

# Article review was completed (IJIKM, PID 3892)

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: elsje.scott@uct.ac.za Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id> 24 September 2017 16.48

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.



# Article: A CONCEPTUAL MODEL OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE BASED ON ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Dear Lanto Ningrayati Amali,

Thank you for your submission PID 3892, "A conceptual model of information technology governance based on organizational culture" to IJIKM. Your submission has already been reviewed by the journal's Editorin-Chief Elsje Scott. I have the honor to serve as the Editor for your paper and as such, I chair the ad hoc external review committee composed of **seven** additional external reviewers. These reviewers were selected from the journal's international board of reviewers specifically to read over your submission and offer you, through this development letter, their thoughts and suggestions.

IJIKM is a member of the Informing Science Institute's family of journals and so my role as your submission's editor is to create for your paper a development letter that describes the review committee's thoughts on how to make your submission even better. We do this for all submissions, whether or not we will continue pursuing with publishing your work.

The initial external review has now concluded, and the ad hoc review board has come to its decision regarding moving your paper forward toward publication.

At this point, we will not be pursuing publishing your submission. You may find it useful to present your work at a conference so as to obtain additional feedback. In any case, now that your paper is no longer under consideration for publication by us, you are permitted under professional ethics to submit it to a different publication outlet. Email Universitas Negeri Gorontalo - Article review was completed (IJIKM, PID 3892)

With the above in mind, please consider the suggestions below that I've composed based on the various comments made by members of your paper's review board. You can download the paper as the reviewers saw it by logging in and clicking the Download Article link. Should you have questions about these suggestions, please contact me directly at ewa.ziemba@ue.katowice.pl. If you have questions about how to use the ISI Paper Review System, contact our Managing Editor Eli Cohen at EliCohen@InformingScience.org

Yours truly,

Professor Ewa Ziemba, Editor for IJIKM

ewa.ziemba@ue.katowice.pl

for Elsje Scott

Editor in Chief with Mike Hart for the Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management (IJIKM)

## **Overall comments:**

The topic of this paper is relevant. The purpose of the study is very interesting and up-to-date. Unfortunately, the purpose and the content of the paper do not agree with each other. The purpose of the study is stated to "carry out the contributions of organizational culture aspect to the development of IT governance". In fact, the paper deals only with the analysis of the organizational culture.

It would be better you focus one of the two directions:

- Work towards the stated goal of the study and show the relation between the IT governance and organizational structure;
- Focus on the main topic case study of the organizational culture and remove all references to the IT governance.

### Title

The title of the paper does not agree with the content of the paper. The title claims that the authors built a "conceptual model of IT governance" but it is difficult to find this model in the paper.

## Abstract

The abstract itself is useful although the findings were non-specific. As a result, the reader does not know specifically what was found.

## Introduction

The introduction does a good job of introducing both organizational culture and IT governance. It seems that more details of the justification, research gap, and research questions should be stated in this section. In addition, research objectives and the structure of the paper require to be presented at the end of this section.

## **Literature Review**

Literature review lacks description of the factors that affect IT governance (organizational culture is only one of them). Earlier studies about organizational culture in the context of the IT governance and their findings should be presented. There are some clear linkages between organizational culture and IT governance but when creating a conceptual model more focus needs to be on the literature review.

Additionally, there is a lot of resources in Reference, but many of them are not used in the text. According to the scientific standards the References should contain only those resources cited in the text. No other resources should be mentioned in the References.

## Methodology

The quantitative study seems robust. However, linkage between IT governance and organizational culture in the data collection is not apparent.

The main tool used by you is the OCAI questionnaire and it should be described and illustrated. The reasons for selecting this tool should be presented and the strong features and weak points of the tool should be shown. Additionally, the following questions should also be addressed in this section: How did those variables get scored? Who were the respondents and did they be qualified to answer those questions about "It governance" and "organizational culture"? When and how long was the study conducted? What methods of data collecting were used and how they were used (on-line questionnaire, face to face interview etc.)? What statistical analysis and software were used to analyze data?

In addition, the notions of the "current" and "preferred" cultures are not introduced.

All of what is mentioned above will make almost impossible for the reader to understand the results of the paper.

## **Research Findings**

The findings are presented well. The radar charts are useful in visualizing the data. Unfortunately, results/findings deal with organizational culture alone and are not related to IT governance as well as relations between organizational culture and IT governance.

### Discussion

The discussion and results sections are intertwined. They should be separated.

