

On Actor-Network Theory

Mr. Hari Mohan Rai, Salma Khan, Yogesh Chauhan, Sandeep Chauhan

Dronacharya college of engineering, Gurgaon

Priya.yadav@ggnindia.dronacharya.info

Abstract

This paper will advocate the addition of actor-network theory to the qualitative research traditions presently used in information systems. We will contend that actor-network theory can be especially useful when studying the implementation of information systems and in other situations involving technological innovation. The paper describes actor-network theory, an approach originating in studies of science and technology, and how it might be used in studying technological projects. It also offers the theory of innovation translation, informed by actor-network theory, as an alternative to innovation diffusion in understanding issues of information systems implementation. As it is helpful for information system.

Keywords

IS Research Methodology; Research Methodology; Socio-Technical Approach; Technological Innovation

INTRODUCTION

Network theory catadored in big field. Each field of academic inquiry is characterised by its own preferred and commonly used research methodologies. Several years ago in a survey of published MIS articles in selected Information Systems journals Orlikowski and Baroudi (1991) found that 96% of their sample adopted a positivist perspective while the remainder were interpretive. Building on a research taxonomy developed by Hamilton and Ives (1982), Farhoomand (1992) has classified IS related

research papers published in a similar set of journals in the 1980s into five categories: case

study, survey, field test, experimental and non-empirical research. Farhoomand reports that 57% of his sample consisted of empirical research with case studies and surveys constituting the majority of this. A more recent examination of the literature however, suggests that the percentage of interpretive research published since that time has increased markedly.

In the late 1980s, Galliers and Land (1987) deplored the tendency of IS researchers to accept the primacy of traditional, empirical approaches that they saw as more appropriate to the natural sciences than to studies of organisational use of information. In line with this Hirschheim (1992), Nissen et al. (1991), and Achterberg et al. (1991) have argued for a shift in IS research towards a broader perspective with the acceptance of methodological pluralism. Partly as a result of these efforts, since the early 1990s qualitative research has gained considerably in legitimacy and is now used much more extensively in investigating information systems. In this paper we will advocate the addition of actor-network theory (ANT), an approach developed by scholars including Latour, Callon and Law from the study of science and technology, to the qualitative research traditions presently used in information systems research. We will show how actor-network theory can form a framework that can be useful for studying the implementation of information systems.

EXISTING RESEARCH APPROACH LIMITATION

A common approach to researching innovation in Information Systems is to focus on the technical aspects of an innovation and to treat 'the social' as the context in which its development and adoption take place. Technological determinist approaches of this type which contend that only the 'most appropriate' innovations are adopted, and that only those 'sensible people' who make these adoptions go on to prosper, assume that all outcomes of technological change are attributable to the 'technological' rather than the 'social' (Grint and Woolgar 1997). At the other extreme is social determinism which holds that relatively stable social categories can be used to explain technical change (Law and Callon 1988), and concentrates on the investigation of social interactions, relegating the technology to context;

to something that can be bundled up and forgotten. This bundling means that fixed and unproblematic properties, or 'essences' can then be assigned to the technology and used in any explanation of change. Many approaches to technological innovation are based on the premise that the systems or entities under consideration have some essential nature or capacity that determines how they operate. Soft systems methodology, for instance, takes this stance. We will argue that essentialist approaches like this present difficulties when crediting certain actors and entities with essences or properties that determine how they will behave in particular circumstances. Brey (1997) proposes that rather than relying on some 'inner technological logic', technological change is best understood by reference to technological controversies, disagreements and difficulties with which the actors involved in the change are concerned. He argues for an approach using some form of social constructivism in which the researcher does not need to evaluate claims made by different groups about any 'real' properties of

the technology being studied. He cautions, however, that if an approach like this is used one cannot then invoke such properties to explain technological change. Change must be explained, instead, by interpretations of the different groups involved in it, after a series of controversies and negotiations. Brey then classifies social constructivist approaches into three groups: strong social constructivism, mild social constructivism, and actor-network theory. In strong social constructivism, which is aligned most closely with the sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK) approach of scholars like Collins, technology is explained as a social construction, and technological change by reference to social practices such as interpretation, negotiation and closure of the actors involved. It supports a division between social, natural and technical entities but attributes no properties, powers or effects to the technology itself. Approaches using mild social constructivism, often going under the name 'social shaping',

retain conventional distinctions between the social, natural and technical, and attempt their explanations by examining ways that social factors shape technology. Social shaping does allow a role for non-social factors in technological change but is also willing to attribute properties and effects to the technology although it claims that, as technology is socially shaped, these properties and effects are largely built-in through factors relating to the social context (Brey 1997).

Latour et al (1992) note that the issue of anti-essentialism, in the sense of there being some difference in essence between humans and non-humans, is a major contention between actornetworktheory and the sociological position of SSK. They suggest that in SSK it is necessary to recognise in advance the essences of humans and of social organisations and to distinguish their actions from the inanimate behaviour of technological and natural objects. Actornetworktheory sees things quite differently as Latour, Mauguin et al. (1992 :56)

argue: “We believe that both essence and differentiation are the result of attribution work and can be studied empirically.” There are two main ideas here: in many methodological approaches we think in binaries which often leads us to designate an entity as either technological or social, and then we attribute specific properties to that entity in order to explain its behaviour, thereby adopting an essentialist position. Studies that follow grounded theory often adopt this approach, but actornetwork theory does not distinguish between the social and technological and sees properties as network effects rather than innate characteristics of an entity.

