

## Innovation SIG Track 37

### 37.2. Practice, Innovation, and Sociomateriality

#### Sub-Track Chairs:

Dr Zeynep Erden, (Corresponding Organizer), ETH Zurich, Switzerland, [zerden@ethz.ch](mailto:zerden@ethz.ch)

Prof Sue Newell, Bentley University, [snewell@bentley.edu](mailto:snewell@bentley.edu)

Dr Stefan Haefliger, ETH Zurich, Switzerland, [shaefliger@ethz.ch](mailto:shaefliger@ethz.ch)

Prof. Dr Georg von Krogh, ETH Zurich, Switzerland, [gvkrogh@ethz.ch](mailto:gvkrogh@ethz.ch)

#### Introduction

Innovation and its relation to knowledge creation have been widely addressed in the literature. However, knowledge in innovation studies has been mainly viewed as a “separate entity, static property, or stable disposition” (Orlikowski, 2002:250). The practice perspective, which has recently gained attention in organization studies, has provided a new perspective on knowledge (e.g., Nicolini, 2011) by suggesting a shift in the focus of innovation studies away from a static view of knowledge to a dynamic view of knowing, which represents a social accomplishment, constituted and reconstituted in actors’ everyday work practices.

The practice perspective emphasizing the importance of knowledgeable action can help us to advance our understanding of how innovations come about: The practice perspective replaces the “passive” view of material in creative action with the performative role of both material and human agency in enacting creative processes, raising novel questions as to the organization of collaboration, the role of non-material artifacts, computer-mediated communication, timing, boundaries, identity, and consequences of innovation and the processes that create new knowing. In its sociomaterial guise, the study of practices in organizations views technology and the material context of work as inseparable from the work itself (Orlikowski and Scott, 2008) due to a relational ontology and it understands practice as always mediated by a material and technological context and subject and object as co-constituting in action (Barad, 2007).

We welcome papers that address questions out of this open list of puzzles connected to innovation studies from a practice perspective

- How do boundary relations and boundary objects impact on innovations?
- What, if anything, does a sociomaterial perspective add to our theoretical and practical understanding of innovation processes?
- How to organize for innovation with the imbrication of human and material agencies?
- Does visualization impact on the innovativeness of teams?
- How can an ethics of innovation be conceptualized?
- How can we build practical frameworks for innovation processes that incorporate ethical concerns?

