Pisco Med Publishing

Human Resources Management and Services 2026, 8(4), 6497.
https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms6497

Article

Strategic alignment of business and information technology: a multi-dimensional framework for organizational performance enhancement

Abdullah ALKHORAIF[1, *]

[1] Prince Musaid bin Abdulrahman University, Riyadh 11673, Saudi Arabia.

[*]**Corresponding author:** Abdullah ALKHORAIF, Email: a.alkhoraif@seu.edu.sa

CITATION

Alkhoraif A. (2026). Strategic alignment of business and information technology: a multi-dimensional framework for organizational performance enhancement. Human Resources Management and Services. 8(4): 6497. https://doi.org/10.18282/hrms6497

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2026 by author(s). *Human Resources Management and Services* is published by Piscomed Publishing Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Abstract: Strategic alignment between business and information technology (IT) has emerged as a critical determinant of organizational performance in the digital era. This study presents a comprehensive multi-dimensional framework for understanding and implementing strategic alignment, integrating both analytical and administrative approaches. Drawing on the Strategic Alignment Model (SAM) and its operationalization through twelve distinct alignment perspectives, we examine how organizations across different industries achieve and maintain strategic fit between business strategy and IT capabilities. Using mixed methods combining qualitative case analysis of 45 organizations and quantitative survey data from 312 executives across multiple industries, we investigate the mechanisms through which strategic alignment is associated with improvements in organizational performance. Our findings reveal distinct industry-specific patterns in alignment perspective preferences, with financial services favoring technology transformation perspectives while manufacturing sectors emphasize competitive potential alignments. We evaluate six prominent alignment models through a comprehensive framework encompassing strategic fit, functional integration, dynamic capabilities, and performance outcomes. Results demonstrate that organizations achieving high strategic alignment through integrated governance processes, enhanced technology capabilities, aligned human resource practices, and systematic value management exhibit superior performance outcomes including approximately 23% higher mean operational efficiency scores and approximately 31% higher mean innovation capacity scores compared to low-alignment organizations (cluster comparison between balanced alignment and strategy-driven alignment groups; 95% CI for operational efficiency difference: 18.4%–27.6%, Cohen's $d = 1.49$; 95% CI for innovation capacity difference: 25.2%–36.8%, Cohen's $d = 1.67$), with alignment mechanisms fully mediating this relationship. This research contributes to strategic management theory by synthesizing analytical and administrative approaches to alignment and provides practitioners with actionable frameworks for achieving sustainable strategic fit in dynamic business environments.

Keywords: strategic alignment, strategic alignment model, business-IT alignment, organizational performance, alignment perspectives, governance mechanisms, digital transformation, strategic fit

1. Introduction

The alignment of business strategy with information technology (IT) strategy represents one of the most persistent and critical challenges facing contemporary organizations (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993; Luftman, 2000; Luftman & Kempaiah, 2007; Papp, 1999). As digital technologies increasingly permeate every aspect of organizational operations and strategy formulation, the ability to achieve and maintain strategic alignment has become a fundamental determinant of competitive advantage and organizational performance (Chan & Reich, 2007;

Kearns & Sabherwal, 2006; Tallon & Kraemer, 2003). Strategic alignment refers to the process of aligning an organization's structure, resources, and technological capabilities with its strategic goals to enhance performance and achieve organizational objectives (Reich & Benbasat, 1996).

An often underappreciated dimension of strategic alignment is the critical role played by human resource management (HRM). Human capital—the collective knowledge, skills, competencies, and behaviors of organizational members—constitutes a pivotal enabler of alignment between business and IT strategies (Bassellier & Benbasat, 2004; Reich & Benbasat, 2000). Effective HRM practices, including competency-based recruitment, structured training and development programs, leadership development initiatives, cross-functional career systems, and talent management strategies, build the organizational capabilities necessary to execute and sustain alignment efforts. When employees across business and IT domains possess the digital literacy, strategic thinking skills, and collaborative orientations required for alignment, organizations are far better positioned to translate strategic intentions into operational realities (Nelson & Cooprider, 1996). This study explicitly examines how HR capabilities mediate the relationship between strategic alignment perspectives and performance outcomes, offering novel insights into the human dimension of alignment that complement existing governance- and technology-focused perspectives.

The concept of strategic alignment emerged in the early 1990s as organizations began recognizing that IT investments alone were insufficient to generate competitive advantage without corresponding alignment with business strategy (Broadbent & Weill, 1993; Henderson & Sifonis, 1988; Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993). The seminal strategic alignment model (SAM) proposed by Henderson and Venkatraman (1993) established a foundational framework for understanding the complex relationships between business strategy, IT strategy, organizational infrastructure, and IT infrastructure. This model has since become the most widely cited and influential framework in the strategic alignment literature, spawning numerous extensions, refinements, and empirical investigations (Ciborra, 1997; Sabherwal & Chan, 2001; Kearns & Lederer, 2003).

Despite extensive research spanning three decades, strategic alignment remains a top concern for executives and continues to challenge organizations across industries (Luftman & Ben-Zvi, 2010; Gerow et al., 2014; Tallon et al., 2000). The persistent difficulty in achieving alignment stems from multiple factors including the dynamic nature of business environments, rapid technological change, organizational complexity, and the inherent challenges of integrating distinct organizational domains with different cultures, languages, and priorities (Ciborra, 1997; Chan & Reich, 2007). Furthermore, the increasing pace of digital transformation and the emergence of disruptive technologies such as artificial intelligence, cloud computing, and blockchain have intensified the imperative for organizations to develop robust alignment capabilities (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Grover & Kohli, 2013; Vial, 2019).

The operationalization of the Strategic Alignment Model has evolved significantly since its initial conceptualization. Coleman and Papp (2006) developed a web-based assessment tool that enables organizations to evaluate their alignment position across twelve distinct alignment perspectives derived from the original SAM framework. This operationalization represents a significant advancement in translating theoretical constructs into practical assessment mechanisms. Their longitudinal analysis revealed that different industries exhibit distinct patterns of alignment perspective preferences, suggesting that optimal alignment configurations may be contingent upon industry characteristics, competitive dynamics, and technological intensity (Coleman & Papp, 2006).

Two complementary approaches have emerged for conceptualizing and managing strategic alignment: the analytical approach and the administrative approach (Venkatraman et al., 1993). The analytical approach, embodied in the Strategic Alignment Model, focuses on the structural relationships between four fundamental domains of strategic choice: business strategy, IT strategy, organizational infrastructure and processes, and IT infrastructure and processes (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993). This approach emphasizes the importance of achieving fit across these domains through strategic positioning and configuration. In contrast, the administrative approach addresses the organizational mechanisms and processes required to achieve and sustain alignment, including governance structures, technology capabilities, human resource capabilities, and value management systems (De Haes & Van Grembergen, 2009; Venkatraman et al., 1993; Luftman, 2000; Van Grembergen & De Haes, 2010).

The proliferation of alignment models and frameworks has created both opportunities and challenges for researchers and practitioners. While multiple models offer different perspectives and emphases, the diversity of approaches has also generated confusion regarding which models are most appropriate for specific organizational contexts (Galliers, 2004; Luftman, 2003; Mekawy et al., 2009; Peppard & Ward, 1999). Mekawy and colleagues (2009) addressed this challenge by developing a comprehensive strategic alignment evaluation framework composed of multiple criteria for assessing and comparing alignment models. Their evaluation of six prominent alignment models provides valuable guidance for organizations seeking to select and implement appropriate alignment approaches.

Despite substantial progress in strategic alignment research, several critical gaps remain in our understanding. First, while numerous studies have examined the relationship between strategic alignment and organizational performance, the specific mechanisms through which alignment generates performance benefits remain incompletely understood (Gerow et al., 2014; Hirschheim & Sabherwal, 2001; Leidner & Kayworth, 2006; Sabherwal & Chan, 2001a; Yayla & Hu, 2012). Second, most research has focused on static conceptualizations of alignment, with limited attention to the dynamic processes through which organizations achieve, maintain, and adapt alignment over time (Benbya & McKelvey, 2006; Tallon & Pinsonneault, 2011). Third, the industry-specific patterns of alignment identified by Coleman and Papp (2006) require further investigation to understand the contextual factors that shape optimal alignment configurations. Finally, the integration of analytical and administrative approaches to alignment has received limited empirical attention, despite theoretical arguments for their complementarity (Venkatraman et al., 1993).

This study addresses these gaps through a comprehensive investigation of strategic alignment that integrates multiple theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches. Our research is guided by three primary objectives. First, we examine how the Strategic Alignment Model has been operationalized through the twelve alignment perspectives framework and investigate industry-specific patterns in alignment perspective preferences. Second, we analyze the mechanisms through which organizations achieve strategic alignment, integrating both analytical and administrative approaches. Third, we evaluate prominent alignment models using a comprehensive framework to provide guidance for model selection and implementation.

To achieve these objectives, we employ a mixed-methods research design combining qualitative case analysis of 45 organizations across multiple industries with quantitative survey data from 312 senior executives. This methodological approach enables us to capture both the nuanced contextual factors that shape alignment processes and the generalizable patterns that emerge across

organizational contexts. Our qualitative analysis examines how organizations implement alignment mechanisms including governance processes, technology capabilities development, human resource alignment, and value management systems. The quantitative component investigates the relationships between alignment perspectives, alignment mechanisms, and organizational performance outcomes.

This research makes several important contributions to strategic management and information systems literature. First, we provide empirical evidence regarding the operationalization of the strategic alignment model through the twelve perspectives framework and document industry-specific patterns in alignment configurations. Second, we integrate analytical and administrative approaches to alignment, demonstrating how structural alignment and process-based mechanisms work in concert to generate organizational benefits. Third, we evaluate and compare prominent alignment models using a comprehensive framework, providing evidence-based guidance for practitioners. Fourth, we identify the specific mechanisms through which strategic alignment enhances organizational performance, including operational efficiency, innovation capacity, and strategic flexibility. Finally, we develop an integrated multi-dimensional framework for strategic alignment that synthesizes theoretical insights and empirical findings to guide both future research and organizational practice.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 1 explores the literature review. Section 2 describes our research methodology, including data collection procedures, sample characteristics, and analytical approaches for both qualitative and quantitative components. Section 3 presents our results and discussion organized around five key themes: the strategic alignment model and its theoretical foundations, the twelve alignment perspectives and their operationalization, industry-specific patterns in alignment configurations, the evaluation framework for alignment models, and the mechanisms through which alignment is achieved and sustained. Section 4 provides an integrated discussion of findings, theoretical implications, and practical recommendations. Section 5 concludes with a summary of key contributions, limitations, and directions for future research.

2. Materials and methods

This study employs a mixed-methods research design integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches to provide comprehensive insights into strategic alignment processes, mechanisms, and outcomes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). The combination of methods enables triangulation of findings and captures both the contextual richness of alignment processes and the generalizable patterns across organizations (Venkatesh et al., 2013). Our research design follows an exploratory sequential approach, with qualitative case analysis informing the development of quantitative instruments, followed by integrated analysis of both data streams (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

2.1. Research design and philosophical foundations

Our methodological approach is grounded in pragmatist philosophy, which emphasizes the practical consequences of research and the use of multiple methods to address complex organizational phenomena (Morgan, 2014). Strategic alignment represents a multifaceted construct that manifests through both structural configurations and dynamic processes, requiring methodological pluralism to capture its full complexity (Venkatesh et al., 2013). The qualitative component adopts an interpretivist stance, seeking to understand how organizational actors make sense of and enact alignment processes within specific contexts (Walsham, 1995). The quantitative component follows a post-positivist approach, testing relationships between alignment constructs and performance

outcomes while acknowledging the contextual contingencies that shape these relationships (Gerow et al., 2014).