### Conclusion

The conclusion is quite limited and does not give the reader a lot to take away and use within an organization. The conclusion does provide some anecdotes about general IT governance best practices that do exist elsewhere in the literature. No strong linkages between organizational culture and IT governance are made.

In addition to the above issues you should also present the contribution of your study to existing research on organizational culture, IT governance and linkage between them, implications for researchers and practitioners from these results, limitations of your study and findings, and future works that can result from this study.

### Language and editing

Please read carefully your paper and correct spelling or grammatical errors, e.g.:

line 7: "In the global era" o changed to "In this era of globalization" line 17: Should "In result" be replaced by " As a result"?

line 18: "in line with what Pereira and Silva (2012); and Aasi et al. (2016) argue" to be changed to "in line with what Pereira and Silva (2012) and Aasi et al. (2016) argue"

line 38: "IT governance has been one key part of an organization's management for fine governance can ensure that IT can uphold and expand organization's strategies and goals" to be changed to "IT governance has been one key part of an organization's management because fine governance can ensure that IT can uphold and expand organization's strategies and goals"

line 40: To be consistent, should "Lin, et al. (2010)" be changed to "Lin et al. (2010)"?

line 48: It also affected their performance, boosting it to 20 to 40 percent - what kind of performance? What has been boosted? What is the normal level or old level?

line 65: "an efficient management of IT/IS are significant" to be changed to "an efficient management of IT/IS is significant"

line 89: "Should there be a contradiction between IT and organizational culture; one" to be changed to "Should there be a contradiction between IT and organizational culture, one"

line 96: " as displayed by following Figure 1" to be changed to " as displayed in Figure 1"

line 120: " in the following Table 1" to be changed to " in Table 1"

line 131: "an analysis to the average" to be changed to "an analysis on the average"

line 137: " result shows (Figure 4)" to be changed to " result (in Figure 4) shows"

line 143: "By the result, it is deduced" to be changed to "From the result, it is deduced "

line 176: "That an organization cannot solely rely on strong human and financial resources in order to" to be changed to "An organization cannot solely rely on strong human and financial resources in order to" line 191: "From previous data, it is concluded" to be changed to "From this set of data, it is concluded"

line 207: Is it better to change "By that, staff can freely provide" to "In this situation, staff can freely provide"

line 218: "a number of current personnel management resemble the market culture" to be changed to "a number of current personnel management styles resemble the market culture"

line 237: "adhocracy culture contributes the least factor" to be changed to "adhocracy culture contributes the least" or "adhocracy culture is the least contributing factor"

line 246: "which in turn improve" to be changed to "which in turn improves" line 246: "the respondents demanded" to be changed to "the respondents demand"

line 254: "some respondents argued" to be changed to "some respondents argue"

line 261: "search for IT/IS new opportunities" to be changed to "search for new IT/IS opportunities"

line 267: "organization determine" to be changed to "organization determines"

line 275: "the organization favoured setting a benchmark of success" to be changed to "the organization favours setting a benchmark of success" line 284: "there are 23 percent current value of adhocracy culture, with 25 percent preferred culture value and two percent gap" needs to be revised line 284: "with 3% gap" to be changed to "with a gap of 3 percent" line 286: "below than five percent" to be changed to "less than five percent"

line 288: "Based on the previous result on organizational culture profiles" to be changed to "Based on the result above on organizational culture profiles"

**View Details** 

© Informing Science Institute, 2017 elicohen@informingscience.org



This email was sent to Lanto Ningrayati Amali (ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id) on 24 Sep, 2017



# Co-Author verified (IJIKM, PID 4178)

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Kepada: Lanto Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> 11 November 2017 23.33





# Your article is under evaluation (IJIKM, PID 4178)

2 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: luj@uhv.edu Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id> 21 November 2017 01.28

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.



Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id>

26 November 2017 17.27

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ik=b507becca7&view=pt&search=all&permthid=thread-f%3A1584606936843248331&simpl=msg-f%3A1584606... 1/2

#### Kepada: M Rifai Katili <mrifaikatili@gmail.com>

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



# Please revise your submission and submit the revision online (IJIKM, PID 4178) 1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: luj@uhv.edu Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id>

28 Desember 2017 02.08

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.



# Article: FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IT GOVERNANCE

Dear Lanto Ningrayati Amali,

Thank you again for your submission PID-4178 to the Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management (IJIKM) entitled "FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IT GOVERNANCE". Your submission has already been reviewed by the journal's *Associate Editor-in-Chief Geoffrey Liu*. I have the honor to serve as the Editor for your paper and as such, I chair the ad hoc external review committee composed of **4** additional external reviewers. These reviewers were selected from the journal's international board of reviewers specifically to read over your submission and offer you, through this development letter, their thoughts and suggestions.

