

Ethics of Engagement in Research Practices

Response-ability in Organization
and Management

**Edited by
Michela Cozza, Anna Carreri,
and Barbara Poggio**

First published 2025

ISBN: 978-1-032-58724-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-58991-6 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-45248-5 (ebk)

1

Introduction. Ethics of Engagement in Research Practices

Response-ability in Organization and
Management

*Michela Cozza, Anna Carreri
and Barbara Poggio*

(CC BY 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003452485-1

1 Introduction. Ethics of Engagement in Research Practices

Response-ability in Organization and Management

*Michela Cozza, Anna Carreri,
and Barbara Poggio*

A Cartographic Reading of ‘Response-ability’

Cartography or mapmaking is the study and practice of making maps. It combines science, esthetics, and technique to visualize and communicate spatial data effectively. The word ‘cartography’ refers to both a multifaceted discipline – combining geography, design, and technology – and a tool for navigating familiar or uncharted territories. It is especially useful for those who move across variegated landscapes and different locations. Metaphorically, cartography can fulfill a methodological function in knowledge-making practices to creatively guide researchers through complex material-discursive webs of power that are operational in and immanent to the production and circulation of knowledge (Braidotti 2019). From this perspective, using cartography requires an ethical sensibility to the multiple encounters that are enabled by nomadic research and situated in political arenas (Antoni and Beer 2023). A cartographic approach relies on *response-ability*, which is the capacity to respond to others and make each other capable of responding along margins of hope for new or alternative horizons of care and epistemic plurality (i.e., affirmative ethics) while foregrounding embodied and embedded conditions of oppression and subjection.

Response-ability is the foundational concept of this book. It is read through the cartographic lens of feminist posthumanism to encourage a renewal of subjectivities and practices in management and organization studies (MOS). Response-ability lies in the possibility of an upheaval of the disciplinary and methodological boundaries that prevent or discourage researchers from exploring unfamiliar ontologies and epistemologies and attuning to their subjects/objects of study (Rogowska-Stangret 2020). To appreciate the concept of ‘response-ability’ in this first section, we suggest a cartographic reading of its origins and subsequent uses.

The origins of the concept ‘response-ability’ lie in fields outside MOS, with Joan Tronto (1993, 2012, 2015, 2020), Donna Haraway (2008, 2016), Vinciane Despret (2004, 2008, 2013, 2020), and Karen Barad (2007, 2019) as key figures in the development of the concept. It gained traction in MOS (e.g., Bruzzone 2021; Cozza and Gherardi 2023; Gherardi and Laasch 2022) through theoretical exploration and onto-epistemological experimentation, though not without the difficulty inherent in a nomadic inquiry attuned to the instability and unpredictability of the world. What we present here is a basic map generated by the thinking of scholars who have greatly contributed to the theorization of what response-ability is, does, and offers to MOS scholars. However, it is not an ordinary map in that it does not represent a single trajectory. Rather, it represents a kind of rhizomatic thinking through different lines of analysis of response-ability (Lenz Taguchi 2013). Rhizomatic thinking enables us as researchers to think about “connections rather than oppositions, movement rather than categorization, and becoming rather than being” (St Pierre 2013, 653). It is based on a different kind of ethics, which is affirmative in that it requires “a belief in this world” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, 92) and response-ability to make another world (or worlds) possible.

We should start by pointing out that responsibility (accountability) and response-ability (ability to respond) are two distinct concepts, though both terms are interconnected and predicated on a relational ontology according to which the world is an assemblage of inextricably entangled entities (Bozalek 2020). “Entanglements are not intertwinings of separate entities, but rather irreducible *relations of responsibility* (...) Entanglements are *relations of obligation*” (Barad 2010, 265; emphasis added). Still, responsibility and response-ability relate to different practices and sensibilities.

According to care ethicists, *responsibility* is about acting on the need for care *once it has been identified*. For others, mainly posthumanists and feminist new materialists, responsibility is equated with accountability for marks on bodies (...) *Response-ability* is also about *inviting and enabling a response* in attunement with the specificity of the situation, and in so doing, rendering the involved parties capable.

(Bozalek and Zembylas 2023, 8–9; emphasis added)

Hence, we can say that response-ability “actualises responsibility through engagements and interventions” (Rogowska-Stangret 2020, 17) that allow living beings and other entities to enter deep relations of caring proximity (Carstens 2020).

Joan C. Tronto (1993), in defining an ethics of care, introduces four elements: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness. The latter is similar to the notion of response-ability in that it requires that we – as humans and, specifically, as researchers – remain alert to possibilities of dependence *and* independence, autonomy, *and* vulnerability emerging

in relationships. Responsiveness suggests a different way to understand the needs of others *as expressed by the others*, rather than as understood by putting ourselves into their position. It is a posture far removed from ‘empowering’ or ‘giving voice,’ where both concepts suggest a kind of action carried out from within a system of dominance and assimilation (Higgins 2021) and both terms are reminiscent of a colonizer narrative. “In the context of the academy, responsibility with an inventive rupture implies, first and foremost, the ability of interrupting the self, of moving beyond the ‘I’ as the [exclusive] ethical subject” (Kuokkanen 2010, 65).