2.2. Qualitative research component

2.2.1. Case selection and sampling

The qualitative component employed purposive sampling to select 45 organizations across six industry sectors: financial services (n = 9), manufacturing (n = 8), healthcare (n = 7), retail (n = 8), telecommunications (n = 7), and professional services (n = 6). Organizations were selected based on several criteria: (1) annual revenue exceeding $100 million, (2) significant IT investments representing at least 3% of revenue, (3) evidence of strategic alignment initiatives, and (4) willingness to provide access to senior executives and documentation (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 2017). This sampling strategy ensured variation across industries while focusing on organizations where strategic alignment represents a critical concern.

Organizations were recruited through professional networks, industry associations, and direct outreach to chief information officers (CIOs) and chief strategy officers (CSOs). The final sample included organizations ranging from $150 million to 12 billion in annual revenue, with an average of $1.8 billion. Geographic distribution included North America (n = 22), Europe (n = 15), and Asia-Pacific (n = 8), providing cross-cultural perspectives on alignment processes.

2.2.2. Data collection procedures

Qualitative data collection occurred over an 18-month period from January 2023 to June 2024. Multiple data sources were employed to ensure triangulation and enhance validity (Yin, 2017). Primary data collection methods included:

Semi-structured interviews: We conducted 127 interviews with senior executives including CIOs (n = 45), Chief Executive Officers (CEOs, n = 23), CSOs (n = 31), and other C-suite executives (n = 28). Interviews lasted 60-90 minutes and followed a protocol addressing alignment processes, mechanisms, challenges, and outcomes. All interviews were recorded with permission and professionally transcribed, yielding 2,847 pages of transcript data.

Document analysis: We collected and analyzed organizational documents including strategic plans, IT strategy documents, governance frameworks, organizational charts, performance reports, and alignment assessment results. Document analysis provided contextual information and enabled triangulation of interview data (Bowen, 2009).

Observation: For a subset of 12 organizations, we conducted on-site observations of governance meetings, strategic planning sessions, and alignment workshops. Observation provided insights into the enacted practices of alignment beyond espoused theories (Schatzki, 2001).

Archival data: We collected archival data on organizational performance, IT investments, and strategic initiatives covering a five-year period (2019-2023) to examine alignment trajectories and outcomes over time.

2.2.3. Qualitative data analysis

Qualitative data analysis followed a systematic process combining deductive and inductive coding approaches (Miles et al., 2014). Initial coding was guided by theoretical constructs from the strategic alignment model, alignment mechanisms literature, and the twelve perspectives framework (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993; Coleman & Papp, 2006; Luftman, 2000). This deductive approach was complemented by inductive coding to identify emergent themes and patterns not anticipated by existing theory (Gioia et al., 2013).

The analysis process proceeded through several stages. First, all interview

transcripts were imported into NVivo 14 qualitative analysis software. Second, two researchers independently coded a subset of 15 interviews to develop a preliminary coding scheme, which was refined through discussion and consensus. Third, the refined coding scheme was applied to all interview data, with regular meetings to discuss coding decisions and resolve discrepancies. Fourth, coded data were organized into thematic categories aligned with research objectives. Fifth, within-case and cross-case analyses were conducted to identify patterns, variations, and relationships (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Document analysis followed a similar process, with documents coded using the same scheme as interview data. Observational field notes were analyzed to identify alignment practices and compare espoused theories with enacted practices. Archival data were analyzed to construct alignment trajectories and examine relationships between alignment initiatives and performance outcomes.

To enhance rigor and trustworthiness, we employed several validation strategies (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checking involved sharing preliminary findings with 18 participating executives to verify interpretations and gather feedback. Peer debriefing sessions with three senior researchers not involved in data collection provided external perspectives on emerging findings. Triangulation across data sources, methods, and researchers enhanced confidence in findings. Thick description provides sufficient contextual detail to enable transferability assessments.

2.3. Quantitative research component

2.3.1. Survey development and instrumentation

The quantitative component employed a cross-sectional survey design to examine relationships between alignment perspectives, alignment mechanisms, and organizational performance outcomes. Survey development was informed by qualitative findings and existing validated instruments from strategic alignment literature (Chan et al., 1997; Luftman, 2000; Sabherwal & Chan, 2001a).

The survey instrument comprised five main sections:

Alignment perspectives: We operationalized the twelve alignment perspectives identified by Coleman and Papp (2006) using a web-based assessment approach. Respondents evaluated their organization's emphasis on each perspective using 7-point Likert scales (1 = no emphasis to 7 = very strong emphasis). Items were adapted from Coleman and Papp (2006) with modifications based on qualitative findings.

Alignment mechanisms: Four categories of alignment mechanisms were measured: governance processes (8 items), technology capabilities (7 items), human resource capabilities (15 items organized across six HR practice domains, with two to three items per practice), and value management (6 items). Items were developed based on Luftman (2000), Venkatraman et al. (1993), and qualitative findings. All items used 7-point Likert scales assessing the extent to which each mechanism was implemented.

Strategic alignment maturity: Overall strategic alignment was assessed using the strategic alignment maturity model (Luftman, 2000), which evaluates alignment across six dimensions: communications, competency/value measurement, governance, partnership, scope and architecture, and skills. The 24-item scale has demonstrated reliability and validity in previous research (Luftman & Ben-Zvi, 2010).

Organizational performance: Performance outcomes were measured across four dimensions: operational efficiency (5 items), innovation capacity (6 items), strategic flexibility (5 items), and financial performance (4 items). Items were adapted from validated scales (Tallon & Kraemer, 2003; Sabherwal & Chan, 2001a) and supplemented with items developed from qualitative findings.

Control variables: We included control variables for organization size (revenue, employees), industry sector, IT intensity (IT spending as percentage of revenue), environmental dynamism (5 items), and competitive intensity (4 items) to account for contextual factors that may influence alignment and performance relationships.

The survey instrument underwent rigorous validation procedures. Content validity was established through expert review by five senior researchers in strategic alignment. Face validity was assessed through cognitive interviews with 12 executives not included in the main study. Pilot testing with 47 organizations enabled refinement of items and assessment of psychometric properties.

2.3.2. Sampling and data collection

The target population comprised senior executives (CIO, CEO, CSO, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Chief Operating Officer (COO)) in medium to large organizations ($>$ \$100 million revenue) across multiple industries. We employed a multi-stage sampling approach. First, we identified potential respondent organizations through commercial databases (Dun & Bradstreet, Hoovers) and professional association membership lists. Second, we contacted executives through personalized email invitations explaining the research purpose and ensuring confidentiality. Third, we employed snowball sampling, asking initial respondents to recommend other qualified executives.

Survey administration occurred over a six-month period from July 2023 to December 2023. The survey was implemented using Qualtrics enterprise survey platform with multiple quality control features including attention checks, response time monitoring, and IP address verification to prevent duplicate responses. Reminder emails were sent at two-week intervals to non-respondents.

We distributed 1,847 survey invitations and received 387 responses, yielding a response rate of 21.0%. After removing incomplete responses (n $=$ 52) and responses failing attention checks (n $=$ 23), the final sample comprised 312 usable responses, each representing a unique organization. Response rate analysis indicated no significant differences between early and late respondents on key variables, suggesting limited non-response bias (Armstrong & Overton, 1977).

2.3.3. Sample characteristics

The final quantitative sample (n $=$ 312) exhibited the following characteristics. Respondent roles included CIO/ Chief Technology Officer (CTO, 38.5%), CEO/President (18.3%), CSO/ Vice President (VP) Strategy (22.1%), CFO (10.9%), and other C-suite executives (10.3%). Industry distribution included financial services (19.2%), manufacturing (17.6%), healthcare (15.1%), retail (14.4%), telecommunications (13.5%), professional services (11.2%), and other sectors (9.0%). Organization size ranged from $105 million onto$18.7 billion in annual revenue (median $=$ \$847 million) and from 250 to 87,000 employees (median $=$ 3,200). Geographic distribution included North America (52.6%), Europe (28.8%), Asia-Pacific (14.1%), and other regions (4.5%).

2.3.4. Quantitative data analysis

Quantitative data analysis employed multiple statistical techniques appropriate to research objectives. Preliminary analyses included descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and assessment of data quality. Measurement model evaluation employed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) using AMOS 28 to assess construct validity, reliability, and discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2019). Criteria for acceptable fit included Corporate Finance Institute (CFI) $>$ 0.90, Tucker–Lewis Index (TLI) $>$ 0.90, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) $<$ 0.08, and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) $<$ 0.08. Construct reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α $>$ 0.70) and composite reliability (CR $>$ 0.70). Convergent validity was evaluated

using average variance extracted Average Variance Extracted (AVE > 0.50), and discriminant validity was assessed using the Fornell-Larcker criterion and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratios.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) was employed to explore the research questions concerning relationships between alignment perspectives, alignment mechanisms, and performance outcomes while controlling for contextual variables (Kline, 2015). We estimated multiple models to examine direct effects, mediation effects, and moderation effects. Mediation analysis followed the procedures recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008), with bootstrapping (5,000 samples) to estimate indirect effects and confidence intervals.

Cluster analysis using k-means clustering identified distinct alignment configuration profiles based on emphasis across the twelve alignment perspectives (Hair et al., 2019). Optimal cluster solutions were determined using multiple criteria including elbow method, silhouette coefficients, and theoretical interpretability. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and chi-square tests examined differences between clusters on alignment mechanisms, performance outcomes, and contextual characteristics.

Hierarchical regression analysis examined the incremental variance in performance outcomes explained by alignment mechanisms beyond control variables. Moderation analysis tested whether relationships between alignment and performance varied by industry sector, organization size, or environmental characteristics using interaction terms and simple slopes analysis (Aiken & West, 1991).

Common method bias was assessed using multiple techniques including Harman's single-factor test, confirmatory factor analysis with a common latent factor, and correlation matrix examination (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Results indicated that common method bias was not a significant concern, with the largest single factor explaining 31.2% of variance (below the 50% threshold) and the common latent factor showing minimal impact on structural paths.

2.4. Integration of qualitative and quantitative findings

The final stage of analysis involved systematic integration of qualitative and quantitative findings to develop comprehensive insights into strategic alignment (Fetters et al., 2013). Integration occurred at multiple levels. First, qualitative findings informed quantitative instrument development and hypothesis formulation. Second, quantitative results were interpreted in light of qualitative contextual insights. Third, convergent and divergent findings across methods were identified and explored. Fourth, an integrated multi-dimensional framework was developed synthesizing insights from both methodological approaches.

Integration analysis employed joint display tables that systematically compare qualitative themes with quantitative results, identify areas of convergence and divergence, and generate meta-inferences that transcend individual methods (Guetterman et al., 2015). This integrative approach enhances the comprehensiveness and validity of findings while providing both generalizable patterns and contextual understanding.

2.5. Ethical considerations

This research received approval from the Institutional Review Boards of all three participating universities. All participants provided informed consent after receiving detailed information about research purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits. Confidentiality was ensured through data anonymization, secure data storage, and restricted access. Organizations and individuals are identified only by codes in research outputs. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Data will be retained for seven years in accordance with institutional policies and then securely destroyed.

3. Results and discussion

This section may be divided by subheadings. It should provide a concise and precise description of the experimental results, their interpretation, as well as the experimental conclusions that can be drawn.

This section presents the integrated findings from our qualitative and quantitative analyses organized around five key themes: (1) the strategic alignment model and its theoretical foundations, (2) the twelve alignment perspectives and their operationalization, (3) industry-specific patterns in alignment configurations, (4) evaluation framework for alignment models, and (5) mechanisms for achieving and sustaining strategic alignment. Each subsection integrates relevant theoretical perspectives with empirical evidence from both research components.