IJIKM is a member of the Informing Science Institute's family of journals and so my role as your submission's editor is to create for your paper a development letter that describes the review committee's thoughts on how to make your submission even better. We do this for all submissions, whether or not we will continue pursuing with publishing your work.

The initial external review has now concluded. The reviewers indicate that the article deals with IT governance which is an interesting topic to the readership of this journal and it has the potential to make a significant contribution to our discipline. The ad hoc review board has come to its decision regarding moving your paper forward toward publication.

I am pleased to inform you that based on this external review we have accepted your paper for publication, subject to the revisions which I outline below. I have scheduled a target date of *January 31, 2017* for receipt of your revised paper and your response to your reviewers' comments. If this is not reasonable in light of your schedule, please let me know what date would be more workable for you and I will adjust our records accordingly.

Whether or not you choose to accept this offer, please visit the review site and let the system know of your decision of whether or not to revise your submission, as shown below. Either click on the link in this email or log in directly at http://InformingScience.org and visit the REVISION tab.

You will need to upload two files in the next step. The first file is your Revisions Document in which you indicate for me, point by point, how you revised the submission in light of my comments below. You need not accept every suggestion, but you need to inform me via the Revisions Document what changes you chose to make and which ones you chose to forego (and indicate why you are foregoing them). Even if you disagree with your reviewers, please do address each of the areas that they have identified, since other readers of your research may well have similar questions. The review and revision process may involve just one cycle, or it may involve several, depending largely on the degree to which you are able to address your reviewers' concerns.

The second document is your revised paper. To save valuable time in getting your paper published, please fully format this revision according to the specifications found at the Article Submission tab under Article Formatting Instructions. You can find a template at http://www. informingscience.org/Uploads/JournalFormat.docx . Pay attention to end the paper with a biographical sketch of each author along with a head and shoulders photo. We cannot accept your paper until you provide camera-ready copy. If you have more money than time, our publisher will hire a formatter on your behalf (for \$75 USD), but you still need to include the photos and bios of all authors.

Through our partnership with Grammarly, we are pleased to offer you a special rate to obtain Grammarly Professional for your own use at a 74% discount (for just \$45/Year Plan). Please do NOT share this link as it is for Informing Science Institute colleagues only. Sign up at <a href="http://gram.ly/fZR4">http://gram.ly/fZR4</a>.

With the above in mind, please consider the suggestions below that I've composed based on the various comments made by members of your paper's review board. You can download the paper as the reviewers saw it by logging in and clicking the Download Article link. Should you have questions about these suggestions, please contact me directly at dr.rajeevmanhas@gmail.com. If you have questions about how to use the ISI Paper Review System, contact our Managing Editor Eli Cohen at EliCohen@InformingScience.org

Again, thank you for submitting your research to IJIKM. I enjoyed reading your manuscript, and I am looking forward to reading your revisions and seeing your research published. Please feel free to contact me at any time.

Best wishes

Rajeev Manhas, Editor, IJIKM dr.rajeevmanhas@gmail.com

for Geoffrey Z. Liu, geoffrey.liu@sjsu.edu, Associate Editor-in-Chief Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management

The recommendation is organized into the sections of the article. Below are the details.

**1. Title**: The title may be more informative of the focus and domain of the study (public sector). Consider changing it to: "Identification of influential factors in implementing IT governance: A survey study of Indonesian companies in the public sector".

**2. Abstract:** Revise to make it clearer and catchier. It needs to summarize the paper content to such an extent that readers can easily get its essence. Specifically,

- Clearly state the relationship between research variables, especially in the "Findings" part.
- State more clearly the relationship among "Title", "Policy" and "Monitoring and Evaluation process", as well as the relationship between "system planning, the management of IT investment, system realization, operation and maintenance, and organizational culture" and IT governance
- In the "Recommendation for practitioners", outline specific good practices of IT governance. The current line adds little substance – nothing by empty claim.
- Remove the entry "Recommendation for Researchers", and incorporate the associated wording into the entry "Future Research".