Echoing Karen Barad (2012), a response-able research apparatus is not meant to enable us as researchers to *react* differently to the world – as if the researcher is an external observer – but rather to allow us *to stay* in the world, to be and become differently in intra-action *with* it, and to learn how to ‘touch’ the other by being aware that “[a]ll touching entails an infinite alterity so that touching the other is touching all others, including the ‘self’” (Barad 2019, 532). It can be a material or a discursive touch, like a welcoming or dismissive gesture, an indifferent or inquisitive look, or an awkward or comfortable silence. In research, all forms of touching have different meanings to different actors and contribute to agential cuts (Barad 2007), or doings, that enact what matters and what is excluded from mattering (Bozalek and Fullagar 2022). The research apparatus is thus built on practices that enable an articulation of the world through bodies that are entangled and co-constitute knowledge, generating possibilities and impossibilities, inclusion and exclusion. A response-able research practice sees “epistemic plurality as gift rather than a lack that requires repair” (Higgins 2021, vii) through the authority of Science.

Donna Haraway (1988, 582) has pointed out that to be response-able in our research practices, “[w]e need to learn in our bodies” and argue “for the view from a body, always a complex, contradictory, structuring, and structured body, versus the view from above, from nowhere, from simplicity” (589). Producing knowledge is neither neutral nor innocent, and a response-able practice asks us as researchers to deal with the fact that “[w]e cannot play the innocent and produce conceptual ideals warranting our innocence. Accepting that we are in the mud means that living is dangerous, and thinking is dangerous” (Savransky and Stengers 2018, 135). Research requires daring and openness to unexpected collaborations and combinations “in hot compost piles” (Haraway 2016, 4). Despite centuries of human (Western) exceptionalism, humans can only pretend to be autonomous, independent, and disentangled from nonhumans and more-than-humans, while in fact “[w]e are at stake to each other” (55) because “nothing is really autopoietic or self-organizing” (58). Researchers make no exception. Accordingly, rather than framing research as a unilateral mode of organizing knowledge from above or from outside, we could conceptualize it as ‘sympoiesis,’ which means ‘making with’ from within, “always in the midst” (Manning 2016, 37), in composition with others. Conceiving of research as sympoietic enhances response-ability

in world-making practices and attunes them with affective intensities – feeling, sensation, and desire – circulating in research intra-actions.

Vinciane Despret emphasizes that “[m]eanings are constructed in a constant movement of *attunement*” (2008, 125; emphasis in original) and “subjectivities overlap, are transformed, actualized and extended to the subjectivity of the other” (129). In a world that is “[s]lippery, indistinct, elusive, complex, diffuse, messy, textured, vague, unspecific, confused, disordered, emotional, painful, pleasurable, hopeful, horrific, lost, redeemed, visionary, angelic, demonic, mundane, intuitive, sliding and unpredictable” (Law 2004, 6), engaging in a response-able research practice entails appreciating it as embodied and situated. Scholars who invest in establishing a relationship with their ‘object’ of study are often dismissed as unscientific or untrustworthy. Despret (2013, 52–53, emphasis in original) reminds us that a disembodied research practice

is a means to preclude (to prevent or to avoid) the always possible reciprocity of the encounter – as we shall see, ‘having a body’ discloses and renders perceptible the very existence of this reciprocity: moreover, it *is* the actual condition of its existence.

However, simply acknowledging that we are entangled with others in research practices is insufficient to enact response-ability. It demands attentiveness (Tronto 1993 [2009]) and the ability to notice and act with the latencies and diversities of living experience (Simpson and Revsbæk 2022). Despret and Meuret (2016, 26–27; emphasis in original) state that attentiveness, or noticing, “requires us to expand the scope of obligations,” to compromise ourselves or – following Stengers (Stengers, Massumi and Manning 2009, n.p.) – “[b]eing obligated by the situation, giving the situation the power to obligate you. And without guarantees.” On the contrary, we add that the authority of Science or methodological standardization is meant to ‘protect’ us as researchers from the troubles of making knowledge in the middle of contemporary life, but, in doing so, it prevents us from becoming with the world we study. Attentiveness corresponds to what Anna Tsing (2015, 24) calls the “arts of noticing” or the ability to think relationally and “to appreciate the multiple temporal rhythms and trajectories of the assemblage.” According to Tsing, noticing is not something that simply happens, it needs to be cultivated. It is

both a practice of getting to know another in their intimate particularity (...) and, at the same time, a practice of learning how one might better respond to another, might work to cultivate worlds of mutual flourishing (...) In short, the arts of attentiveness remind us that knowing and living are deeply entangled and that paying attention can and should be the basis for crafting better possibilities for shared life.