Measurement model assessment. Prior to examining substantive findings, we report construct validity and reliability results from the measurement model evaluation. The overall confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) demonstrated good fit: CFI $= 0.93$, TLI $= 0.91$, RMSEA $= 0.063$ (90% CI: 0.057–0.069), SRMR $= 0.066$. All factor loadings were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), with standardized loadings ranging from 0.62 to 0.87, and all exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.50 (Hair et al., 2019). Construct reliability was satisfactory across all latent variables (Cronbach's α range: 0.78–0.91; composite reliability [CR] range: 0.81–0.93). Convergent validity was supported, with average variance extracted (AVE) values ranging from 0.52 to 0.68, all exceeding the 0.50 threshold. Discriminant validity was evaluated using both the Fornell-Larcker criterion—wherein each construct's AVE exceeded the squared inter-construct correlations—and heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratios, which ranged from 0.41 to 0.79 and remained below the conservative 0.85 threshold (Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015). These results collectively confirm that the measurement model exhibits adequate reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, providing a sound basis for structural model interpretation.

3.1. The strategic alignment model: theoretical foundations and contemporary relevance

The strategic alignment model (SAM) proposed by Henderson and Venkatraman (1993) remains the most influential theoretical framework for understanding business-IT alignment (Avison et al., 2004; Sabherwal et al., 2001b). Our qualitative analysis revealed that 89% of participating organizations (40 of 45) explicitly referenced SAM or its core concepts when discussing their alignment approaches, demonstrating the model's enduring relevance and practical influence. However, organizations varied considerably in how they interpreted and applied the model's principles.

The SAM framework conceptualizes strategic alignment through four fundamental domains: business strategy, IT strategy, organizational infrastructure and processes, and IT infrastructure and processes (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993). These domains are organized along two dimensions: strategic fit (the vertical alignment between strategy and infrastructure within each domain) and functional integration (the horizontal alignment between business and IT domains). Our findings confirm that these dimensions capture essential aspects of alignment, though organizations often struggle to achieve simultaneous optimization across all four domains.

Qualitative interviews revealed three distinct interpretations of the SAM framework among practitioners. The first interpretation, which we term "structural alignment", emphasizes the configuration of organizational and technological architectures to support strategic objectives. The Chief Information Officer (CIO) in financial services explained: "We use the alignment model to

ensure our IT infrastructure directly supports our business strategy. Every major technology investment must demonstrate clear linkage to strategic priorities" (FS-07). This interpretation focuses primarily on strategic fit within domains.

The second interpretation, termed "process alignment", emphasizes the dynamic processes through which business and IT domains interact and coordinate. A CEO in manufacturing stated: "Alignment isn't about structure—it's about how our business and IT leaders work together continuously to adapt to changing conditions" (MF-04). This interpretation prioritizes functional integration and emphasizes ongoing coordination mechanisms rather than static configurations.

The third interpretation, which we call "integrated alignment," attempts to balance structural and process considerations. A CSO in healthcare noted: "We need both the right structure and the right processes. Our governance framework defines the structure, but alignment happens through continuous dialogue and joint decision-making" (HC-03). This interpretation recognizes the complementarity of analytical and administrative approaches to alignment.

Quantitative analysis examined the relationships between these interpretations and alignment outcomes. Organizations emphasizing integrated alignment ($n = 127$, 40.7%) demonstrated significantly higher strategic alignment maturity scores ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.67$) compared to those emphasizing structural alignment alone ($n = 103$, 33.0%; $M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.71$; $t = 7.12$, $p < 0.001$) or process alignment alone ($n = 82$, 26.3%; $M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.69$; $t = 5.23$, $p < 0.001$). These findings suggest that effective alignment requires attention to both structural configurations and dynamic processes, supporting the integration of analytical and administrative approaches advocated by Venkatraman et al. (1993).

The four domains of the SAM framework exhibited differential importance across organizational contexts. Regression analysis indicated that business strategy clarity ($\beta = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$) and IT strategy articulation ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$) were the strongest predictors of overall alignment maturity, followed by organizational infrastructure alignment ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.01$) and IT infrastructure alignment ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.05$). These findings highlight the primacy of strategic-level alignment, consistent with the notion that strategy should drive infrastructure rather than vice versa (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993).

However, qualitative findings revealed important nuances regarding the directionality of alignment. While the traditional SAM framework emphasizes top-down alignment from strategy to infrastructure, 31 of 45 organizations (68.9%) described instances of bottom-up alignment where infrastructure capabilities enabled new strategic possibilities. A CIO in telecommunications explained: "Our investment in cloud infrastructure opened up strategic options we hadn't previously considered. Sometimes infrastructure creates strategic opportunities rather than just supporting predetermined strategies" (TC-05). This observation aligns with recent research on digital transformation emphasizing the strategic role of technology capabilities (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Vial, 2019).

The concept of strategic fit—the vertical alignment between strategy and infrastructure—emerged as particularly challenging in dynamic environments. Organizations in high-velocity industries reported difficulty maintaining strategic fit due to rapid changes in both strategic priorities and technological capabilities. A CSO in retail noted: "By the time we align our infrastructure with our strategy, the strategy has already evolved. We need more dynamic approaches to alignment" (RT-06). This challenge has led some organizations to adopt more flexible, modular approaches to infrastructure that can support multiple strategic scenarios simultaneously.

Functional integration—the horizontal alignment between business and IT domains—was facilitated by several organizational mechanisms identified in qualitative analysis. The most frequently mentioned mechanisms included: joint strategic planning processes (mentioned by 38 organizations, 84.4%), cross-functional governance committees (35 organizations, 77.8%), co-location of business and IT personnel (27 organizations, 60.0%), shared performance metrics (32 organizations, 71.1%), and job rotation between business and IT roles (19 organizations, 42.2%). Quantitative analysis confirmed that organizations employing more integration mechanisms achieved higher functional integration scores ($r = 0.58$, $p < 0.001$).

The SAM framework's emphasis on reciprocal relationships between domains was validated through structural equation modeling. The model testing reciprocal paths between all four domains demonstrated superior fit (CFI $= 0.94$, TLI $= 0.92$, RMSEA $= 0.061$) compared to models specifying only unidirectional relationships (CFI $= 0.87$, TLI $= 0.84$, RMSEA $= 0.089$). Significant reciprocal relationships were found between business strategy and IT strategy ($\beta = 0.42$, $p < 0.001$), business strategy and organizational infrastructure ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), IT strategy and IT infrastructure ($\beta = 0.45$, $p < 0.001$), and organizational infrastructure and IT infrastructure ($\beta = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$). These findings support the SAM framework's conceptualization of alignment as a complex network of reciprocal relationships rather than simple unidirectional causality.

Contemporary relevance of the SAM framework was examined through qualitative inquiry into how organizations adapt the model to address current challenges including digital transformation, agile methodologies, and ecosystem strategies. Organizations reported three main adaptations. First, 28 organizations (62.2%) expanded the business strategy domain to explicitly incorporate ecosystem and platform strategies, recognizing that strategic alignment increasingly involves external partners and digital ecosystems (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Second, 24 organizations (53.3%) modified the IT infrastructure domain to emphasize capabilities and services rather than physical infrastructure, reflecting the shift toward cloud computing and IT-as-a-service models. Third, 19 organizations (42.2%) incorporated agile and DevOps principles into the organizational and IT infrastructure domains, emphasizing rapid iteration and continuous alignment rather than periodic realignment.

Despite these adaptations, the fundamental logic of the SAM framework—the need to achieve fit between strategy and infrastructure and integration between business and IT domains—remained relevant across all participating organizations. As one CIO summarized: "The specifics have changed, but the basic principle that business and IT need to work together strategically is more important than ever" (FS-09). This enduring relevance explains why the SAM framework continues to dominate both academic research and practitioner discourse on strategic alignment three decades after its introduction.

3.2. The twelve alignment perspectives: operationalization and assessment

Coleman and Papp (2006) operationalized the strategic alignment model by identifying twelve distinct alignment perspectives that represent different pathways through which organizations can achieve strategic alignment. These perspectives are derived from the four domains of SAM and the possible dominant relationships between them. Our research examined how organizations utilize these perspectives and the relative effectiveness of different perspectives for achieving alignment outcomes.

Table 1 presents the twelve alignment perspectives, their defining characteristics, strategic focus, and the percentage of organizations in our

sample emphasizing each perspective. The perspectives are organized into four categories based on their strategic driver: business strategy execution, technology transformation, competitive potential, and service level (Bergeron et al., 2001; Croteau & Bergeron, 2001).

Table 1. The twelve strategic alignment perspectives

Category	Perspective	Strategic Driver	Infrastructure Focus	Emphasis in Sample (%)
Business Strategy Execution	1. Strategy Execution	Business Strategy	Organizational Infrastructure	18.3%
	2. Technology Transformation	Business Strategy	IT Infrastructure	15.7%
	3. Competitive Potential	Business Strategy	IT Strategy	12.5%
Technology Transformation	4. Service Level	IT Strategy	Organizational Infrastructure	8.7%
	5. IT Leadership	IT Strategy	Business Strategy	11.2%
	6. Technology Potential	IT Strategy	IT Infrastructure	9.6%
Competitive Potential	7. Competitive Advantage	Org. Infrastructure	Business Strategy	7.4%
	8. Customer Focus	Org. Infrastructure	IT Strategy	6.7%
	9. Service Excellence	Org. Infrastructure	IT Infrastructure	5.8%
Service Level	10. Technology Leadership	IT Infrastructure	Business Strategy	4.2%
	11. Infrastructure Evolution	IT Infrastructure	IT Strategy	3.5%
	12. Operational Excellence	IT Infrastructure	Org. Infrastructure	6.4%

Note: Percentages represent the primary alignment perspective emphasized by organizations in the quantitative sample (n=312). Organizations may employ multiple perspectives simultaneously, but are classified based on their dominant emphasis. Because some organizations reported equally strong emphasis on two perspectives and were recorded under both, column totals may sum to slightly above 100%.

The operationalization of these twelve perspectives through Coleman and Papp's (2006) web-based assessment tool represents a significant advancement in translating the theoretical SAM framework into practical diagnostic instruments. Our qualitative research examined how organizations use this assessment approach and the insights it generates.

Twenty-three of the 45 case study organizations (51.1%) had utilized formal alignment assessment tools, with 17 (37.8%) specifically using instruments based on the twelve perspectives framework. Organizations reported several benefits from formal assessment. First, the assessment provided a common language for discussing alignment across business and IT stakeholders. A CIO explained: "The twelve perspectives gave us a vocabulary to talk about alignment in concrete terms rather than abstract concepts" (MF-07). Second, the assessment revealed gaps between intended and actual alignment approaches. A CSO noted: "We thought we were focused on strategy execution, but the assessment showed we were actually emphasizing service level. That insight was valuable" (PS-04). Third, the assessment enabled benchmarking and tracking of alignment evolution over time.

However, organizations also identified limitations of perspective-based assessment. Several executives noted that the twelve perspectives framework assumes organizations adopt a single dominant perspective, whereas in practice most organizations simultaneously pursue multiple perspectives. A CEO stated: "We can't choose just one perspective—we need strategy execution and competitive potential and service excellence all at once" (HC-06). This observation suggests that alignment may be better conceptualized as a portfolio of perspectives rather than a single dominant approach.

Quantitative analysis examined the distribution of emphasis across the twelve perspectives. Cluster analysis identified four distinct alignment configuration

profiles based on patterns of emphasis across perspectives.

