

# Modeling Technological Change in Small Business

Arthur Tatnall

Victoria University, Australia

## INTRODUCTION

The introduction of a new information system into a small business, or upgrading an existing system, should be seen as an innovation and considered through the lens of innovation theory. The most widely accepted theory of how technological innovation takes place is provided by innovation diffusion, but most of the research based on this model involves studies of large organisations or societal groups. This article argues that another approach, innovation translation, has more to offer in the case of innovations that take place in smaller organisations (Burgess, Tatnall & Darbyshire, 1999; Tatnall, 2002; Tatnall & Burgess, 2004).

## BACKGROUND

There are important differences in the processes by which small and large enterprises choose to adopt or reject computers (Burgess et al., 1999), and this article concerns itself only with issues related to small business. To begin, however, it is important to distinguish between invention and innovation. Whereas invention can be seen in the discovery or creation of new ideas, innovation involves putting these ideas into commercial or organisational practice (Maguire, Kazlauskas & Weir, 1994). Invention does not necessarily invoke innovation and it is fallacious to think that invention is necessary and sufficient for innovation to occur (Tatnall, 2004).

Changing the way things are done is a complex affair (Machiavelli, 1995, p. 19) and one that is difficult to achieve successfully. The dominant paradigm, by far, in innovation research is that of *innovation diffusion* and no discussion would be complete without consideration of this approach. Innovation diffusion has had success in describing how innovations diffuse through large populations (Rogers, 1995). There are occasions, however, when diffusion does not occur and the diffusion model finds these difficult to explain (Latour, 1996). The approach offered in *innovation translation*, informed by actor-network theory (ANT), is also worthy of consideration. In the translation model the key to innovation is creating a powerful enough consortium of actors to carry it through, and when an innovation fails this can be

considered to reflect on the inability of those involved to construct the necessary network of alliances amongst the other actors. This article will compare these two models of technological innovation.

## INNOVATION DIFFUSION

Rogers (1995), perhaps its most influential advocate, approaches the topic of innovation diffusion by considering a variety of case studies, the prime concern of which is the identification of factors that affect the speed with which an innovation is adopted, or that cause it not to be adopted at all.

In diffusion theory the existence of an innovation is seen to cause uncertainty in the minds of potential adopters, causing a lack of predictability and of information. Rogers (1995) asserts that a technological innovation embodies information, and that this has the potential to reduce uncertainty. Diffusion is thus considered to be an information exchange process amongst members of a communicating social network driven by the need to reduce uncertainty (Lepa & Tatnall, 2002). There are four main elements of the theory of innovation diffusion (Rogers, 1995):

### Characteristics of the Innovation Itself

Rogers argues that the attributes and characteristics of the innovation are important in determining the manner of its diffusion and the rate of its adoption, and outlines five important characteristics of an innovation that affect its diffusion: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability and observability. The attributes of the potential adopter are also seen as an important consideration and Rogers maintains that these include social status, level of education, degree of cosmopolitanism and amount of innovativeness.

### Nature of the Communications Channels

Acts of communication are a necessary part of any change process, and to reach a potential adopter the innovation

must be diffused through some communications channel. Channels involving mass media are the most rapid and efficient means of spreading awareness of an innovation, but interpersonal channels are generally more effective in persuading someone to accept a new idea.

## **The Passage of Time**

In common with earlier researchers, Rogers found that different individuals in a social system do not necessarily adopt an innovation at the same time. Borrowing from work by Deutschmann and Fals Borda (1962), he proposes that adopters can be classified in their degree of “innovativeness” into five categories: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority and laggards, and that if the number of individuals adopting a new idea is plotted over time it usually follows a normal curve.

## **The Social System**

Diffusion occurs within a social system in which the structure constitutes a boundary inside which this diffuses. Rogers argues that the system’s social structure affects diffusion through the action of social norms, the roles taken by opinion leaders and change agents, the types of innovation decisions that are taken, and the social consequences of the innovation.

## **INNOVATION TRANSLATION**

An alternative view is that of innovation translation, which draws on the sociology of translations, more commonly known as actor-network theory (ANT). The core of the actor-network approach is translation (Law, 1992), which can be defined as: “... the means by which one entity gives a role to others” (Singleton & Michael, 1993, p. 229).