INNOVATION AS AN ACTOR-NETWORK

An innovation has been described as an idea that is perceived to be new to a particular person or group of people (Rogers 1995). Implementation of an Information System thus inevitably involves innovation as the system will almost always be seen as new by at least some of its users. By far the dominant paradigm in innovation research is that of innovation diffusion (Rogers 1995) in which the four main elements are: characteristics of the innovation itself, the nature of the communication channels, the passage of time, and the social system. Using this approach in an explanation of the successful adoption, or rejection, of an IS innovation the researcher would concentrate on things like details of the new system itself, how the change agents helped in its adoption, why users accepted or resisted the implementation, and over what time period this all occurred. An alternative view of innovation is that proposed in actornetwork theory and the core of this approach is translation (Law 1992) that can be defined as: “... the means by which one entity gives a role to others.” (Singleton and Michael 1993 :229) Callon et al. (1983) propose that translation involves all the strategies through which an actor identifies other actors and arranges them in relation to each other. Latour

(1996) speaks of how ‘chains of translation’ can transform a global problem, such as the transportation needs of a city like Paris (or the design of the a new information system) into a local problem like

continuous transportation (or using Visual Basic to obtain data from an Oracle database). The model of translation as proposed in actornetwork theory proceeds from a quite different set of assumptions to those used in innovation diffusion. Latour (1986) argues that the mere ‘possession’ of power by an actor does not automatically confer the ability to cause change unless other actors can be *persuaded* to perform the appropriate actions for this to occur. The notion that power is an attribute that can be possessed by an actor is an essentialist one, and Latour contends that rather than this, it is the number of other people who enter into the business that indicate the amount of power that has been exercised (Latour 1986). He maintains that in an innovation translation model the movement of an innovation through time and space is in the hands of people each of whom may react to it in different ways. They may modify it, deflect it, betray it, add to it, appropriate it, or let it drop (Latour 1986). He adds that this is true for the spread of anything from goods and artefacts to claims and ideas. In this case, the adoption of an innovation comes as a consequence of the actions of everyone in the

chain of actors who has anything to do with it. Furthermore, each of these actors shapes the innovation to their own ends, but if no one takes up the innovation then its movement simply stops; inertia cannot account for its spread. Instead of a process of transmission, we have a process of continuous transformation (Latour 1996) where faithful acceptance involving no changes is a rarity requiring explanation. “Instead of the transmission of the same token – simply deflected or slowed down by friction – you get ... the continuous transformation of the token.” (Latour 1986 :286). There are occasions, however, when

diffusion does not occur despite the excellence of the idea or the technical quality of the innovation. The non-diffusion of the Dvorak keyboard is

just such an example and Rogers (1995) suggests that the Dvorak keyboard failed, despite its 'obvious superiority' over the QWERTY keyboard, because of 'vested interests' supporting its rival. Actor-network theory, on the other hand, would argue that the Dvorak keyboard was not adopted because there were just too many things attached to use of the QWERTY keyboard; it had too many associations to make it feasible for the Dvorak keyboard to unattach them. Latour (1996) contrasts innovation diffusion with the translation model in which the initial idea hardly counts and the innovation is not endowed with autonomous power or 'propelled by a brilliant inventor'. The innovation has no inertia and moves only if it interests one group of actors or another. Its movement cannot be caused by an initial impetus as there is none. It is instead a consequence of energy given to it by everyone in the chain. When the innovation does interest a new group they transform it a little or perhaps a lot. Latour notes that, except in rare cases, there can be 'no transportation without transformation', and that "... after many recruitments, displacements and transformations, the project, having *become* real, then manifests, perhaps, the characteristics of perfection, profitability, beauty, and efficiency that the diffusion model located in the starting point." (Latour 1996 :119) An actor-network is configured (Grint and Woolgar 1997) by the enrolment of both human and non-human allies, and this is done by means of a series of negotiations in a process of redefinition in which one set of actors seek to impose definitions of the situation on others (Callon 1986b). Translation can be regarded as a means of obliging some entity to consent to a 'detour' (Callon 1986a) that takes it along a path determined by some other entity. Law (1987) uses the term 'heterogeneous engineer'

to describe the entity that designs and creates these detours. A heterogeneous engineer is then able to speak on behalf of other actors enrolled in the network. A network becomes durable when actors feel no need to spend time opening and looking inside black-boxes, but just accept these as given. As an example of how this might be applied in an information systems implementation, consider the adoption of Java in a particular systems development project in a situation where the consultants had no previous experience of this language. An innovation diffusion approach would, in outline, begin with a consideration of the characteristics of Java including