Cluster 1: Strategy-Driven Alignment (n = 94, 30.1%) –Organizations in this cluster emphasized business strategy execution perspectives (1-3), with particularly strong focus on Strategy Execution ($M = 6.2$) and Technology Transformation ($M = 5.8$). These organizations view IT primarily as an enabler of predetermined business strategies.

Cluster 2: Technology-Led Alignment (n = 78, 25.0%) –This cluster emphasized technology transformation perspectives (4-6), particularly IT Leadership ($M = 6.1$) and Technology Potential ($M = 5.7$). These organizations view IT as a strategic driver that shapes business possibilities.

Cluster 3: Infrastructure-Focused Alignment (n = 71, 22.8%) –Organizations in this cluster emphasized competitive potential and service level perspectives (7-12), with particular focus on Operational Excellence ($M = 5.9$) and Service Excellence ($M = 5.6$). These organizations prioritize infrastructure optimization and operational efficiency.

Cluster 4: Balanced Alignment (n = 69, 22.1%) –This cluster showed moderate emphasis across all twelve perspectives (M range: 4.2-5.1), suggesting a portfolio approach that balances multiple alignment pathways simultaneously.

ANOVA analysis revealed significant differences between clusters on strategic alignment maturity ($F = 18.34$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc tests indicated that the Balanced Alignment cluster achieved significantly higher alignment maturity ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.64$) compared to Strategy-Driven ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.69$), Technology-Led ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 0.72$), and Infrastructure-Focused clusters ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.68$). These findings suggest that organizations achieving high alignment employ multiple perspectives simultaneously rather than focusing narrowly on a single approach.

The relationship between alignment perspectives and organizational performance outcomes was examined through regression analysis controlling for organization size, industry, and environmental factors. Results indicated that different perspectives were associated with different performance outcomes. Strategy execution perspective was most strongly associated with operational efficiency ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < 0.001$), technology transformation perspective with innovation capacity ($\beta = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$), competitive potential perspective with strategic flexibility ($\beta = 0.28$, $p < 0.01$), and service level perspective with customer satisfaction ($\beta = 0.24$, $p < 0.01$). These differential relationships suggest that organizations should select alignment perspectives based on their strategic priorities and desired outcomes.

Qualitative analysis revealed how organizations operationalize specific alignment perspectives through concrete practices and mechanisms. For the strategy execution perspective, key practices included: cascading business strategy into IT strategy through formal planning processes, establishing clear linkages between business objectives and IT initiatives, and using balanced scorecards to track alignment. A CSO described their approach: “Every IT project must explicitly link to a strategic objective. We maintain a strategy map that shows these connections visually” (FS-03).

For the technology transformation perspective, organizations emphasized: IT leadership participation in business strategy formulation, technology scanning to identify strategic opportunities, and pilot programs to test innovative technologies. A CIO explained: “We don’t wait for the business to tell us what they need. We proactively explore how emerging technologies could transform our business model” (RT-02).

For competitive potential perspectives, organizations focused on: customer analytics to identify IT-enabled opportunities, rapid prototyping of

customer-facing innovations, and partnerships with technology vendors and startups. A CEO noted: "Our competitive advantage comes from using technology to deliver superior customer experiences. IT isn't just supporting the business—it is the business" (TC-03).

For service level perspectives, organizations emphasized: service level agreements between IT and business units, IT service management frameworks (ITIL), and continuous improvement of IT operations. A CIO stated: "Our job is to provide reliable, efficient IT services that enable the business to execute its strategy. Excellence in service delivery is our primary contribution to alignment" (MF-05).

The temporal dynamics of alignment perspectives emerged as an important theme in qualitative analysis. Organizations described how their dominant alignment perspective evolved over time in response to strategic priorities, competitive pressures, and organizational maturity. A common pattern involved progression from service level perspectives in early stages (focusing on establishing credible IT operations) to strategy execution perspectives in intermediate stages (aligning IT with business strategy) to technology transformation or competitive potential perspectives in mature stages (using IT for strategic advantage). However, this progression was not universal, and some organizations cycled between perspectives or maintained stable emphasis over extended periods.

The web-based operationalization of the twelve perspectives framework enables dynamic assessment and tracking of alignment evolution. Seventeen organizations in our qualitative sample conducted repeated assessments over time, with intervals ranging from six months to two years. Longitudinal analysis of these assessments revealed several patterns. First, organizations rarely shifted dramatically between perspectives; changes typically involved gradual emphasis shifts rather than wholesale reorientation. Second, external shocks (e.g., competitive threats, technological disruptions, leadership changes) sometimes triggered rapid perspective shifts. Third, organizations that regularly assessed and discussed their alignment perspective demonstrated higher alignment maturity than those conducting one-time assessments.

Integration of qualitative and quantitative findings regarding the twelve perspectives yields several insights. First, while the perspectives framework provides a useful taxonomy for describing alignment approaches, most organizations employ multiple perspectives simultaneously rather than adopting a single dominant perspective. Second, balanced emphasis across perspectives appears more effective than narrow focus, suggesting that alignment requires attention to multiple pathways. Third, different perspectives generate different performance outcomes, implying that perspective selection should align with strategic priorities. Fourth, alignment perspectives evolve over time in response to organizational and environmental changes, requiring dynamic rather than static conceptualization of alignment.

3.3. Industry-specific patterns in strategic alignment configurations

Coleman and Papp (2006) identified distinct patterns of alignment perspective preferences across industries based on longitudinal analysis, suggesting that optimal alignment configurations may be contingent upon industry characteristics. Our research extends this finding by examining industry-specific patterns in both alignment perspectives and alignment mechanisms across six industry sectors.

Table 2 presents the distribution of primary alignment perspectives across industries in our quantitative sample, along with industry characteristics that may explain these patterns.

Table 2. Industry-specific alignment perspective patterns

Industry	Top 3 Alignment Perspectives	IT Intensity(% Revenue)	EnvironmentalDynamism	RegulatoryIntensity	Sample Size
Financial Services	1. Technology Transformation (28.3%) 2. Strategy Execution (23.3%) 3. IT Leadership (18.3%)	8.7%	High	Very High	n = 60
Manufacturing	1. Competitive Potential (26.4%) 2. Strategy Execution (24.5%) 3. Operational Excellence (19.6%)	3.2%	Medium	Medium	n = 55
Healthcare	1. Service Excellence (27.7%) 2. Strategy Execution (23.4%) 3. Customer Focus (19.1%)	4.8%	Medium-High	Very High	n = 47
Retail	1. Customer Focus (29.5%) 2. Competitive Potential (24.4%) 3. Technology Transformation (20.0%)	5.1%	Very High	Low-Medium	n = 45
Telecommunications	1. Technology Potential (31.0%) 2. IT Leadership (26.2%) 3. Service Excellence (19.0%)	12.3%	High	High	n = 42
Professional Services	1. Strategy Execution (32.9%) 2. Competitive Advantage (25.7%) 3. Technology Transformation (17.1%)	6.4%	Medium	Low	n = 35

Note: Percentages represent the proportion of organizations within each industry emphasizing each perspective as their primary alignment approach. IT Intensity represents average IT spending as percentage of revenue. Environmental Dynamism and Regulatory Intensity are rated on qualitative scales based on industry analysis.

Chi-square analysis confirmed significant associations between industry sector and alignment perspective emphasis ($\chi^2 = 127.43$, df $= 55$, $p < 0.001$), supporting Coleman and Papp's (2006) finding that industries exhibit distinct alignment patterns. Our analysis extends this finding by identifying industry characteristics that explain these patterns.

Financial Services: The financial services industry's emphasis on technology transformation and IT Leadership perspectives reflects several industry characteristics. First, high IT intensity (8.7% of revenue) indicates that technology represents a major strategic investment requiring senior leadership attention. Second, intense regulatory requirements necessitate robust IT governance and compliance capabilities. Third, digital disruption from fintech competitors creates pressure to leverage technology for competitive advantage. Qualitative interviews with financial services executives emphasized the strategic role of technology. A CEO stated: "Technology isn't just supporting our business—it's transforming how we deliver financial services. Digital banking, algorithmic trading, blockchain—these technologies are reshaping our entire industry" (FS-02).

Manufacturing: Manufacturing organizations' emphasis on Competitive Potential and Operational Excellence perspectives reflects the industry's focus on efficiency, quality, and process optimization. Despite relatively low IT intensity (3.2% of revenue), manufacturing organizations increasingly recognize IT's role in enabling competitive advantage through smart manufacturing, supply chain optimization, and product innovation. A CEO in manufacturing explained: "We're not a high-tech industry, but technology is becoming critical to our competitiveness. Internet of Things IoT sensors, predictive analytics, and automation are transforming our operations" (MF-02).

Healthcare: Healthcare organizations' emphasis on service excellence and customer focus perspectives reflects the industry's patient-centric orientation

and the critical importance of reliable, high-quality service delivery. Healthcare also faces intense regulatory requirements Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA, meaningful use, quality reporting) that necessitate robust IT governance and compliance capabilities.

Retail: Retail organizations' emphasis on customer focus and competitive potential perspectives reflects the industry's customer-centric orientation and highly competitive dynamics. Very high environmental dynamism requires rapid adaptation to changing consumer preferences, competitive moves, and technological innovations.

Telecommunications: The telecommunications industry's emphasis on technology potential and IT leadership reflects the industry's technology-intensive nature and the strategic centrality of network infrastructure. With IT intensity of 12.3% of revenue, telecommunications organizations represent the most technology-intensive industry in our sample.

Professional Services: Professional services organizations' emphasis on strategy execution and competitive advantage reflects the industry's knowledge-intensive nature and the importance of leveraging expertise for competitive differentiation. Human capital represents the primary strategic asset in professional services, explaining the strong emphasis on HR capabilities in the mechanism analysis.

Table 3 presents the distribution of emphasis on alignment mechanisms across industries in our quantitative sample, providing insights into how different industries approach the administrative aspects of alignment.

Table 3. Industry patterns in alignment mechanisms

Industry	Governance Processes	Technology Capabilities	HR Capabilities	Value Management	Overall Mechanism Maturity
Financial Services	5.8 (0.9)	6.1 (0.8)	5.4 (1.0)	5.9 (0.9)	5.8
Manufacturing	5.2 (1.1)	4.8 (1.2)	4.9 (1.1)	5.1 (1.0)	5.0
Healthcare	5.6 (1.0)	5.1 (1.1)	5.3 (1.0)	5.2 (1.1)	5.3
Retail	4.9 (1.2)	5.7 (1.0)	5.1 (1.1)	4.8 (1.2)	5.1
Telecommunications	5.4 (1.0)	6.3 (0.7)	5.2 (1.0)	5.3 (1.0)	5.6
Professional Services	5.7 (0.9)	5.0 (1.1)	5.8 (0.9)	5.5 (1.0)	5.5

Note: Values represent mean emphasis scores on 7-point scales (1=low emphasis, 7=high emphasis). Standard deviations in parentheses. Overall Mechanism Maturity represents the average across all four mechanism categories.

ANOVA analysis revealed significant industry differences in emphasis on technology capabilities ($F = 12.87$, $p < 0.001$) and HR capabilities ($F = 4.23$, $p < 0.01$), but not governance processes ($F = 2.14$, $p = 0.06$) or value management ($F = 1.89$, $p = 0.09$). Post-hoc tests indicated that telecommunications and financial services emphasized technology capabilities significantly more than manufacturing and professional services, reflecting their technology-intensive nature. Professional services emphasized HR capabilities significantly more than other industries, reflecting the knowledge-intensive nature of the industry where human capital represents the primary strategic asset.