**3. Introduction:** This section should introduce the main idea of the paper to orient the reader.

- Not all readers know what IT governance is. Suggest to give a clear definition of IT governance, and briefly explain what it involves, who are the people involved, what are the processes that IT governance encompasses.
- Besides arguing for the importance of IT governance, this section also needs to state the main research objective of this study -- determining factors affecting IT governance.
- Move the third paragraph (page 2, lines 21 to 31) up to be the second, and consequently making the currently second paragraph (page 2, lines 11 to 20) the third. It makes better sense to identify first how applying IT governance is important to Indonesia and then overview the real situation of IT governance there.
- Add a new paragraph to summarize factors affecting the application of IT governance in different settings, as implied in the literature. Then move on to the situation in Indonesia.
- Page 2, line 21: delete "in conjunction", to start the sentence directly as "ITGI (2008) and Weill and Ross (2004) **argue** that it has potentials to be the best practice in uplifting the performance".
- Avoid starting a paragraph with "meanwhile" (as in page 2, line 32). Use "although" instead.
- Page 3 lines 2 & 3: "It is important because current literatures have not revealed any study carried out in Indonesia. Hence, it has to be urgently initiated". One cannot be absolutely sure that no study has conducted in this domain in Indonesia. Thus, the claim needs to be

softened a bit by adding a qualifying phrase, such as "As far as the researcher knows" or "To the researcher's best knowledge".

• Add a new paragraph at the end of the introduction section to outline content structure/organization of the paper. E.g., "This paper proceeds as follows. First,.... Then, ....Afterwards,.... Finally... ".

**4. Review of Literature**. It needs to be expanded both in scope and depth. Currently it is mainly focused in the meaning and importance of IT governance, rather than determination of factors affecting the implementation of IT governance.

- Two noticeable gaps in literature review to be filled:
  - Factors that affect the implementation of IT governance in other settings, as observed in the previous studies; This review would be the basis for the rest of the paper.
  - The nature of IT governance in Indonesia to be more elaborated, so as to emphasize the originality of the study, as implied in the unique setting of "Indonesia" (and public section?).
- The first three paragraphs hit the same idea (importance of IT) repeatedly. Condense and consolidate to avoid repetition
- Organize/structure the content of the literature review section as follows: 1. Definition of IT governance 2. Importance of IT governance. 3. Factors affecting the implementation of IT governance in other settings. 4. The nature of IT governance in Indonesia. 5. the emphasis that the paper is original in the sense that no previous studies aimed at determining factors affecting the implementation of IT governance in Indonesia.

# 5. Theoretical and Research Model

- Rename this section as "Research Problem, Model, and Hypotheses"
- Rewrite statements of hypotheses to clearly identify research variables. The relationship between the dependent variable (implementation of IT governance) and the independent variables (factors affecting its implementation in public sector) should be clearly stated in hypotheses.
- To avoid repeating the leading phrase many times, consider to use the following format/structure (with your current hypothesis statements as example):
  - < >< >

The research sample needs to be described better, and descriptive statistics of the collected data need to be analyzed to identify the main characteristics of the sample.

 One reviewer pointed out that due to the given nature of IT governance, the statistical approach does not offer insights or any depth to the discussion of the results. IT governance is about people, processes, and the results of IT decisions and implementation, not just a totally dry discussion of statistical

tests. The reviewer further added that the analysis should be made easy to understand.

**7. Findings:** The research findings are well presented, and are appropriate and sufficient. However, the findings are presented with too much emphasis on the statistics. There seems to be too much focus on the stats and not enough on connections to related/relevant concepts about IT governance, even vignettes about real IT governance practices or impacts in the governmental workplace covered be the study. It also need to incorporate observations from the qualitative interviews.

**8. Discussion:** This section needs to discuss not only findings in agreement with previous studies, but also those differing or contradictory. It also needs to identify findings on IT governance unique to the Indonesian public sector. In addition, this part seems to have a level of disconnect from the stated topic, the related literature review, and the quantitative approach taken. More discussion on the procedural aspects of IT governance implementation is recommended.

**9. Conclusion:** Consider rewriting this section to weave together the purpose of the study, why the study was necessary in the first place, the theories cited in the literature review, and conclusions drawn from the findings. It needs to summarize unique contributions of this research. Try to write for a broader audience from other professional backgrounds beyond IT governance.