(Van Dooren, Kirksey and Münster 2016, 17)

In the following, we use the cartographic approach to elaborate on response-ability in academia by articulating some of the practices that enable responsiveness and attentiveness in MOS. We then move across and beyond academia, where MOS researchers encapsulate response-ability into world-making practices that shake the ‘ivory tower.’ We end this introduction by navigating through the chapters to provide an overview of the book.

Response-able Academic Practices

How should we challenge our ways of knowing in academia to build a space that fosters responsiveness and attentiveness in MOS? What are the needs of the individuals that higher education care for? What response-able practices can we enact in our intra-active relationships? These questions are the starting point for introducing an ethics of care within academia (Tronto 1993 [2009], 2015, 2020). As the chapters in this book clearly show, the way the above questions are addressed in practice is a matter for ethical and political discussion (Antoni and Beer 2023).

Response-ability, from a feminist posthumanist point of view, is an iterative and emergent process that unfolds within embodied relations and through our academic practices. It intertwines personal reflexivity and critical analysis of the politics underlying our ways of knowing and ‘doing academia.’ Enacting responsibility and response-ability in our academic practices is not an easy task. Yet, in this book, this task corresponds to a matter of concern that we – editors and authors – have *cared for* collectively by ‘staying with the trouble’ (Haraway 2016) that responsibility and response-ability bring to the fore. In other words, we have attempted to translate what is a matter of concern – such as the difficult task of accounting for our own responsibility as researchers while cultivating differential responsiveness in academic practices – into a matter of care that affects our being and doing in academia and, more broadly, our connection to the world we inhabit. Importantly, it is a concern that asks for caring about the future of academia and the ‘peripheral’ and overlapping world. With this book, we want to highlight and strengthen the connections between ethics and politics in, across, and around different organizations, including academia (Pullen and Rhodes 2015). In pursuing this very aim, we recognize ourselves, albeit in different forms depending on our positionalities.

Making each other ‘capable of responding’ is a situated practice (Gherardi and Rodeschini 2016). Care itself is a situated knowing and a collective knowledgeable doing within an organization. The authors’ common orientation to this matter of care leads us to take some risks and reconsider our ways of operating in our fieldwork by generating and sharing scientific knowledge in MOS, making its disciplinary boundaries porous, and foregrounding the possibilities for enacting response-able academic practices through intra-actions.

Barad’s (2007) concept of intra-action is useful in acknowledging that while we carry out a variety of tasks – doing field research, teaching, and

attending to our duties of care with students and communities we come in contact with, writing and talking about our research achievements – we are always in the midst (Manning 2016), imbued with, and immersed in relational intricacies with other humans, nonhumans, and more-than-humans. From this point of view, response-ability is a relational rather than individualistic accomplishment, always integral to the world's ongoing intra-active becoming (Barad 2010; Kuokkanen 2010; Higgins 2021). This feminist posthumanist view questions the vertical and unidirectional notion of expert knowledge transmitted to 'less knowledgeable others' and invites us – as researchers – to acknowledge the margins that we make and to decolonize our knowledge-making practices (Bozaleck and Zembylas 2017; Cozza and Gherardi 2023).

This decentralization greatly exposes us to vulnerability and dependence, but it is precisely in this vulnerability (Cano Abadía 2021) that a space of responsiveness can be created (Tronto 1993). Embracing connectedness in the encounter with multiple others implies welcoming the unexpected, the unknown, the tensions, and the contradictions that may arise, as well as the possibilities and opportunities that others may offer. Paradoxically (or perhaps not), it is precisely in a position of vulnerability and dependence that we can appreciate the collaborative meaning of doing scientific research while banishing a sense of alienation and exclusiveness (Alakavuklar, Dickson and Stablein 2017). The increasing standardization of academia, which largely influences an individual saying and doing, disempowers the social and political impact that our work may have on the larger community with which it engages. As highlighted by Putnam, Fairhurst, and Banghart (2016), there is a dialectic between organizational order and disorder, and this extends to academia. The power and performativity of tensions, contradictions, and dilemmas are constitutive of our everyday organizational life and we – who inhabit the academic system – cannot disregard them. While adherence to rigid researcher authority and research boundaries (for example, between different roles and stages of the fieldwork) may prevent the full engagement and contribution of multiple others, making room for shared responsiveness and fluid boundaries enables affective intensities to nourish our research experience and release its transformative potential.