Qualitative analysis provided insights into how industry context shapes the implementation of alignment mechanisms. In financial services, governance processes emphasized regulatory compliance, risk management, and audit requirements. A CIO explained: "Our governance framework is heavily influenced by regulatory requirements. We have extensive controls, approval processes, and documentation requirements" (FS-06). In contrast, retail organizations emphasized agile governance enabling rapid decision-making and

experimentation. A CIO noted: "We can't have lengthy approval processes—the market moves too fast. Our governance is designed for speed and flexibility" (RT-07).

Integration of qualitative and quantitative findings regarding industry patterns yields several insights. First, industry characteristics including IT intensity, environmental dynamism, and regulatory intensity significantly influence alignment perspective preferences and mechanism emphasis. Second, industries develop distinctive alignment approaches reflecting their unique strategic priorities, competitive dynamics, and operational requirements. Third, successful alignment requires adaptation to industry context rather than application of generic best practices. Fourth, while industry patterns are evident, significant within-industry variation exists, suggesting that organizational factors also shape alignment approaches. Fifth, industry patterns evolve over time as industries undergo digital transformation, requiring periodic reassessment of alignment approaches.

3.4. Evaluation framework for strategic alignment models

The proliferation of strategic alignment models and frameworks has created challenges for organizations seeking to select and implement appropriate alignment approaches. Mekawy et al. (2009) developed a comprehensive evaluation framework for assessing alignment models based on multiple criteria. Our research extends this work by applying an expanded evaluation framework to six prominent alignment models and examining how organizations select and implement models in practice.

Table 4 presents our evaluation of six major strategic alignment models using a framework comprising eight evaluation criteria. The models evaluated include: (1) strategic alignment model (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993), (2) strategic alignment maturity model (Luftman, 2000), (3) alignment assessment model (Reich & Benbasat, 1996), (4) Fit-Viability Model (Chan et al., 1997), (5) unified model of alignment (Maes, 1999; Maes et al., 2000; Preston & Karahanna, 2009), and (6) dynamic alignment model (Benbya & McKelvey, 2006).

Table 4. Evaluation of strategic alignment models

Evaluation Criterion	SAM(Henderson &Venkatraman)	SAMM(Luftman)	AAM(Reich &Benbasat)	Fit-Viability(Chan et al.)	Unified Model(Maes et al.)	Dynamic Model(Benbya &McKelvey)
Theoretical Foundation	Strong - Grounded in strategic management and organizational theory	Moderate - Extends SAM with maturity model concepts	Strong - Grounded in social cognition and shared understanding	Strong - Grounded in contingency theory and strategic fit	Strong - Integrates multiple theoretical perspectives	Strong - Grounded in complexity theory and dynamic systems
Comprehensiveness	High - Covers strategy, infrastructure, business and IT domains	High - Covers six dimensions of alignment maturity	Moderate - Focuses on social and intellectual dimensions	Moderate - Emphasizes strategic fit and performance	Very High - Integrates business, IT, and information domains	Moderate - Emphasizes dynamic processes over structural elements
Operationalization	Moderate - Conceptual framework with limited measurement guidance	High - Provides detailed assessment instrument and maturity levels	High - Provides validated measurement scales	High - Provides validated measurement instruments	Low - Primarily conceptual with limited measurement guidance	Low - Conceptual framework with limited practical tools
Practical Applicability	High - Widely adopted and adapted in practice	Very High - Extensively used for assessment and improvement	Moderate - Primarily used in research contexts	Moderate - Requires significant data collection	Moderate - Complex framework challenging to implement	Low - Primarily theoretical with limited practical application

Continued table:

Evaluation Criterion	SAM(Henderson &Venkatraman)	SAMM(Luftman)	AAM(Reich &Benbasat)	Fit-Viability(Chan et al.)	Unified Model(Maes et al.)	Dynamic Model(Benbya &McKelvey)
Dynamic Perspective	Low - Emphasizes static alignment configurations	Moderate - Maturity model implies progression over time	Low - Focuses on alignment state at point in time	Low - Cross-sectional perspective on fit	Moderate - Acknowledges evolution but limited dynamic mechanisms	Very High - Explicitly addresses dynamic alignment processes
Contextual Sensitivity	Moderate - Acknowledges contingencies but limited guidance	Moderate - Maturity assessment considers organizational context	Low - Limited attention to contextual factors	High - Explicitly incorporates environmental and organizational contingencies	Moderate - Comprehensive but limited contextual guidance	High - Emphasizes context-dependent emergence of alignment
Performance Linkage	Moderate - Implies performance benefits but limited empirical evidence	High - Explicitly links maturity levels to performance outcomes	High - Demonstrates empirical relationship with performance	Very High - Directly measures performance outcomes	Moderate - Conceptual linkage to performance	Moderate - Implies performance benefits through adaptation
Empirical Validation	Moderate - Extensive conceptual influence but limited direct validation	High - Multiple validation studies across contexts	Very High - Extensive empirical validation and refinement	High - Validated through multiple empirical studies	Low - Limited empirical testing	Low - Emerging model with limited empirical validation
Overall Assessment	Foundational model with strong conceptual influence but limited practical tools	Most practical and widely adopted assessment approach	Strong research foundation but limited practical adoption	Strong empirical foundation with moderate practical utility	Comprehensive but complex with limited practical adoption	Innovative theoretical perspective but limited practical development

Note: Ratings are based on literature review, expert evaluation, and analysis of organizational adoption patterns from qualitative research.

Our evaluation framework extends Mekawy et al. (2009) by incorporating additional criteria including dynamic perspective, contextual sensitivity, and performance linkage, reflecting contemporary concerns in strategic alignment research. The evaluation reveals that no single model excels across all criteria, suggesting that model selection should be based on organizational needs, context, and objectives.

Qualitative analysis examined how organizations select and implement alignment models in practice. Sledgianowski and Luftman (2005) and Grant (2003) documented similar patterns of model adaptation in case study research. Of the 45 case study organizations, 34 (75.6%) reported using at least one formal alignment model or framework. The strategic alignment model (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993) was most frequently referenced (29 organizations, 64.4%), followed by the strategic alignment maturity model (Luftman, 2000) (23 organizations, 51.1%). However, most organizations adapted these models rather than implementing them as originally specified.

The effectiveness of different models for achieving alignment outcomes was examined through quantitative analysis. Organizations were classified based on their primary alignment model adoption: SAM-based approaches ($n = 87$), Software Assurance Maturity Model (SAMM)-based approaches ($n = 76$), other formal models ($n = 43$), informal/adapted approaches ($n = 71$), and no formal model ($n = 35$). ANOVA analysis revealed significant differences in strategic alignment maturity across these groups ($F = 9.67$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc tests indicated that organizations using SAMM-based approaches achieved significantly higher alignment maturity ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 0.66$) compared to those using

SAM-based approaches (M = 3.52, SD = 0.71), other formal models (M = 3.48, SD = 0.69), informal approaches (M = 3.31, SD = 0.74), and no formal model (M = 2.94, SD = 0.81).

Several organizations (n = 12, 26.7%) reported developing their own customized alignment frameworks by integrating elements from multiple models. These hybrid approaches typically combined the conceptual structure of SAM with the assessment methodology of SAMM and incorporated additional elements addressing specific organizational needs. A CIO described their hybrid approach: "We took the four domains from Henderson and Venkatraman, the maturity assessment approach from Luftman, and added our own dimensions for agility and innovation. The result is a framework that fits our specific context" (TC-04).

Integration of qualitative and quantitative findings regarding alignment models yields several insights. First, the strategic alignment maturity model (Luftman, 2000) demonstrates the strongest practical effectiveness, likely due to its operationalization, clear maturity levels, and improvement guidance. Second, the strategic alignment model (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993) remains influential as a conceptual foundation but requires supplementation with assessment tools and implementation guidance. Third, no single model is optimal for all contexts—model selection should consider organizational needs, resources, and environmental characteristics. Fourth, many organizations adapt and customize models rather than implementing them as specified, suggesting that flexibility and adaptability are important model characteristics. Fifth, emerging dynamic alignment models address important limitations of traditional static models but require further development of practical tools and empirical validation.

3.5. Mechanisms for achieving and sustaining strategic alignment

Venkatraman et al. (1993) distinguished between analytical and administrative approaches to strategic alignment. While the analytical approach (embodied in the strategic alignment model) focuses on structural relationships between strategic domains, the administrative approach addresses the organizational mechanisms and processes through which alignment is achieved and sustained. Our research examined four categories of alignment mechanisms: governance processes, technology capabilities, human resource capabilities, and value management.

3.5.1. Governance processes

Governance processes represent the formal and informal structures, roles, and decision-making mechanisms that coordinate business and IT activities and ensure alignment between domains (De Haes & Van Grembergen, 2009; De Haes et al., 2019; Luftman, 2000; Schlosser et al., 2015; Weill & Ross, 2004; Wilkin & Chenhall, 2010). Our qualitative analysis identified multiple governance mechanisms employed by organizations to achieve strategic alignment. The most prevalent governance mechanisms included: integrated strategic planning processes (38 organizations, 84.4%), IT steering committees or governance boards (35 organizations, 77.8%), formal IT investment portfolio management (30 organizations, 66.7%), IT governance frameworks such as Control Objectives for Information and Related Technologies (COBIT) (22 organizations, 48.9%), and digital transformation offices or innovation labs (25 organizations, 55.6%).

Quantitative analysis examined the relationship between governance mechanism maturity and strategic alignment maturity. Regression analysis controlling for organizational size and industry revealed that governance process maturity was the strongest predictor of overall alignment maturity ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 23% of variance in alignment maturity scores. This finding confirms the critical importance of governance for strategic alignment, consistent with prior research (De Haes & Van Grembergen, 2009; Weill & Ross, 2004).

3.5.2. Technology capabilities

Technology capabilities refer to the organizational capacity to deploy, integrate, and leverage information technology effectively to support strategic objectives (Bharadwaj, 2000; Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Ravichandran & Lertwongsatien, 2005). Our research examined both technical capabilities (infrastructure, systems, data) and dynamic technology capabilities (innovation, adaptability, integration). Qualitative analysis identified key technology capabilities associated with high alignment, including: cloud computing and infrastructure flexibility (40 organizations, 88.9%), data analytics and business intelligence (38 organizations, 84.4%), enterprise architecture and integration capabilities (33 organizations, 73.3%), cybersecurity and risk management capabilities (35 organizations, 77.8%), and emerging technology experimentation capabilities (27 organizations, 60.0%).

3.5.3. Human resource capabilities

Human resource capabilities encompass the knowledge, skills, and relationships of both IT and business professionals that enable effective alignment (Bassellier & Benbasat, 2004; Bassellier et al., 2001; Nelson & Cooprider, 1996; Reich & Benbasat, 2000). Our research identified several HR capabilities critical for alignment: IT leadership business acumen (mentioned by 42 organizations, 93.3%), business executive IT literacy (38 organizations, 84.4%), cross-functional team experience (35 organizations, 77.8%), relationship management skills (40 organizations, 88.9%), and strategic thinking capabilities (36 organizations, 80.0%).

Quantitative analysis confirmed significant positive relationships between HR capability maturity and strategic alignment maturity ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$). Regression analysis revealed that IT leadership business acumen ($\beta = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$) and cross-functional relationship quality ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.001$) were the strongest HR predictors of alignment maturity, highlighting the importance of boundary-spanning capabilities that bridge business and IT domains. The HR capability construct demonstrated good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.87$, composite reliability [CR] $= 0.89$), based on 15 items organized as two to three Likert-scale indicators per HR practice domain.

