

The Role of Sociomaterial Practices in Becoming and Staying Innovative: The AI Lab Case

DISSERTATION
of the University of St. Gallen,
School of Management,
Economics, Law, Social Sciences
and International Affairs
to obtain the title of
Doctor Oeconomiae

submitted by

Kathrin Sele

from

Liechtenstein

Approved on the application of

Prof. Dr. Johannes Rüegg-Stürm

and

Prof. Dr. Simon Grand

Dissertation no. 4045

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES, TABLES, AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	V
SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION.....	VI
ZUSAMMENFASSUNG DER DISSERTATION.....	VII
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Focal Issue and Research Gap.....	2
1.2 Theoretical and Conceptual Frames.....	S
1.2.1 Rhetorical Arguments — Innovation as a Justification Process.....	5
1.2.2 Rhetorical Figures - Technology-in-the-Making as a Translation Process....	7
1.2.3 Organizational Routines - Innovation as a Sociomaterial Entanglement . . .	8
1.3 Methodology.....	10
1.3.1 Research Strategy.....	11
1.3.2 Data Collection and Analysis.....	14
1.4 Structure of the Dissertation.....	15
2 INNOVATION AS THE MARGINALIZATION OF DOMINANT TECHNOLOGY CONCEPTS.....	17
2.1 Introduction.....	18
2.2 Theoretical Background.....	20
2.2.1 Dominant Technology Concepts as Conventions.....	21
2.2.2 Justifying New by Marginalizing Existing Technology Concepts.....	22
2.3 Method.....	23
2.3.1 Case Context.....	25
2.3.2 Data Collection and Analysis.....	27

- 2.4 Inscribing New AI as a Dominant Technology Concept.....29**
 - 2.4.1 Inscription 0: New AI vs. Classical AI.....30
 - 2.4.2 Inscription 1: Autonomous Agents vs. Controllable Systems.....33
 - 2.4.3 Inscription 2: Real World vs. Micro Worlds.....35
 - 2.4.4 Inscription 3: Biology vs. Computer Sciences.....37
 - 2.4.5 Inscription 4: Building Robots vs. Programming.....39
- 2.5 Rhetorical Patterns Enabling Marginalization.....41**
 - 2.5.1 Lending Presence.....41
 - 2.5.2 Alternating Schemes.....43
 - 2.5.3 Assigning Agency.....46
- 2.6 Discussion.....49**
 - 2.6.1 Implications and Contributions.....50
 - 2.6.2 Conclusions.....52

3 LEGITIMIZING EMERGENT TECHNOLOGIES -

- A RHETORIC PERSPECTIVE.....53**
- 3.1 Introduction.....54**
- 3.2 Theoretical Background.....55**
 - 3.2.1 Legitimacy of Emergent Technologies.....56
 - 3.2.2 Legitimation as a Form of Translation.....57
 - 3.2.3 Translation as a Rhetorical Process.....58
- 3.3. Rhetoric of Translation.....63**
 - 3.3.1 Problematization: Emphasis through Repetition.....65
 - 3.3.2 Interessement: Enrichment through Substitution.....66
 - 3.3.3 Enrolment: Enhancement through Quantity.....68
 - 3.3.4 Mobilization: Engagement through Appeal.....70
- 3.4 Example: Legitimation of a New Scientific Paradigm.....72**
 - 3.4.1 Creating Emphasis.....72
 - 3.4.2 Creating Enrichment.....73
 - 3.4.3 Creating Enhancement.....75

3.4.4	Creating Engagement.....	76
3.5	Discussion.....	77
3.5.1	Contributions and Implications.....	78
3.5.2	Conclusion.....	79
4	HOW ARTIFACTS, STORIES, AND ASSETS SHAPE THE WAY WE ROUTINELY INNOVATE.....	81
4.1	Introduction.....	82
4.2	Methods.....	84
4.2.1	Research Setting.....	84
4.2.2	Data Sources.....	86
4.2.3	Data Analysis.....	87
4.3	Findings.....	89
4.3.1	Routines at the AI Lab-a Blend of Artifacts, Stories and Assets.....	89
4.3.2	Materializing, Narrating and Resourcing.....	98
4.4	Discussion and Conclusion.....	106
5	SYNTHESIS.....	111
5.1	Contributions to Innovation Research.....	111
5.1.1	Theoretical Contributions.....	112
5.1.2	Practical Implications.....	116
5.1.3	Methodological Implications.....	117
5.2	Translating Embodiment into Innovation Research.....	118
5.3	Limitations and Future Research.....	123
	REFERENCES.....	125