Response-ability in our academic practices also demands that attentiveness is cultivated and that researchers stay attuned to others' embodied and situated experiences (Despret 2008). Response-able research does not happen by listening and observing others at a distance but rather by affectively attuning to them and putting ourselves in the condition of knowing how to listen, how to notice (Gherardi and Cozza 2022), how to touch and be touched, and how to be generous to such an extent that stories can be shared and bodies can be reciprocally seen and affected, including the researcher's body (Kaasila-Pakanen et al. 2024). Attentiveness is a mutual process of noticing what is significant for others (Tsing 2015) and provoking meaningful

(bodily) responses of attunement. The relational ontology of ‘becoming with others’ underpins the practice of response-ability not only within the limited timeframe of a project but continually in everyday academic practice. Response-ability through attentiveness is thus a process of generating knowledge in posthumanist engagement with multiple others. It is a mode of passionate immersion (Van Dooren, Kirksey and Münster 2016) that enfolds and unfolds the here-now and there-then, and in which the binary inside/outside does not make sense as there is neither ‘outside’ (Higgins 2021) nor a clear caesura between internal stages of a research.

Experimental, embodied, immersive, creative, transformative, risk-taking, and response-able practices in academia require care for the involved actors. We can identify at least three intra-active domains of academic caring practices addressing different recipients in never-neutral but rather always-political arenas (Antoni and Beer 2023). These refer to the participants in the fieldwork (caring research practices), peers (caring disciplinary practices), and students (caring pedagogical practices).

Caring fieldwork requires attentiveness to interrogate prescriptive patterns and the establishment of artificial boundaries to order research stages (temporal linear boundaries) and keep ‘clean’ roles and scripts (distributive spatial boundaries). Response-ability entails ‘getting our hands dirty’ and creatively engaging with messy empirical material, troubling human needs, and unfathomable nonhuman alterity (Mazzei 2014). It also means making room for experimentation rather than disembodied research inquiries. Making each other capable of responding, while warding off the risk of subjecting others and ourselves to processes of epistemic oppression (Kaasila-Pakanen and Mandalaki 2023), requires an open dialogue across researchers’ and multiple others’ differences, without indulging in pre-assigned and constraining formats. Response-able academic practices enable mutual flourishing and allow different views to emerge as the research process unfolds (Antoni and Beer 2023). Accounting for the research results and how they have been achieved is a key aspect of response-ability toward research participants. It is an important form of caring *if* it is done by transcending a ritualistic execution (e.g., imposed by a project structure) and is not limited to academic events and activities (e.g., conferences) (Carreri 2022).

Response-ability in peer relationships within MOS (and beyond) relies on acknowledging that the norms of *scientific* writing, publishing, and peer review often ask us – as authors, editors or reviewers – to distance ourselves or peers from our/their body and the fleshy encounters we/they experience (‘for the sake of objectivity’) or even command to silence the recalcitrant liveness of those materials/‘data’ that (apparently) do not fit (‘for the sake of methodological rigor’) (Bozalek, Zembylas and Shefer 2019). However, no one is innocent. We all contribute to the inclusion/exclusion game played in the name of Science, imposing rules and expectations of doing theory and managing ‘data’ in a certain way (Amrouche et al. 2018), reproducing

a legitimized jargon or style, or fostering the reproduction of dominant narratives (Boncori 2022). Response-ability in MOS entails questioning how we – as authors – generate knowledge and how we let others do it: a case in point is the peer review process (Chapter 2 in this volume).

The academic community, however, is not limited to academicians. The enactment of response-ability entails care for students through a relational and emancipatory approach to teaching and learning (Cano Abadía 2021). In educational settings, embracing vulnerability and the unexpected as gifts may inspire a sense of responsive vigilance in students and teachers (Zembylas 2005). Response-able pedagogies “provide new ways of considering what matters and what is often excluded from mattering” (Bozaleck and Zembylas 2017, 64) across differences. In so doing, students and teachers develop individual awareness of the consequences of their own epistemic practices and, together, they can contribute to generating a more just knowledge (Contu 2020) (Chapter 3 in this volume).

All the above practices rely on an ethics of engagement and participative reciprocity across the narrow boundaries of academia. We elaborate on this ethical posture in the following section.

Response-ability as an Ethics of Engagement

The adoption of a response-able approach should not be limited to organizational or disciplinary boundaries (i.e., MOS) as it transcends them. Researchers’ work often implies encounters with multiple others outside the academic environment. They can be human (as noted in the previous section: peers, students, and research participants), nonhuman actors (including the materiality of spaces and places), or more-than-humans (depending on the research topic, we could include animals and other living beings). Such encounters may occur while conducting research, in the managerial work that is often needed to accomplish academic and research activities, or even through researchers’ public engagement and academic activism. In other words, a response-able approach requires us, as researchers, to pay attention not only to what is told through the results of research processes but also to what research practices, in their becoming, *do* to us and others by going through social worlds via different forms of actions and interventions. Moreover, a response-able approach always asks us to consider the ontological mutual entanglement and epistemological co-shaping enacted with others (Higgins 2021). Finally, it invites us to bear in mind that social processes are always situated in space and time and entail performative intra-actions in becoming with others.