its evolution from C++, its degree of object-orientation, the portability of its applications, and so on, and how these characteristics might help or hinder its adoption. It would then look at the channels through which information about the innovation reached the developers: the computer press, university or training courses, friends from other companies, etc, and how effective these were in delivering the message. Next it would consider aspects of the development company relating to its programming 'culture'; things like what programming languages had been used in the past, the background of the programmers, and the type of applications they had previously developed. On the other hand, innovation translation would concentrate on issues of network formation. It would investigate the alliances and networks built up by the consulting company, their programmers, Java, the potential users, and other actors involved in the implementation. It would concentrate on the negotiations that allow the network to be configured by the enrolment of both human and non-human allies, and would consider Java's characteristics only as network effects resulting from association. Actor-network theory would suggest that it is not any innate properties of Java that are important, but rather network associations such as Java's possibilities for the

creation of Web applets and portable applications that are the significant factors in its adoption. It would look at the process of re-definition in which Java sought to impose definitions of portable applications and Web programming on others; how it 'interested' the programmers and then got them to follow its interests so becoming indispensable to them. In this case what is then finally adopted for this task is not Java as such, but a *translation* of Java in which it becomes a programming language for use with Web applications.

CONCLUSION

Actor-network theory draws on the strengths of qualitative research to provide a powerful, but somewhat different framework for understanding IS innovation. In refusing to accept the social/technical divide, and by treating human and non-human actors impartially, it avoids the essentialism, lack of heterogeneity and explanation by use of binaries that are inherent in many other methodologies. As an alternative to innovation diffusion, a theory of innovation translation offers an approach to explaining innovation that does not rely on any supposedly innate nature of the innovation, or specific characteristics of the change agents or society, but rather on a process of network formation in which all actors seek to persuade others to become their allies in promoting the acceptance of their own view of the way the problem can best be solved. Actor-network theory offers advantages over other IS research methodologies, particularly in situations where 'political' considerations are important. Methodologies such as grounded theory lend themselves to essentialist descriptions of phenomena arising out of the coding process. Open, closed, axial and systematic coding with their reliance on the concepts of categories, properties and dimensions lead us to think about innate properties rather than properties arising out of negotiation. Actor-network theory extends

ethnography to allow an analysis of both humans and technology by using a single register to analyse both, so avoiding the need to consider one as context for the other. It helps the researcher not to think in terms of human/non-human binaries and the different discourse with which each may be aligned. An actor-network analysis of information systems innovation may well be described as an ethnography but one that develops themes that conceptualise people and artefacts in terms of socio-technical networks, thus employing concepts such as networks, enrolments and actors. Case study methodology tends to set prior boundaries for the study of a case even though the parameters of the case may change during the study. An ANT analysis establishes boundaries only as the investigation of the negotiations involved unfolds and the associations between actors are positioned in the narrative for the development of the information system. Unlike action research, actor-network theory is not concerned with emancipation of the researcher or practitioner and is not focused on making us better at developing information systems. Nevertheless, an ANT analysis may provide us with the detail to understand the success or failure of a particular innovation. We contend that actor-network theory can be useful for studies of information systems in situations where interactions of the social, technological and political are regarded as particularly important. It is not that ANT is of no use in predominantly technical situations,

but we see it as of more use in situations where the researcher needs to develop an holistic narrative that relies on the use of a common register to investigate the contributions of each of

these factors. We thus suggest that actor-network theory, and the theory of innovation translation, can be particularly useful for studies in areas such as business use of the World Wide Web, issues in IT project management, computer-based collaborative work, interface

design, usability testing, the use of distributed systems within organisations and other areas that involve a consideration of some of the social and political issues in information systems. We suggest that ANT has something useful to offer to information systems research, particularly in areas like these, and that more attention should be given to use of this approach.

REFERENCES

- Cusumano, M. A. and Selby, R. W. (1997). 'How Microsoft Builds Software'. *Communications of the ACM* 40(6): 53-61.
- Deely, J. (1990). *Basics of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Farhoomand, A. F. (1992). 'Scientific Progress of Management Information Systems'. *Information Systems Research: Issues, Methods and Practical Guidelines*. Galliers, R. (Ed). Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford: 93-111.
- Galliers, R. D. and Land, F. F. (1987). 'Choosing Appropriate Information Systems Research Methodologies'. *Communications of the ACM* 30(11): 900-902.
- Grint, K. and Woolgar, S. (1997). *The Machine at Work - Technology, Work and Organisation*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1988). 'Do Inquiry Paradigms Imply Inquiry Methodologies?'. *Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education: the silent scientific revolution*. Fetterman, D. M. (Ed). Praeger, New York.
- Hamilton, S. and Ives, B. (1982). 'MIS research strategies'. *Information and Management* 5(December): 339-347.
- Hirschheim, R. A. (1992). 'Information Systems Epistemology: an Historical Perspective'. *Information Systems Research: Issues, Methods and Practical Guidelines*. Galliers, R. (Ed). Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford: 28-60.

Kaplan, B. and Duchon, D. (1988). 'Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Information Systems Research: a Case Study'. *MIS Quarterly* 12(4): 571-586.

Google
Wikipedia