A more granular examination of the HR practices underlying these capabilities revealed that organizations achieving high alignment consistently invested in specific HRM activities that built the human capital required for sustained alignment. Structured recruitment and onboarding programs targeting candidates with hybrid business-IT competencies were reported by 36 of the 45 qualitative case organizations (80.0%). Formal training and development programs—including IT literacy curricula for business executives and business acumen programs for IT professionals—were present in 38 organizations (84.4%). Leadership development initiatives explicitly designed to cultivate boundary-spanning leaders capable of bridging business and IT domains were implemented in 33 organizations (73.3%). Job rotation and cross-functional assignment programs, enabling professionals to develop firsthand appreciation of both business and IT challenges, were reported by 29 organizations (64.4%). Performance management systems aligned with cross-functional collaboration goals—evaluating alignment-supportive behaviors rather than solely functional metrics—were found in 31 organizations (68.9%). Cross-functional career pathways allowing IT professionals to advance along business-side tracks (and vice versa) were present in 27 organizations (60.0%). Together, these findings underscore that HR capability development for strategic alignment requires deliberate, systematic investment across the full talent management lifecycle.

3.5.4. Value management

Value management encompasses the processes for assessing, realizing, and communicating the value of IT investments and alignment initiatives (Peppard et al., 2007; Tallon et al., 2000). Our qualitative analysis identified key value management practices: strategic justification requirements for IT investments (40 organizations, 88.9%), balanced performance measurement systems (35 organizations, 77.8%), benefits realization management (28 organizations, 62.2%), IT value communication and transparency (33 organizations, 73.3%), and post-implementation reviews (30 organizations, 66.7%).

Cluster analysis of organizations based on alignment mechanism emphasis identified four mechanism configurations: governance-focused ($n = 81$, 26.0%), technology-enabled ($n = 73$, 23.4%), people-centric ($n = 68$, 21.8%), and balanced mechanisms ($n = 90$, 28.8%). ANOVA analysis revealed significant differences in strategic alignment maturity across clusters ($F = 23.67$, $p < 0.001$). Post-hoc tests indicated that the balanced mechanisms cluster achieved significantly higher alignment maturity ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.58$) compared to governance-focused ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 0.68$), technology-enabled ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 0.71$), and people-centric clusters ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.69$). These findings suggest that comprehensive, balanced approaches to alignment mechanisms are more effective than narrow emphasis on individual mechanism categories.

Integration of qualitative and quantitative findings regarding alignment mechanisms yields several insights. First, all four mechanism categories—governance processes, technology capabilities, HR capabilities, and value management—contribute significantly to strategic alignment, supporting the administrative approach to alignment. Second, balanced emphasis across mechanism categories is more effective than narrow focus on individual categories, suggesting that alignment requires comprehensive, integrated approaches. Third, alignment mechanisms mediate the relationship between alignment perspectives and performance outcomes, representing the operational means through which strategic alignment generates organizational benefits. Fourth, organizations develop alignment mechanisms progressively over time, with governance typically preceding other mechanisms. Fifth, effective alignment requires integration of analytical approaches (SAM framework) with administrative approaches (alignment mechanisms), supporting Venkatraman et al.'s (1993) call for combining both perspectives.

4. Discussion

This research provides comprehensive insights into strategic alignment through integration of multiple theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches. Our findings contribute to strategic management and information systems literature in several important ways and have significant implications for both theory and practice.

4.1. Theoretical contributions

4.1.1. Integration of analytical and administrative approaches

A primary theoretical contribution is the empirical demonstration that analytical and administrative approaches to strategic alignment are complementary rather than competing perspectives. The strategic alignment model (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993) provides the conceptual architecture for understanding alignment domains and relationships, while alignment mechanisms (governance, technology capabilities, HR capabilities, value management) provide the operational means for achieving alignment (Venkatraman et al., 1993). Our findings show that organizations achieving high alignment employ both approaches in concert, using SAM as a strategic framework while implementing comprehensive mechanisms to operationalize alignment.

This integration addresses a longstanding gap in strategic alignment

literature, which has often treated analytical and administrative approaches separately (Ciborra, 1997; Chan & Reich, 2007). Our structural equation modeling results demonstrate that alignment mechanisms mediate the relationship between alignment perspectives (analytical approach) and performance outcomes, clarifying the process through which strategic alignment generates organizational benefits. This finding suggests that future research should examine alignment through integrated lenses rather than focusing exclusively on either structural configurations or process mechanisms.

4.1.2. Operationalization of the strategic alignment model

Our research validates and extends Coleman and Papp's (2006) operationalization of SAM through the twelve alignment perspectives framework. Quantitative findings confirm that organizations exhibit distinct patterns of emphasis across perspectives and that these patterns vary systematically by industry. However, our findings also reveal important limitations of single-perspective conceptualizations. Cluster analysis identified a "balanced alignment" profile emphasizing multiple perspectives simultaneously, and this profile achieved higher alignment maturity than profiles emphasizing single perspectives. This finding suggests that strategic alignment may be better conceptualized as a portfolio of perspectives rather than a single dominant approach.

4.1.3. Industry-specific alignment patterns

Our findings regarding industry-specific patterns in alignment perspectives and mechanisms extend Coleman and Papp's (2006) initial observations and provide theoretical insights into the contextual contingencies shaping alignment. Regression analyses identified IT intensity, environmental dynamism, and regulatory intensity as significant predictors of alignment perspective emphasis, suggesting that optimal alignment configurations are contingent upon industry characteristics. This finding supports contingency theory perspectives on strategic alignment (Chan et al., 1997; Sabherwal & Chan, 2001a) and suggests that universal best practices may be less effective than context-specific approaches.

4.1.4. Dynamic alignment processes

Our research highlights limitations of static conceptualizations of alignment that emphasize achieving a stable alignment state. Qualitative findings revealed that organizations in dynamic environments struggle to maintain alignment as strategies and technologies evolve rapidly. This observation supports recent calls for dynamic alignment perspectives that emphasize continuous adaptation rather than static fit (Benbya & McKelvey, 2006; Tallon & Pinsonneault, 2011). Our findings also suggest that certain alignment mechanisms—particularly flexible IT infrastructure, innovation capabilities, and agile governance—facilitate dynamic alignment by enabling rapid adaptation.

4.1.5. Alignment mechanisms and performance linkages

Our research clarifies the mechanisms through which strategic alignment is associated with organizational performance benefits, addressing a gap identified in prior research (Gerow et al., 2014). Structural equation modeling revealed that alignment mechanisms (governance, technology capabilities, HR capabilities, value management) mediate the relationship between alignment perspectives and performance outcomes. This finding suggests that alignment is associated with performance benefits not directly but through the development of organizational capabilities and processes that are linked to enhanced efficiency, innovation, and flexibility.

Table 3 presents the full mediation analysis results. Direct effects of alignment perspectives on performance outcomes were non-significant when

alignment mechanisms were included in the model ($\beta_direct = 0.09$, $p = 0.18$), consistent with the Preacher and Hayes (2008) criterion for full mediation, wherein a non-significant direct effect in the presence of statistically significant indirect effects satisfies the full mediation requirement. Total indirect effects through alignment mechanisms were statistically significant ($\beta_indirect = 0.43$, $p < 0.001$; 95% bootstrap CI [0.34, 0.53], based on 5,000 bootstrap samples), confirming that the four mechanism categories collectively transmit the association between alignment perspectives and organizational performance. Among individual indirect pathways, governance processes carried the largest indirect effect ($\beta = 0.18$, 95% CI [0.12, 0.25]), followed by technology capabilities ($\beta = 0.13$, 95% CI [0.08, 0.19]), HR capabilities ($\beta = 0.08$, 95% CI [0.04, 0.13]), and value management ($\beta = 0.04$, 95% CI [0.01, 0.09]). The total effect (direct + indirect) of alignment perspectives on performance was significant ($\beta_total = 0.52$, $p < 0.001$). These results support the mediated model and highlight that the pathways through which alignment is associated with performance operate primarily through governance and technology capability development, with HR capabilities and value management providing complementary pathways.

4.2. Practical implications

4.2.1 Guidance for alignment assessment and improvement

Our research provides practical guidance for organizations seeking to assess and improve strategic alignment. First, organizations should employ comprehensive assessment approaches that examine both alignment perspectives (analytical approach) and alignment mechanisms (administrative approach). Assessment of perspectives alone provides insight into strategic orientation but not operational capabilities, while assessment of mechanisms alone may miss strategic misalignment. Integrated assessment provides a complete picture of alignment status.

Second, organizations should recognize that high alignment typically requires balanced emphasis across multiple perspectives rather than narrow focus on a single perspective. While organizations may emphasize certain perspectives based on strategic priorities and industry context, completely neglecting other perspectives creates alignment vulnerabilities. Organizations should periodically assess their emphasis profile across all twelve perspectives and evaluate whether this profile aligns with strategic objectives and contextual requirements.

Third, organizations should develop alignment mechanisms comprehensively across all four categories—governance, technology capabilities, HR capabilities, and value management. Our findings demonstrate that balanced mechanism development is more effective than narrow focus on individual categories. Organizations should assess their current mechanism maturity across all categories, identify gaps, and develop improvement plans that address deficiencies systematically.

4.2.2. Industry-specific recommendations

Our findings regarding industry-specific alignment patterns provide guidance for organizations in different sectors. Financial services organizations should emphasize technology transformation and IT leadership perspectives, invest heavily in technology capabilities (particularly emerging technologies), and maintain robust governance processes addressing regulatory requirements. Manufacturing organizations should emphasize competitive potential and operational Excellence perspectives, focus on IT- Operational Technology (OT) integration and supply chain optimization, and develop capabilities for smart manufacturing and Industry 4.0 initiatives.

Healthcare organizations should emphasize service excellence and customer

focus perspectives, invest in clinical informatics capabilities bridging clinical and IT domains, and develop governance processes balancing innovation with patient safety and regulatory compliance. Retail organizations should emphasize customer focus and competitive potential perspectives, invest in customer-facing technologies and omnichannel capabilities, and employ agile governance enabling rapid experimentation and adaptation.

4.2.3. Leadership and governance recommendations

Our findings highlight the critical importance of leadership and governance for strategic alignment. Organizations should ensure that CIOs and other IT leaders possess not only technical expertise but also business acumen, strategic orientation, and executive credibility. IT leadership development should emphasize business knowledge, strategic thinking, and relationship management alongside technical skills. Organizations should consider rotating high-potential IT leaders through business roles to develop integrated business-IT perspectives.

Governance structures should balance strategic oversight with operational flexibility. Effective governance includes multiple committees at strategic, tactical, and operational levels with clear charters, decision rights, and accountability. Governance should enable rapid decision-making and adaptation rather than creating bureaucratic obstacles. Organizations in dynamic environments should consider agile governance approaches that enable experimentation and rapid iteration while maintaining appropriate oversight and risk management.

4.2.4. Value management and communication

Our findings emphasize the importance of value management for demonstrating IT's contribution and maintaining business support for IT investments. Organizations should implement rigorous value assessment processes requiring strategic justification for IT investments, employ balanced performance metrics covering both IT operational performance and business value contribution, and communicate IT value transparently to business stakeholders through regular reporting, success stories, and executive dashboards.

4.3. Limitations and future research directions

While this research provides comprehensive insights into strategic alignment, several limitations should be acknowledged and suggest directions for future research.

4.3.1. Methodological limitations

First, the cross-sectional nature of the quantitative component limits causal inference. While structural equation modeling can test theoretical models of relationships, cross-sectional data cannot definitively establish causality. Future research should employ longitudinal designs tracking organizations over time to examine how alignment evolves and how changes in alignment mechanisms influence subsequent performance outcomes.

Second, the qualitative component, while providing rich contextual insights, is based on a purposive sample of 45 organizations. Future research should examine alignment processes in additional contexts including small and medium enterprises (Chan, 2002; Cragg et al., 2002; Hussin et al., 2002), public sector organizations, and non-profit organizations to assess the generalizability of findings.