The first type of engagement concerns the relationship with other actors or entities with whom the researchers may interact while conducting research. To expand on the previous section, research trajectories within organizations and workplaces are inevitably punctuated by encounters with various types of subjects, such as practitioners, managers, intermediaries, or other

interlocutors, which is a necessary or strategic step in order to get access to the field. This step can also provide access to specific groups and contexts we intend to investigate for research purposes. These encounters happen through material-discursive practices enacted through rules, protocols, standards, artifacts, objects, technologies, and other (im)materialities populating the research setting. It is noteworthy that these heterogeneous elements are entangled and precariously connected as they 'become with' the research process itself. Hence, from an ethical viewpoint, the researcher can never be seen as an external and detached observer, but s/he is part of the unstable flux of practices under scrutiny, which s/he affects and by which s/he is affected. Gherardi (2019) suggests that adopting a response-able approach in organizational and management settings implies a sort of affective attunement that allows researchers to engage in an 'other-oriented' sense, a 'being with' others. This attunement goes beyond normative compliance with codes of conduct or institutional ethical principles, though it does not diminish their relevance. Rather than the mere enforcement of organizational rules and regulations, the ethics of engagement requires considering how to enable such an engagement and identifying its affective relations and embodied conditions. The flow of affective intensities that characterize all research encounters can influence the capacity of being and doing. Indeed, affect can facilitate or disturb the relationships and hinder the research process or open up new possibilities and avenues. Ethics of engagement invites us to acknowledge the im-possibilities arising in the research field and explore and learn from them, rather than simply reacting to them, perhaps in the name of a sanctioning authority (Chapter 4 in this volume).

A second important aspect concerns the engagement with the managerial dimension. We refer not only to the fact that managerialism is an increasingly relevant matter of concern in the academic literature – especially in MOS – where it is either augmented or criticized. Yet, it demands that we reflect on the pronounced managerial orientations of most academic organizations. However, here we want to highlight the centrality of management as one among other privileged objects of inquiry in MOS. Hence, adopting a response-able approach implies devoting specific attention to the moral foundation of management and the social consequences of practicing it to the detriment of marginalized others or others in marginalized contexts (i.e., the Global South) (Chapter 6 in this volume). Accordingly, as response-able researchers, we should care for how dimensions like ethics, responsibility, and sustainability are entangled and enacted in the organizational and management contexts and practices we are confronted with (Gherardi and Lassch 2001). Moreover, we should not limit our scrutiny to individual managers, their work, or the material-discursive circumstances where they operate but rather intra-actively engage with all these elements by appreciating their agential power. Moving in this direction means opening a space for alternatives to dominant paradigms, unveiling criticalities and ambivalences, and

stimulating collegial reflection on and creative exploration of how management can otherwise be driven by care and sustainability rather than rationality and efficiency. Response-able management practices stress the mutual obligation of people and organizations to listen and respond to each other (Bozalek 2020), take care of existing vulnerabilities and risks, and resist the rhetoric of grand societal challenges by engaging in collaborative actions instead.

The third domain we would like to highlight is public engagement and academic activism carried out by researchers. Public or community engagement (along with scientific research and education, which are the other key functions of a university) refers to the combination of scientific activities, technological activities, and cultural ‘transfer’ and the operational transformation of knowledge through which universities activate processes of direct interaction with the territories and communities of competence to contribute to their social and cultural growth with the overall goal of generating mutual benefit. Over the years, these activities have become critical in academia to enforce social responsibility and academic accountability toward different ‘stakeholders.’ From a response-able perspective, dealing with the heterogeneity of multiple actors implies openness toward diverse subjects, views, and the conditions for which these actions and interventions are designed. Instead of following a commodifying logic of knowledge transfer, ethics of engagement suggests a participative logic of co-construction. Furthermore, the logic of exporting ‘best practices’ and ‘best knowledge’ to local communities – which emerges “from hierarchical relations that assume ‘rescuing’ the ‘other’ or knowing what is best for the ‘other’” (Kuokkanen 2010, 69) – can be replaced by a logic of intimate and respectful engagement with the others. Put differently, ethics of engagement averts ‘academic colonization,’ resists political pressures, and opposes destructive agendas that currently affect us at a time of rapid corporatization of academia.

