learning about being critical. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 85-101.
- Wastell, D.G., (1999). Learning Dysfunctions in Information Systems Development: Overcoming the Social Defences with Transitional Objectives. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 23, pp. 581- 600.
- Wastell, D.G., (1996). The fetish of technique: methodology as a social defence. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 6, pp. 25 - 40.
- Wenger, E.C., and Snyder W. M., (2000). Communities of Practice: The Organisational Frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, pp. 139 – 145.
- Wertsch, J.V., (1985). *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Westrup, C., (1999). Knowledge, legitimacy and progress? Requirements as inscriptions in information systems development. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 9, pp 35-54.
- Wynekoop, J.L., and Russo, N.L. (1997). Studying system development methodologies: an examination of research methods. *Information Systems Journal*, Vol. 7, pp. 47 - 65.

Yamagata-Lynch, L.C., (2003). Using Activity Theory as an Analytical Lens for Examining Technology Professional Development in Schools. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, Vol. 10 (2), pp. 100 - 119.

## Appendix A – PIR User Interview Guideline

- 1) NAME: DATE OF INTERVIEW:
- 2) POSITION:
- 3) NUMBER OF YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION:
- 4) EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:
- 5) INVOLVEMENT ON THE SMIMS PROJECT (i.e. Role and start date):
- 6) FUNCTIONALITY USED:
- 7) USEFULNESS OF FUNCTIONALITY:
- 8) EASE OF USE:
- 9) EFFECTIVENESS
  - REPORTING
  - SUPPORTING BUSINESS PROCESSING)
  - TRAINING AND DOCUMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS
  - SUPPORT
- 10) IMPACT:
  - (1) BUSINESS PROCESSING
  - (2) INDIVIDUAL (WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNT)
- 11) REFLECTIONS ON THE PROJECT:



## Appendix B – PIR COX Team Interview Guideline

- 1) NAME: DATE OF INTERVIEW:
- 2) POSITION:
- 3) NUMBER OF YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION:
- 4) EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:
- 5) INVOLVEMENT ON THE PEX PROJECT (i.e. Role and start date):
  - (I) Role (e.g. Design Architect, Developer etc.)
  - (II) Project phase / stage involvement started
  - (III) User transition from SOUR phase to Design & Development
- 6) UNDERSTANDING OF GoB ISD PROCESS
  - (I) Subject (s) / Social Actors
  - (II) Object and Outcome
  - (III) Methodologies and Tools used during design, development, implementation (state any changes to tools, methodology etc. during actual project execution, also state why specific methodologies / tools were used?)
  - (IV) Rules governing ISD process (i.e. GoB or organisation specific)
  - (V) Community
  - (VI) Division of Labour (if any)
- 7) INDIVIDUAL CORPORATE MOTIVES FOR PROJECT ENGAGEMENT
- 8) EFFECTIVENESS
  - METHODOLOGY AND TOOLS (what have users learnt about the ISD process? Should they only learn about the use of the system?)
  - IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH (Does it contribute towards enhanced user learning?)
  - TRAINING AND DOCUMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS
  - SUPPORT
- 9) IMPACT:
  - a. ORGANISATION
  - b. INDIVIDUAL (WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNT)



10) REFLECTIONS ON THE PROJECT:

## Appendix C – PIR COX – LEAD DEVELOPER Interview Guideline

NAME:

DATE OF INTERVIEW:

ROLE ON THE SMIMS PROJECT:

POSITION IN THE COMPANY:

DATE COMPANY WAS ESTABLISHED:

NUMBER OF YEARS IN BUSINESS:

1) ONE OF THE REASONS YOU GAVE AT THE ISD PRACTICE CHANGE LAB FOR ADOPTING THE RAD / PROTOTYPING METHODOLOGY TO ISD WAS THAT IT ENCOURAGES LEARNING. IN YOUR VIEW DID THE PROTOTYPING SESSIONS FOR THE PEX PROJECT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY FOR LEARNING? IF YES IN WHAT AREAS?

- Users
- For Developers

2) IN PLANNING FOR THE PROTOTYPING SESSIONS – DID YOU HAVE CLEAR OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTCOMES?

3) WERE YOU HAPPY WITH THE PLANNING AND THE OUTCOME OF THE SESSIONS AND WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS FOR THAT?

4) THERE WERE TEN (10) PROTOTYPING SESSIONS HELD AS OPPOSED TO THE THREE (3) ORIGINALLY PLANNED. WHAT BROUGHT THIS ABOUT?

5) THERE SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN A LOT OF TIME SPENT ON STATIC SCREEN DESIGNS WITH NO LOGIC BEHIND THE SCREENS - WHY DID YOU ADOPT THAT APPROACH? AND WERE YOU HAPPY WITH THE OUTCOME?

6) THE UAT WAS DELAYED. COULD THE FACT THAT MOST OF THE LOGIC WAS ONLY BUILT INTO THE SYSTEM AT THE END RATHER THAN DURING THE PROTOTYPING SESSIONS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THAT?

7) ON REFLECTION WOULD YOU STILL HAVE ADOPTED THE SAME APPROACH? IF NOT WHY NOT AND WHICH APPROACH WOULD YOU HAVE ADOPTED INSTEAD AND WHY?

- 8) USER LEARNING AND THEREFORE SLOW SYSTEM UPTAKE WAS A MAJOR PROBLEM ON THIS PROJECT – WHAT WOULD YOU SINGLE OUT AS HAVING BEEN THE MAJOR REASON FOR THAT? DID THE PROTOTYPING APPROACH ADOPTED CONTRIBUTE TO THAT?
- 9) DURING THE CHANGE LAB SESSION YOU RAISED THE ISSUE OF ‘INSUFFICIENT JOB KNOWLEDGE AND PROCESSES – THE FACT THAT YOU ARE DOING A JOB DOES NOT MEAN YOU KNOW THE JOB – MAY NOT UNDERSTAND THE PROCESSES AND BUSINESS RULES BEHIND THE JOB’ DID THIS AFFECT LEARNING AT ALL – ESPECIALLY FOR YOUR DEVELOPMENT TEAM? DID THIS ALSO AFFECT LEARNING BY USERS? WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO ADDRESS THIS?
- 10) SHARE YOUR OTHER REFLECTIONS ON THE PROJECT?
- 11) WHAT DID YOU LEARN FROM THIS PROJECT WITH REGARDS TO THE CURRENT ISD PRACTICE?
- 12) AT THE CHANGE LAB YOU SUGGESTED A NUMBER OF THINGS TO IMPROVE CURRENT PRACTICE TWO OF WHICH WERE CHANGE MANAGEMENT AND DUE DILIGENCE ON THE REQUIREMENTS AND PROJECT APPROACH PRIOR TO STARTING A PROJECT. EXPAND ON THIS AND EXPLAIN HOW THEY WOULD ADDRESS THE MAJOR CHALLENGE OF LEARNING AND SYSTEM UPTAKE?