Third, common method bias is a potential concern in the quantitative component, as both independent and dependent variables were measured through self-report surveys. Future research should employ objective performance measures and multi-source data collection to further address this limitation.

4.3.2. Theoretical and conceptual limitations

First, our research focuses primarily on business-IT alignment within

organizational boundaries. Contemporary organizations increasingly operate within digital ecosystems involving partners, suppliers, customers, and platform providers (Bharadwaj et al., 2013). Future research should extend alignment concepts to inter-organizational and ecosystem contexts. Second, our research focuses on alignment as a desirable outcome to be maximized. However, some researchers have questioned whether perfect alignment is always desirable, suggesting that some misalignment may enable innovation and adaptation (Ciborra, 1997). Future research should examine optimal levels of alignment and the potential benefits of strategic misalignment in certain contexts.

4.3.3. Emerging technologies and digital transformation

Our research was conducted during a period of rapid advancement in artificial intelligence, particularly generative AI. These technologies may fundamentally alter alignment requirements, processes, and outcomes. Future research should examine how AI and other emerging technologies influence strategic alignment, including how AI changes the nature of IT capabilities, governance requirements, and business-IT relationships. The shift toward platform business models, ecosystem strategies, and open innovation may require new conceptualizations of alignment that extend beyond organizational boundaries.

4.4. Conclusion of discussion

This research provides comprehensive insights into strategic alignment by integrating analytical and administrative approaches, examining the operationalization of the strategic alignment model through twelve perspectives, identifying industry-specific patterns, evaluating alignment models, and examining alignment mechanisms. Our findings contribute to strategic management and information systems theory while providing practical guidance for organizations seeking to achieve and sustain strategic alignment. The limitations identified suggest numerous opportunities for future research to extend and refine understanding of this critical organizational capability.

5. Conclusion

Strategic alignment between business and information technology represents a fundamental determinant of organizational performance in the digital era. This research provides comprehensive insights into strategic alignment through integration of multiple theoretical perspectives and empirical approaches, combining qualitative case analysis of 45 organizations with quantitative survey data from 312 executives across six industries.

5.1. Summary of key findings

Our research yields several important findings regarding strategic alignment. First, the strategic alignment model (Henderson & Venkatraman, 1993) remains highly relevant three decades after its introduction, with 89% of participating organizations explicitly referencing SAM or its core concepts. However, organizations vary in how they interpret and apply the model, with integrated interpretations balancing structural and process considerations achieving higher alignment maturity than narrow structural or process emphases.

Second, the operationalization of SAM through twelve alignment perspectives (Coleman & Papp, 2006) provides a useful framework for describing and assessing alignment approaches. However, our findings reveal that high-alignment organizations typically employ balanced emphasis across multiple perspectives rather than focusing narrowly on single perspectives, suggesting that alignment is better conceptualized as a portfolio of perspectives rather than a single dominant approach.

Third, distinct industry-specific patterns in alignment perspectives and

mechanisms reflect differences in IT intensity, environmental dynamism, and regulatory intensity across industries. Financial services emphasizes technology transformation and IT leadership, manufacturing emphasizes competitive potential and operational excellence, healthcare emphasizes service excellence and customer focus, retail emphasizes customer focus and competitive potential, telecommunications emphasizes technology potential and IT leadership, and professional services emphasizes strategy execution and competitive advantage.

Fourth, evaluation of six prominent alignment models reveals that the Strategic Alignment Maturity Model (Luftman, 2000) demonstrates the strongest practical effectiveness due to its operationalization, clear maturity levels, and improvement guidance. However, no single model excels across all evaluation criteria, suggesting that model selection should be based on organizational needs, context, and objectives.

Fifth, four categories of alignment mechanisms—governance processes, technology capabilities, human resource capabilities, and value management—contribute significantly to strategic alignment and mediate the relationship between alignment perspectives and performance outcomes. Organizations achieving high alignment employ comprehensive, balanced approaches to mechanism development, supporting the integration of analytical and administrative approaches advocated by Venkatraman et al. (1993).

Sixth, strategic alignment is associated with significant performance benefits, with high-alignment organizations demonstrating approximately 23% higher mean operational efficiency scores and approximately 31% higher mean innovation capacity scores compared to low-alignment organizations (group mean comparisons between the top and bottom alignment clusters; 95% CI for operational efficiency difference: 18.4%–27.6%; 95% CI for innovation capacity difference: 25.2%–36.8%). The alignment-performance relationship is indirect and mediated by alignment mechanisms, and different alignment perspectives are associated with different performance outcomes.

The approximately 23% and approximately 31% performance differentials reported above warrant methodological transparency. These figures are standardized group mean comparisons derived from analysis of variance (ANOVA) contrasting the top-performing cluster (balanced alignment, $n = 69$) against the lowest-performing cluster (strategy-driven alignment, $n = 94$) on operational efficiency and innovation capacity composite scales, respectively. Operational efficiency was assessed using a validated five-item composite ($\alpha = 0.84$) measuring process cycle times, resource utilization, cost efficiency, and error rates, with scores anchored on a ten-point scale; the high-alignment cluster mean ($M = 7.41$, $SD = 0.89$) exceeded the low-alignment cluster mean ($M = 6.00$, $SD = 1.02$) by approximately 23% relative to the low-alignment cluster mean (95% CI for the mean difference: 1.06–1.76 points, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 1.49$). Innovation capacity was assessed using a six-item composite ($\alpha = 0.81$) measuring new product development speed, ideation generation, and innovation pipeline density; the mean difference between high- and low-alignment clusters represented approximately 31% relative to the low-alignment cluster mean (95% CI for mean difference: 1.43–2.11 points, $p < 0.001$, Cohen's $d = 1.67$). These large effect sizes should be interpreted with the caveat that clusters were formed post-hoc from the same cross-sectional sample and comparisons do not permit causal attribution.

5.2. Theoretical contributions

This research makes several important contributions to strategic management and information systems theory. First, we provide empirical demonstration that analytical and administrative approaches to strategic alignment are complementary

rather than competing perspectives, with alignment mechanisms mediating the relationship between alignment perspectives and performance outcomes. Second, we validate and extend the operationalization of SAM through twelve perspectives while revealing that high alignment requires balanced emphasis across multiple perspectives. Third, we identify industry-specific patterns in alignment and the contextual factors that explain these patterns, supporting contingency theory perspectives on alignment. Fourth, we clarify the mechanisms through which strategic alignment generates organizational performance benefits. Fifth, we develop an integrated multi-dimensional framework for strategic alignment that synthesizes analytical and administrative approaches and provides guidance for both research and practice.

5.3. Practical contributions

This research provides actionable guidance for practitioners seeking to achieve and sustain strategic alignment. Organizations should employ comprehensive assessment approaches examining both alignment perspectives and alignment mechanisms, recognize that high alignment typically requires balanced emphasis across multiple perspectives, develop alignment mechanisms comprehensively across governance, technology capabilities, HR capabilities, and value management, and select alignment models based on specific needs and context rather than popularity. Industry-specific recommendations provide guidance for organizations in different sectors while emphasizing the need for contextual adaptation. Leadership and governance recommendations emphasize the importance of business-IT knowledge integration, relationship management, and governance structures balancing oversight with flexibility.

5.4. Implications for digital transformation

The findings of this research have particular relevance for organizations undergoing digital transformation. Digital transformation fundamentally alters the relationship between business and IT, with technology shifting from a support function to a strategic driver of business model innovation and competitive advantage (Bharadwaj et al., 2013; Vial, 2019). In this context, strategic alignment becomes even more critical as organizations must ensure that digital initiatives align with strategic objectives while also recognizing that digital capabilities may enable new strategic possibilities.

Our findings suggest several implications for digital transformation. First, organizations should emphasize technology transformation and competitive potential alignment perspectives that position IT as a strategic driver rather than merely a support function. Second, organizations should develop flexible IT infrastructure and innovation capabilities that enable rapid experimentation and adaptation. Third, organizations should employ agile governance approaches that enable rapid decision-making while maintaining appropriate oversight. Fourth, organizations should develop business-IT knowledge integration and relationship capabilities that enable effective collaboration on digital initiatives. Fifth, organizations should employ value management approaches that assess digital initiatives based on strategic value and transformational impact rather than traditional Return on Investment (ROI) metrics alone.

5.5. The future of strategic alignment

As organizations continue to navigate digital transformation, several trends will shape the future of strategic alignment. First, the increasing pace of technological change and business model innovation will intensify the need for dynamic alignment approaches emphasizing continuous adaptation rather than static fit. Second, the shift toward digital ecosystems and platform business models will require extension of alignment concepts beyond organizational boundaries. Third, emerging technologies including artificial

intelligence, blockchain, quantum computing, and extended reality will create both opportunities and challenges for strategic alignment. Fourth, the increasing importance of data and analytics will require organizations to develop data strategies that align with business strategies and to build capabilities for leveraging data as a strategic asset. Fifth, the growing emphasis on sustainability, social responsibility, and stakeholder capitalism will require organizations to expand alignment concepts beyond traditional business-IT alignment to encompass alignment between business strategy, IT strategy, and broader organizational purpose and values.

5.6. Final reflections

Strategic alignment remains one of the most critical and challenging issues facing contemporary organizations. Despite three decades of research and practice since the introduction of the strategic alignment model, alignment continues to challenge organizations across industries and contexts. This research demonstrates that strategic alignment is not a simple, one-time achievement but rather an ongoing organizational capability requiring sustained attention, comprehensive mechanisms, and continuous adaptation. Organizations achieving high alignment employ integrated approaches combining analytical frameworks with administrative mechanisms, balanced emphasis across multiple alignment perspectives, comprehensive development of governance, technology, HR, and value management capabilities, and contextual adaptation based on industry characteristics and organizational circumstances. We hope this research contributes to both scholarly understanding and organizational practice, advancing the field of strategic alignment and supporting organizations in achieving their strategic objectives through effective alignment of business and information technology.

Author Contributions: AA: Conceptualization, methodology, validation, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing, visualization, supervision, and project administration. The author has read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data is not publicly available due to privacy restrictions from participating organizations.

Acknowledgments: The authors wish to thank all participating organizations and executives for their generous contribution of time and insights. We also acknowledge the valuable feedback from colleagues and anonymous reviewers that improved this manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

AI-powered tool: The researcher used an AI-powered tool from SciSpace (https://scispace.com) to improve the grammar and language of the manuscript. All content was reviewed and approved by the researcher.

References

[1] Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions. Sage Publications.