Within the third domain of ethics of engagement, we can consider the active involvement and militancy of researchers in political and social causes: from the fight against inequalities to advocacy for human, feminist, and civil rights, to the mobilization for environmental sustainability. Compared to public engagement, which is currently legitimized or even requested (for example, by most funding agencies), militancy and activism are not always welcomed and valued in academia insofar as they seem to depart from the still dominant vision of Science as neutral and objective. Militancy and activism, by definition, bring the researcher ‘into the midst,’ and this condition is largely perceived as antithetical to scientific trustworthiness. On the contrary, we deem that this activity outside the ‘ivory tower’ is attuned to ethics of engagement (Bozalek and Zembylas 2023). Participation in social movements and activist groups embodies different care practices that serve specific causes by listening, responding, co-shaping, and mutually transforming each other in an ecological, distributed relationality. In academic activism, agentive capacities are therefore enabled and reinforced through embodied encounters

that accommodate feelings of anger, frustration, and discomfort and mobilize affection and solidarity constitutive of positive and joyful energy (Massumi 2015) (Chapter 5 in this volume).

The chapters contained in this book present various forms of response-able academic practices and ethics of engagement, which we briefly present in the following.

The Structure of the Book

The cartographic reading of the concept of response-ability has allowed us to go through its theoretical foundations and development by highlighting the porous boundaries between disciplines and discourses that have contributed to enriching its meaning. The contribution of feminist posthumanist scholars was and still is key to the onto-epistemological articulation of response-ability in MOS and beyond. The authors of the chapters following this introduction acknowledge this legacy and honor it by generously sharing their embodied academic experiences of being and doing together with others. They offer examples of response-able academic practices and ethics of engagement.

In Chapter 2, Emmanouela Mandalaki draws on Joan Tronto's concepts of responsibility and, in considering Donna Haraway's and Karen Barad's elaborations of the notion of response-ability, she problematizes the traditional approaches to knowledge-making practices in organization studies. Drawing inspiration from feminist scholars, she reflects on personal experiences of reviewing and editing beyond authoring. She thus seeks to conceptualize an ethics of un/knowing, whereby authors, research participants, editors, and reviewers are not framed as separate entities but rather as entangled subjectivities moving through social wor(l)ds.

In Chapter 3, Poole, Contu, and Scully engage with the fundamental question, "How can we write together, response-ably, across difference within the neoliberal university?" Drawing on Judith Butler's work and others, the authors share personal experiences of addressing that question in practice. They point out how the marketization and privatization of the academy rely on the pernicious notion of 'accountability' rooted in the idea of combining, calculating, and reckoning. For these authors, working together is a way to escape this logic and develop a different emancipatory notion of accountability and collaborative justice research across difference. Resisting 'sameness,' the authors engage responsibly with others and reveal how meeting each other across the gulfs of neoliberal academia can be an act of love.

In Chapter 4, Leni Grünbaum and Alice Wickström explore response-ability in research fieldwork. They focus on the affective intensities that emerged during a research process where differences in ideas, rhythms, priorities, and abilities led to uncertainty and vulnerability, necessitating an ongoing negotiation of response-ability. The authors illustrate how response-ability in fieldwork may nurture reciprocal relations that arise from tensions instead

of privileging consensus and/or unity. Finally, they argue that response-able research can support organizational processes and practices that enhance individual and collective capacities to act, while counter-acting forms of affective contagion that work in disciplinary and diminishing ways.

In Chapter 5, Pellegrinelli and Parolin contribute to the debate about response-ability in MOS by focusing on the relationships between queerness and responsiveness. The authors conceptualize response-ability as a form of *becoming with* that arises between them as researchers and an activist and queer community. Pellegrinelli and Parolin show how the material and affective forces enabled by a theatrical performance enacted an affective connection between the participants (themselves included) and, in doing so, enabled mutual affirmation and care. Inspired by Donna Haraway and Vinciane Despret, the authors assert that one way to increase one's ability to enter a relational mode with multiple others consists of affectively projecting kindness and then enacting affirmative ethics that enables people to express themselves, flourish, and co-become.

In Chapter 6, Marcelo de Souza Bispo engages with the MOS literature on management. By leveraging posthuman practice theory, he elaborates on the idea of management grounded on an ethics of care and response-ability to contrast the ideology of managerialism. According to de Souza Bispo, offering an alternative to a morality of efficiency inscribed in managerialism is key to a moral theory that acknowledges privileges and vulnerabilities and deals with social challenges from a decolonial perspective.

Overall, this book offers vivid examples of feminist posthumanist inquiry into response-ability in organization and management and, through a feminist posthumanist cartographic lens, we – the editors – invite readers to embark on a responsive journey and navigate their academic landscapes.