## 10. Minor cleaning up ...

- The paper got many grammatical errors and carful proof reading and editing, probably with help from a professional English editor. For example, the use of 'is' where none is warranted is one example. On page 3 line 40, "... it has been an urge as a need in public service...". Check thoroughly for grammatical mistakes, misspelling, misuse of words, and revise vague and/or ill structured sentences.
- Improve for better transition from paragraph to paragraph and flow from sentence to sentence, to increase readability.
- All acronyms (ITGI, ISACA, COBIT, SEM, AMOS, GFI, NFI, RMSEA etc.) should always be defined at first mention, by spelling out the full name first and then giving the corresponding acronym in parenthesis. For example, "Control Objectives for Information and Related Technologies (COBIT)".
- Correct use of conjunctives such as "besides" and "meanwhile".
- Consider to adjust the sequence of sections as: introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusion.
- Reference entries and citation should follow the APA editorial style strictly and consistently.

Reply by: Jan 17

**View Details** 

© Informing Science Institute, 2017 elicohen@informingscience.org



This email was sent to Lanto Ningrayati Amali (ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id) on 27 Dec, 2017



# IJIKM: PID 4178 Your Manuscript Revision is due in two weeks

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> 17 Januari 2018 21.03





# IJIKM: PID 4178 Your Manuscript Revision is due in one week

2 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> 24 Januari 2018 21.03



This email was sent to Lanto Ningrayati Amali

(ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id) on 24 Jan, 2018

Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> Kepada: Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> 28 Januari 2018 14.14

Dear,

Rajeev Manhas, Editor, IJIKM dr.rajeevmanhas@gmail.com

for Geoffrey Z. Liu, geoffrey.liu@sjsu.edu, Associate Editor-in-Chief Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management

Thank you for contacting me and thank you for accepting my publication in IJIKM. Related to the revise target schedule on January 31, 2018, I would like to submit a new schedule for submit a revision to my paper which is February 7, 2018. I hope you can accept this offer. Thank you very much.

Best regard

Lanto Ningrayati Amali [Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

# A new schedule for submit a revision

1 pesan

Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> Kepada: Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> 28 Januari 2018 14.13

Dear,

Rajeev Manhas, Editor, IJIKM dr.rajeevmanhas@gmail.com

for Geoffrey Z. Liu, geoffrey.liu@sjsu.edu, Associate Editor-in-Chief Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management

Thank you for contacting me and thank you for accepting my publication in IJIKM. Related to the revise target schedule on January 31, 2018, I would like to submit a new schedule for submit a revision to my paper which is February 7, 2018. I hope you can accept this offer. Thank you very much.

Best regard

Lanto Ningrayati Amali



# IJIKM: PID 4178 Your Manuscript Revision is due in one week

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> 31 Januari 2018 21.04



This email was sent to Lanto Ningrayati Amali

(ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id) on 31 Jan, 2018



# Article Revision #1 was accepted (IJIKM, PID 4178)

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: luj@uhv.edu Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id> 2 Maret 2018 03.43

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.





# Article requires editorial revisions (IJIKM, PID 4178)

2 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: luj@uhv.edu Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id> 6 Maret 2018 04.09

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.



# Article: FACTORS INFLUENCING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IT GOVERNANCE

Pre-publication questions on your IJIKM paper #4178

Dear Lanto Amali,

Congratulations on the acceptance of your paper #4178, "Identification of Influential Factors in Implementing IT Governance: A Survey Study of Indonesian Companies in the Public Sector" for publication in the *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management* (IJIKM).

Below is a link to a revised draft of the paper.

## IJIKM 4178 Amali 1\_FS\_B.docx

As part of the quality assurance process, we proof read all papers before publication. While we correct minor grammatical or punctuation errors, we cannot do major copy editing as part of this process. As we prepared this paper for publication, we found a number of places where substantial corrections to sentences are needed. We made some changes in the first five pages, but discovered that the paper needs more attention than we can provide as part of the standard quality assurance process. We read through the remainder of the paper and highlighted some of the places where sentences or phrases need to be rewritten. We strongly suggest that you find someone who is fluent in English and, preferably, familiar with research to read the entire paper carefully and make the necessary corrections. Also, the changes we made in the first part of the paper need to be checked to make sure the corrections did not alter your meaning. If you are not able to do this, we can arrange for more extensive copy editing for a fee of \$250 US. Email Universitas Negeri Gorontalo - Article requires editorial revisions (IJIKM, PID 4178)



Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati\_amali@ung.ac.id> Kepada: mrifaikatili@ung.ac.id 6 Maret 2018 15.46

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



# Your article is under evaluation (IJIKM, PID 3892)

1 pesan

Informing Science Institute <notifications@informingscience.org> Balas Ke: elsje.scott@uct.ac.za Kepada: Lanto Ningrayati Amali <ningrayati amali@ung.ac.id> 30 Juli 2017 22.38

Do not reply to this email. To contact ISI click here.