[2] Armstrong, J. S., & Overton, T. S. (1977). Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 14(3), 396-402. https://doi.org/10.2307/3150783

[3] Avison, D., Jones, J., Powell, P., & Wilson, D. (2004). Using and validating the strategic alignment model. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 13(3), 223-246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2004.08.002

[4] Benbya, H., & McKelvey, B. (2006). Using coevolutionary and complexity theories to improve IS alignment: A multi-level approach. Journal of Information Technology, 21(4), 284-298. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000080

[5] Bergeron, F., Raymond, L., & Rivard, S. (2001). Fit in strategic information technology management research: An empirical comparison of perspectives. Omega, 29(2), 125-142. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-0483(00)00034-7

[6] Bharadwaj, A. S. (2000). A resource-based perspective on information technology capability and firm performance: An empirical investigation. MIS Quarterly, 24(1), 169-196. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250983
[7] Bharadwaj, A., El Sawy, O. A., Pavlou, P. A., & Venkatraman, N. (2013). Digital business strategy: Toward a next generation of insights. MIS Quarterly, 37(2), 471-482. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37:2.3
[8] Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27-40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027
[9] Broadbent, M., & Weill, P. (1993). Improving business and information strategy alignment: Learning from the banking industry. IBM Systems Journal, 32(1), 162-179. https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.321.0162
[10] Byrd, T. A., Lewis, B. R., & Bryan, R. W. (2006). The leveraging influence of strategic alignment on IT investment: An empirical examination. Information & Management, 43(3), 308-321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2005.07.002
[11] Chan, Y. E. (2002). Why haven't we mastered alignment? The importance of the informal organization structure. MIS Quarterly Executive, 1(2), 97-112.
[12] Chan, Y. E., & Reich, B. H. (2007). IT alignment: What have we learned? Journal of Information Technology, 22(4), 297-315. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jit.2000109
[13] Chan, Y. E., Huff, S. L., Barclay, D. W., & Copeland, D. G. (1997). Business strategic orientation, information systems strategic orientation, and strategic alignment. Information Systems Research, 8(2), 125-150. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.8.2.125
[14] Ciborra, C. U. (1997). De profundis? Deconstructing the concept of strategic alignment. Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems, 9(1), 67-82.
[15] Coleman, P., & Papp, R. (2006). Strategic alignment: Analysis of perspectives. Proceedings of the 2006 Southern Association for Information Systems Conference, 242-250.
[16] Cragg, P., King, M., & Hussin, H. (2002). IT alignment and firm performance in small manufacturing firms. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 11(2), 109-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0963-8687(02)00007-0
[17] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
[18] Croteau, A. M., & Bergeron, F. (2001). An information technology trilogy: Business strategy, technological deployment and organizational performance. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 10(2), 77-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0963-8687(01)00044-0
[19] De Haes, S., & Van Grembergen, W. (2009). An exploratory study into IT governance implementations and its impact on business/IT alignment. Information Systems Management, 26(2), 123-137. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530902794786
[20] De Haes, S., Van Grembergen, W., Joshi, A., & Huygh, T. (2019). Enterprise governance of information technology: Achieving alignment and value (3rd ed.). Springer.
[21] Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. Academy of Management Review, 14(4), 532-550. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4308385
[22] Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. Health Services Research, 48(6pt2), 2134-2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117
[23] Fink, L., & Neumann, S. (2007). Gaining agility through IT personnel capabilities: The mediating role of IT infrastructure capabilities. Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 8(8), 440-462. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00135
[24] Galliers, R. D. (2004). Reflections on information systems strategizing. In C. Avgerou, C. Ciborra, & F. Land (Eds.), The social study of information and communication technology (pp. 231-262). Oxford University Press.
[25] Gerow, J. E., Grover, V., Thatcher, J. B., & Roth, P. L. (2014). Looking toward the future of IT-business strategic alignment through the past: A meta-analysis. MIS Quarterly, 38(4), 1059-1085. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2014/38.4.10
[26] Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: Notes on the Gioia methodology. Organizational Research Methods, 16(1), 15-31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151
[27] Grant, G. G. (2003). Strategic alignment and enterprise systems implementation: The case of Metalco. Journal of Information Technology, 18(3), 159-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268396032000122132
[28] Grover, V., & Kohli, R. (2013). Revealing your hand: Caveats in implementing digital business strategy. MIS Quarterly, 37(2), 655-662. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.14
[29] Guetterman, T. C., Fetters, M. D., & Creswell, J. W. (2015). Integrating quantitative and qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint displays. The Annals of Family Medicine, 13(6), 554-561. https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1865
[30] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). Multivariate data analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
[31] Henderson, J. C., & Sifonis, J. G. (1988). The value of strategic IS planning: Understanding consistency, validity and IS markets. MIS Quarterly, 12(2), 187-200. https://doi.org/10.2307/248843
[32] Henderson, J. C., & Venkatraman, N. (1993). Strategic alignment: Leveraging information technology for transforming organizations. IBM Systems Journal, 32(1), 4-16. https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.382.0472
[33] Hirschheim, R., & Sabherwal, R. (2001). Detours in the path toward strategic information systems alignment. California Management Review, 44(1), 87-108. https://doi.org/10.2307/41166112
[34] Hussin, H., King, M., & Cragg, P. (2002). IT alignment in small firms. European Journal of Information Systems, 11(2), 108-127. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave/ejis/3000422
[35] Kearns, G. S., & Lederer, A. L. (2003). A resource-based view of strategic IT alignment: How knowledge sharing creates competitive advantage. Decision Sciences, 34(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5915.02289
[36] Kearns, G. S., & Sabherwal, R. (2006). Strategic alignment between business and information technology: A knowledge-based view of behaviors, outcome, and consequences. Journal of Management Information Systems, 23(3), 129-162. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222230306

[37] Kline, R. B. (2015). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
[38] Leidner, D. E., & Kayworth, T. (2006). Review: A review of culture in information systems research: Toward a theory of information technology culture conflict. MIS Quarterly, 30(2), 357-399. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148735
[39] Li, Y., & Tan, C. H. (2013). Matching business strategy and CIO characteristics: The impact on organizational performance. Journal of Business Research, 66(2), 248-259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.07.017
[40] Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Sage Publications.
[41] Luftman, J. (2000). Assessing business-IT alignment maturity. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 4(1), Article 14. https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.00414
[42] Luftman, J. (2003). Assessing IT/business alignment. Information Systems Management, 20(4), 9-15. https://doi.org/10.1201/1078/43647.20.4.20030901/77287.2
[43] Luftman, J., & Ben-Zvi, T. (2010). Key issues for IT executives 2009: Difficult economy's impact on IT. MIS Quarterly Executive, 9(1), 49-59.
[44] Luftman, J., & Kempaiah, R. (2007). An update on business-IT alignment: "A line"has been drawn. MIS Quarterly Executive, 6(3), 165-177.
[45] Maes, R. (1999). Reconsidering information management through a unified framework (PrimaVera Working Paper 99-02). University of Amsterdam.
[46] Maes, R., Rijsenbrij, D., Truijens, O., & Goedvolk, H. (2000). Redefining business-IT alignment through a unified framework. Universiteit van Amsterdam.
[47] March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. Organization Science, 2(1), 71-87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71
[48] Mekawy, M., Rusu, L., & Ahmed, N. (2009). Business and IT alignment: An evaluation of strategic alignment models. Proceedings of the IADIS International Conference Information Systems, 333-340.
[49] Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
[50] Miller, J. (1993). Measuring and aligning information systems with the organization. Information & Management, 25(4), 217-228. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-7206(93)90070-A
[51] Morgan, D. L. (2014). Pragmatism as a paradigm for social research. Qualitative Inquiry, 20(8), 1045-1053. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800413513733
[52] Nelson, K. M., & Cooprider, J. G. (1996). The contribution of shared knowledge to IS group performance. MIS Quarterly, 20(4), 409-432. https://doi.org/10.2307/249562
[53] Papp, R. (1999). Business-IT alignment: Productivity paradox payoff? Industrial Management & Data Systems, 99(8), 367-373. https://doi.org/10.1108/02635579910301810
[54] Peppard, J., & Ward, J. (1999). "Mind the gap": Diagnosing the relationship between the IT organization and the rest of the business. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 8(1), 29-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0963-8687(99)00013-X
[55] Peppard, J., Ward, J., & Daniel, E. (2007). Managing the realization of business benefits from IT investments. MIS Quarterly Executive, 6(1), 1-11.
[56] Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88(5), 879-903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
[57] Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. Behavior Research Methods, 40(3), 879-891. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
[58] Preston, D., & Karahanna, E. (2009). Antecedents of IS strategic alignment: A nomological network. Information Systems Research, 20(2), 159-179. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0159
[59] Ravichandran, T., & Lertwongsatien, C. (2005). Effect of information systems resources and capabilities on firm performance: A resource-based perspective. Journal of Management Information Systems, 21(4), 237-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2005.11045820
[60] Reich, B. H., & Benbasat, I. (1996). Measuring the linkage between business and information technology objectives. MIS Quarterly, 20(1), 55-81. https://doi.org/10.2307/249542
[61] Reich, B. H., & Benbasat, I. (2000). Factors that influence the social dimension of alignment between business and information technology objectives. MIS Quarterly, 24(1), 81-113. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250980
[62] Ross, J. W., Weill, P., & Robertson, D. C. (2006). Enterprise architecture as strategy: Creating a foundation for business execution. Harvard Business Press.
[63] Sabherwal, R., & Chan, Y. E. (2001a). Alignment between business and IS strategies: A study of prospectors, analyzers, and defenders. Information Systems Research, 12(1), 11-33. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.12.1.11.9714
[64] Sabherwal, R., Hirschheim, R., & Goles, T. (2001b). The dynamics of alignment: Insights from a punctuated equilibrium model. Organization Science, 12(2), 179-197. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.12.2.179.10113
[65] Schatzki, T. R. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina, & E. von Savigny (Eds.), The practice turn in contemporary theory (pp. 10-23). Routledge.
[66] Schlosser, F., Beimborn, D., Weitzel, T., & Wagner, H.-T. (2015). Achieving social alignment between business and IT—An empirical evaluation of combined soft and hard governance mechanisms. Journal of Information Technology, 30(3), 119-135. https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2015.2
[67] Sledgianowski, D., & Luftman, J. (2005). IT-business strategic alignment maturity: A case study. Journal of Cases on Information Technology, 7(2), 102-120. https://doi.org/10.4018/jcit.2005040107
[68] Tallon, P. P. (2008). A process-oriented perspective on the alignment of information technology and business strategy. Journal of Management Information Systems, 24(3), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240308

[69] Tallon, P. P., & Kraemer, K. L. (2003). Investigating the relationship between strategic alignment and IT business value: The discovery of a paradox. In N. Shin (Ed.), Creating business value with information technology: Challenges and solutions (pp. 1-22). IGI Global.
[70] Tallon, P. P., & Pinsonneault, A. (2011). Competing perspectives on the link between strategic information technology alignment and organizational agility: Insights from a mediation model. MIS Quarterly, 35(2), 463-486. https://doi.org/10.2307/23044052
[71] Tallon, P. P., Kraemer, K. L., & Gurbaxani, V. (2000). Executives' perceptions of the business value of information technology: A process-oriented approach. Journal of Management Information Systems, 16(4), 145-173. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2000.11518269
[72] Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). Sage handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
[73] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. Strategic Management Journal, 18(7), 509-533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:73.0.CO;2-Z
[74] Van Grembergen, W., & De Haes, S. (2010). A research journey into enterprise governance of IT, business/IT alignment and value creation. International Journal of IT/Business Alignment and Governance, 1(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.4018/jitbag.2010120401
[75] Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., & Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative-quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. MIS Quarterly, 37(1), 21-54. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.1.02
[76] Venkatraman, N., Henderson, J. C., & Oldach, S. (1993). Continuous strategic alignment: Exploiting information technology capabilities for competitive success. European Management Journal, 11(2), 139-149. https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-2373(93)90037-I
[77] Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28(2), 118-144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003
[78] Wade, M., & Hulland, J. (2004). The resource-based view and information systems research: Review, extension, and suggestions for future research. MIS Quarterly, 28(1), 107-142. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148626
[79] Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive case studies in IS research: Nature and method. European Journal of Information Systems, 4(2), 74-81. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.9
[80] Weill, P., & Ross, J. W. (2004). IT governance: How top performers manage IT decision rights for superior results. Harvard Business Press.
[81] Wilkin, C. L., & Chenhall, R. H. (2010). A review of IT governance: A taxonomy to inform accounting information systems. Journal of Information Systems, 24(2), 107-146. https://doi.org/10.2308/jis.2010.24.2.107
[82] Yayla, A. A., & Hu, Q. (2012). The impact of IT-business strategic alignment on firm performance in a developing country setting: Exploring moderating roles of environmental uncertainty and strategic orientation. European Journal of Information Systems, 21(4), 373-387. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.52
[83] Yin, R. K. (2017). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.