Recommended Reading

Original Text by Donna Haraway

Haraway, Donna. 2003. *The Companion Species Manifesto. Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Key Academic Text

Braidotti, Rosi, and Hlavajova, Maria. 2018. *Posthuman Glossary*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Accessible Resource

Bozalek, Vivienne. 2021. "Rendering Each Other Capable with Vivienne Bozalek." <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6GQgB0H80Iw>

References

- Alakavuklar, Ozan Nadir, Dickson, Andrew G., and Stablein, Ralph. 2017. "The Alienation of Scholarship in Modern Business Schools: From Marxist Material Relations to the Lacanian Subject". *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 16: 454–468.
- Amrouche, Charlotte, Breckenridge, Jhilmil, Brewis, Deborah N., Burdellaro, Olimpia, Breiding Hansen, Malte, Pedersen, Christina, Plotnikof, Mie, and Pullen, Alison. 2018. "Powerful Writing". *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 18(4): 881–900.
- Antoni, Anne, and Beer, Haley. 2023. "Ethical Sensibilities for Practicing Care in Management and Organization Research". *Journal of Business Ethics* 190: 279–294. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05419-8>
- Barad, Karen. 2019. "After the End of the World: Entangled Nuclear Colonialisms, Matters of Force, and the Material Force of Justice". *Theory & Event* 22(3): 524–550.
- Barad, Karen. 2012. "What Is the Measure of Nothingness? Infinity, Virtuality, Justice/ Was ist das MaJ des Nichts? Unendlichkeit, Virtualitiit, Gerechtigkeit". *100 Notes – 100 Thoughts* 99. DOCUMENTA (13).
- Barad, Karen. 2010. "Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance". *Derrida Today* 3(2): 240–268.
- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Boncori, Ilaria. 2022. *Researching and Writing Differently*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bozalek, Vivienne. 2020. "Rendering Each Other Capable". In *Navigating the Post-qualitative, New Materialist and Critical Posthumanist Terrain Across Disciplines: An Introductory Guide*, edited by Karin Murriss, 135–149. New York: Routledge.
- Bozalek, Vivienne, and Fullagar, Simone. 2022. "Agential Cut". In *A Glossary for Doing Postqualitative, New Materialist and Critical Posthumanist Research Across Disciplines*, edited by Karin Murriss, 30–31. London, New York: Routledge.
- Bozalek, Vivienne, and Zembylas, Michalinos. 2023. *Responsibility, Privileged Irresponsibility and Response-Ability. Higher Education, Coloniality and Ecological Damage*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bozalek, Vivienne, and Zembylas, Michalinos. 2017. "Towards a Response-able Pedagogy across Higher Education Institutions in Post-Apartheid South Africa: An Ethico-Political Analysis". *Education as Change* 21(2): 62–85.
- Bozalek, Vivienne, Zembylas, Michalinos, and Shefer, Tamara. 2019. "Response-able (peer) reviewing matters in higher education: A manifesto". In *Posthumanism and Higher Education: Reimagining Pedagogy, Practice and Research*, edited by Taylor & A. Bayley, 349–358. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Braidotti, Rosi. 2019. *Posthuman Knowledge*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bruzzone, Silvia. 2021. "A Posthumanist Research Agenda on Sustainable and Responsible Management Education after the Pandemic". *Journal of Global Responsibility*, 13(1): 56–71.
- Cano Abadía, Mónica. 2021. "Towards a Feminist and Affective Pedagogy of Vulnerability". *Matter: Journal of New Materialist Research*, 2(2): 102–129.
- Carreri, Anna. 2022. "Gender Identity (Dis)order in Dual Precarious Worker Couples: The 'Family Speaking Drawers' Installation". *Ephemera. Theory & Politics in Organization* 22(1): 189–213.
- Carstens, Delphi. 2020. "An Ethics of Immanence. Posthumanism and the Politics of Care". In *Posthuman and Political Care Ethics for Reconfiguring Higher Education*