## **Essentialism**

Diffusion theory asserts that a technological innovation embodies information: some essential capacity or essence instrumental in determining its rate of adoption. A significant problem with an essentialist paradigm like this arises if a researcher tries to reconcile the views of all parties involved in the innovation on what *particular* essences are significant. The difficulty is that people often see *different* essential attributes in any specific technological or human entity, making it hard to identify and settle on the ones that allegedly were responsible for the diffusion.

To illustrate this difficulty, consider the case of a small business deciding whether to purchase their first com-

puter. Researchers using an innovation diffusion model would begin by looking for innate characteristics of the PC that would make a potential adopter more likely to accept it. They would consider the relative advantages of a PC over alternatives like a filing cabinet. An examination of the compatibility, trialability and observability of a PC with this older office technology would show good reasons for acceptance. An examination of the PC’s complexity would, however, bring out some reasons for reluctance in its adoption. The researchers would then investigate characteristics of the potential adopters, considering factors like their educational background, innovativeness, and how they heard about the innovation. If, however, you *ask* small business people why they purchased their first PC, the answers often do not match with this view.

## **Actor-Network Theory: The Sociology of Translations**

Rather than recognising in advance the essences of humans and of social organisations and distinguishing their actions from the inanimate behaviour of technological and natural objects, ANT adopts an anti-essentialist position in which it rejects there being some difference in essence between humans and non-humans. ANT considers both social and technical determinism to be flawed and proposes instead a socio-technical account (Latour, 1986) in which neither social nor technical positions are privileged. To address the need to properly consider the contributions of both human and non-human actors, actor-network theory attempts impartiality towards all actors in consideration, whether human or non-human, and makes no distinction in approach between the social, the natural and the technological (Callon 1986).

## **Mechanisms of Translation**

The process of translation has four aspects or “moments” (Callon, 1986), the first of which is known as *problematization*. In this stage, a group of one or more key actors attempts to define the nature of the problem and the roles of other actors so that these key actors are seen as having the answer, and as being indispensable to the solution of the problem. In other words, the problem is re-defined (translated) in terms of solutions offered by these actors (Bloomfield & Best, 1992). The second moment is *interessement* and is a series of processes that attempt to impose the identities and roles defined in the problematisation on the other actors. It means interesting and attracting an entity by coming between it and some other entity. Here the enrollers attempt to lock the other actors into the roles proposed for them (Callon, 1986) and to gradually dissolve existing networks, replacing them by a network created by the enrollers themselves.

3 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

[www.igi-global.com/chapter/modeling-technological-change-small-business/14553](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/modeling-technological-change-small-business/14553)

## Related Content

---

### Nonlinear Approach to Brain Signal Modeling

Tugce Balliand Ramaswamy Palaniappan (2009). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Second Edition* (pp. 2834-2839).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/nonlinear-approach-brain-signal-modeling/13991](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/nonlinear-approach-brain-signal-modeling/13991)

### Implementation of a Network Print Management System: Lessons Learned

George Kelley, Elizabeth A. Reganand C. Stephen Hunt (2004). *Annals of Cases on Information Technology: Volume 6* (pp. 293-311).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/implementation-network-print-management-system/44583](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/implementation-network-print-management-system/44583)

### Visualizing Co-citations of Technology Acceptance Models in Education

Zhonggen Yu (2020). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 77-95).

[www.irma-international.org/article/visualizing-co-citations-of-technology-acceptance-models-in-education/240723](http://www.irma-international.org/article/visualizing-co-citations-of-technology-acceptance-models-in-education/240723)

### Sex Tourism and the Internet: Information, Amplification, and Moral Panics

Jerry Eades (2008). *Information Communication Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1360-1378).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/sex-tourism-internet/22743](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/sex-tourism-internet/22743)

### Virtual Learning Communities in Google Plus, Implications, and Sustainability in MOOCs

Margarita Martinez-Nuñez, Oriol Borrás-Geneand Ángel Fidalgo-Blanco (2016). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 18-36).

[www.irma-international.org/article/virtual-learning-communities-in-google-plus-implications-and-sustainability-in-moocs/167764](http://www.irma-international.org/article/virtual-learning-communities-in-google-plus-implications-and-sustainability-in-moocs/167764)