

Youngjin Yoo, Case Western Reserve University

Keywords: revising assumptions, digital innovations, platform organizations, embeddedness in geopolitical discourse, changing computer architectures, transdisciplinary work

What I would like to share is from my own vantage point. I am a very typical IS scholar, I came into OCIS looking for a home in this massive annual gathering. The OCIS meeting is the only place I could comfortably find friends and find familiar faces to hangout and talk about my research.



When I think about the growth of the research in the IS community and the contribution to the broader management scholarship, [I find] it has always been “technology will change the world, technology will change the world!” and “IT is different from other technologies” etc. We, as IS scholars, always tend to look at IS in isolation, even those of us who take a social-technical

perspective. We want to see technology [in a broader context]. We want to see virtual organizations, computers mediating communication, and so on. Ironically, I think, as technology does have an impact in organizations around the world now, some of our assumptions need to be revisited if we really want to have an impact on the way technology is used in organizations.

Based on some of the work I do with legacy companies with rather large corporations that are really struggling to stay alive with this “digital disruption”, something that I see as important, [I am motivated for] the kind of perspective I will be taking.

The first [point] I would characterise as “The Empire Strikes Back”. Look at what Disney is doing, look at what Goodyear Tire just did in CES this year! They are massively using their non-digital footprints and traditional headsets in order to come up with a way to compete with the “digital disruptors”. Of course, Netflix will not go away, but Disney+ overnight took away about \$1 Billion of market capitalization money when they announced that they are going to move all their assets away from Netflix content library and create their own. It was a very bold move from their part because they are going to lose a lot of money in the short term, but they did it and they are doing quiet well. Now they are introducing their own movie theater replacement in this pandemic era, which I think is interesting.

What this illustrates is that *digitality* and *physicality* must be seen together. There is no such a thing as a pure digital innovation. Digital innovations are consumed in the context of human being existence, and we are living in a material world. I think that is something that we, IS scholars coming from the technology world, must think about.

The second point is “The Rise of New Empires”. We have been thinking about the emergence of new, nimble, and different kinds of platform organizations. Guess what! These platform organizations, as they get older, become vertically integrated. Google is integrating up and down, Apple is integrating up and down, Tesla is evermore integrated from the components all the way to the distribution channels, so where is this research on platforms going? Maybe we should fine tune the way we think about organizational forms. Maybe the old concepts are useful in thinking about new phenomena. How about IS scholars thinking about these ‘boring’ enterprise systems? The companies who are very successful in

scaling their new digital disruptions from their legacy companies. CIO organizations are the only ones that know how to scale. Those with digital disruptive design thinkers come into the organization, can be really good at creating “cute little projects” but they do not deliver real value. The only companies who can deliver value through these digital innovations are the ones who have the power of enterprise systems, which are often managed by the CIO and the old IT group who are doing really “boring” work. So it matters and maybe we need to fine-tune our interests.

For my fourth point, we really need to think about this “Post-Trump Era”. Think about the assumptions that we have been operating with as IS scholars and communication scholars, the power of IS, global outsourcing, virtual teams, is all part of a particular geopolitical reality. This global integration will continue to happen and maybe not so. There is a rise of regionalism, this new [form of] naturalism, that is taking over. This is a force that is much bigger than the management discourse, but we need to realise that our little discourse and management discourse [overall] is embedded in a much large geopolitical discourse that is taking place. Therefore, maybe we need to rethink our naïve assumptions about the geopolitical trends. Maybe our wishful thinking will continue to be the case, but we do not know! But we may need to be ready for that kind of reality.

For the last point, much of current technology work is based on a combination of smartphones and the Cloud and computing architectures. That computer architecture is getting tired for many reasons. We are seeing the decreasing marginal returns on the companies who are driving those paradigms. It feels like 2005, right before Apple came up with a smartphone that brought all these emerging technologies together to a new company platform. I think we are soon going to see a very different computing paradigm that goes beyond this. The frictions that we are seeing with biases, privacy, and data security are all based on this existing computer architecture that we have seen for the part ten years or so. IS scholars and technology scholars need to look ahead [for] what is coming from a technology perspective and begin to calibrate our scholarly research methods and tools. I do not think that only AI is going to be it. I do not think that the algorithm itself is going to be it. There are broader changes that are taking place in a computing world and technology world that goes beyond computers.

My last point is that we need to recalibrate what we mean by *interdisciplinarity* or *multidisciplinarity*. I think that we tend to take a fairly narrow view within management disciplines. If we work with communication or marketing [we assume] it is multidisciplinary. We will have to start working with people in medicine, material science, chemistry, law, social science, and ethics and think of a transdisciplinary work in order for us to make an impact on the world. And I hope that our division will be home for scholars who are interested in technology outside of the management discourse so that we are welcoming of people from healthcare and law and sociology and other fields so that they will come here and interact with us and inform our research work.