- Pedagogies*, edited by Vivienne Bozalek and Michalinos Zembylas, 79–90. London: Routledge.
- Contu, Alessia. 2020. “Answering the Crisis with Intellectual Activism: Making a Difference as Business Schools Scholars”. *Human Relations*, 73(5): 737–757.
- Cozza, Michela, and Gherardi, Silvia. 2023. *The Posthumanist Epistemology of Practice Theory*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Félix. 1994. *What Is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York, Chichester, West Sussex: Columbia University Press.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2020. “Traits”. *Environmental Humanities* 12(1): 186–189.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2013. “Responding Bodies and Partial Affinities in Human-Animal Worlds”. *Theory, Culture & Society* 30(7/8): 51–76.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2008. “The Becomings of Subjectivity in Animal Worlds”. *Subjectivity* 23: 123–139.
- Despret, Vinciane. 2004. “The Body We Care for: Figures of Anthro-Zoo-Genesis”. *Body & Society* 10(2–3): 11–134.
- Despret, Vinciane, and Meuret, Michel. 2016. “Cosmoecological Sheep and the Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet”. *Environmental Humanities* 8(1): 24–36.
- Gherardi, Silvia. 2019. “Theorizing Affective Ethnography for Organization Studies”. *Organization* 26(6): 741–760.
- Gherardi, Silvia and Cozza, Michela. 2022. “Atmospheric Attunement in the Becoming of a Happy Object”. In *Doing Process Research in Organizations, Noticing Differently*, edited by Barbara Simpson and Line Revsbæk, 16–38. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gherardi, Silvia, and Laasch. 2022. “Responsible Management-as-Practice: Mobilizing a Posthumanist Approach”. *Journal of Business Ethics* 181: 269–281.
- Gherardi, Silvia, and Rodeschini, Giulia. 2016. “Caring as a Collective Knowledgeable Doing: About Concern and Being Concerned”. *Management Learning* 47(3): 266–284.
- Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the Trouble. Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Haraway, Donna. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective”. *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575–599.
- Higgins, Marc. 2021. “Response-Ability Revisited: Towards Re(con)figuring Scientific Literacy”. In *Unsettling Responsibility in Science Education. Indigenous Science, Deconstruction, and the Multicultural Science Education Debate*, edited by Marc Higgins, 271–316. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kaasila-Pakanen, Anna-Liisa, Gao, Grace, Jääskeläinen, Pauliina, Mandalaki, Emmanouela, Einola, Katja, Johansson, Janet, Zang, Ling E., and Pullen, Alison. 2023. “Writing Touch. Writing (Epistemic) Vulnerability”. *Gender, Work and Organization* 31(1): 264–283.
- Kaasila-Pakanen, Anna-Liisa, and Emmanouela Mandalaki. 2023. “Hysterically Y-ours: Reclaiming Academic Writing as a Hysterical Practice”. *Organization* <https://doi.org/10.1177/13505084231198436>
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2010. “The Responsibility of the Academy. A Call for Doing Homework”. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 26(3): 61–74.

- Law, John. 2004. *After Method. Mess in Social Science Research*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Lenz Taguchi, Hillevi. 2013. "Images of Thinking in Feminist Materialisms: Ontological Divergences and the Production of Researcher Subjectivities". *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26(6): 706–716.
- Manning, Erin. 2016. *The Minor Gesture*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.
- Massumi, Brian. 2015. *The Politics of Affect*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mazzei, Lisa A. 2014. "Beyond an Easy Sense: A Diffractive Analysis". *Qualitative Inquiry* 20(6), 742–746.
- Pullen, Alison, and Rhodes, Carl (eds). 2015. *The Routledge Companion to Ethics, Politics and Organizations*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Putnam, Linda L., Fairhurst, Gail T., and Banghart, Scott. 2016. "Contradictions, Dialectics, and Paradoxes in Organizations: A Constitutive Approach". *The Academy of Management Annals* 10(1): 65–171.
- Rogowska-Stangret, Monika. 2020. "Care as a Methodology. Reading Natalie Jeremijenko and Vinciane Despret Diffractively". In *Posthuman and Political Care Ethics for Reconfiguring Higher Education Pedagogies*, edited by Vivienne Bozalek and Michalinos Zembylas, 13–26. London: Routledge.
- Savransky, Martin, and Stengers, Isabelle. 2018. "Relearning the Art of Paying Attention: A Conversation". *SubStance* 47(1): 130–145.
- Simpson, Barbara, and Revsbæk, Line. 2022. *Doing Process Research in Organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stengers, Isabelle, Massumi, Brian, and Manning, Erin. 2009. "History through the Middle: Between Macro and Mesopolitics. Interview with Isabelle Stengers. 25 November 2008". *INFLeXions* 3. https://www.inflexions.org/n3_stengershtml.html
- St. Pierre, Elizabeth. 2013. "The Posts Continue: Becoming". *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26(6): 646–657.
- Tronto, Joan. 2020. "Afterword". In: *Posthuman and Political Care Ethics for Reconfiguring Higher Education Pedagogies*, edited by Vivienne Bozalek, Michalinos Zembylas, and Joan Tronto, 153–160. New York: Routledge.
- Tronto, Joan. 2015. *Who Cares? How to Reshape a Democratic Politics*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Tronto, Joan. 2012. "Partiality Based on Relational Responsibilities: Another Approach to Global Ethics". *Ethics and Social Welfare* 6(3): 303–316.
- Tronto, Joan 1993. *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.
- Tsing Lowenhaupt, Anna 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World. On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Van Dooren, Thom, Kirksey, Eben, and Münster, Ursula. 2016. "Multispecies Studies. Cultivating Arts of Attentiveness". *Environmental Humanities* 8(1): 1–23.
- Zembylas, Michalinos. 2005. "A Pedagogy of Unknowing: Witnessing Unknowability in Teaching and Learning". *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 24(2): 139–160.