Call for Papers

Politics of Sociomateriality: Reconnecting with Societal Controversies and Political Struggles

9th Organizations, Artifacts and Practices (OAP) Workshop

#OAP2019

When: Last week of June 2019 (precised soon)

Where: FGV/EAESP – Fundação Getulio Vargas / Escola de Administração de Empresas do Estado de Sao Paulo - Sao Paulo – Brazil

In partnership with: PSL, Université Paris Dauphine (DRM) and Erasmus University

Co-chairs:

Eduardo Diniz (FGV/EAESP)   Nathalie Mitev (King's College London)

Marlei Pozzebon (HEC Montreal & FGV/EAESP)   François-Xavier de Vaujany (PSL-Université Paris-Dauphine, DRM M&O)

Theme and objectives of OAP 2019

How academics might face more purposively contemporary societal and political problems? This is a crucial reflection to put forward in those '*Trumpean*' days. From the pioneer meeting in 2011 – which theme was social networks and artifacts in organizations – eight other annual workshops took place in different cities from 2012 to 2018. The themes selected to brand each workshop witness the vitality and intellectual curiosity of the OAP participants: materiality and space in management and organizational studies (Paris, 2012); time, history and materiality (London, 2013); rules, regulation and materiality (Rome, 2014); managerial techniques and materiality (Sydney, 2015); materiality and institutions (Lisbon, 2016); collaboration and materiality (Singapore, 2017); and new ways of working and the digital age (Amsterdam, 2018). By exploring the relationships between organizations, artifacts and practices, OAP scholars often focus on work and organizing practices, practices that are becoming more and more digital, distributed, community-oriented, open and collaborative. Although relevant to increase our understanding of our contemporary social world, the persistent focus on organizational practices might be seen as a limitation to be overcome by the OAP community. We are not saying that such philosophical discussions are without importance. They have resulted in the distinction between different ontological stances stressing the interpenetration of the social and the material (Introna, 2013), the irrelevance of the terms themselves (Lorino, 2013), the necessity to keep a focus on material and social 'domains' or 'agencies' (Mutch, 2013), or the necessity to move to other interrelated debates such as transcendental versus immanent views of processes and sociomaterial practices (de Vaujany and Mitev, 2016). All those discussions are provoking and important for our understanding of current 'reality'. However, in the sense of urgency that we can feel today regarding a politically unstable, environmentally threatened, socially unfair and economically unbalanced among classes and countries, we could ask ourselves what kind of relevant contribution sociomateriality and materiality research could bring to a better world. This sense of urgency could be considered even bigger in Latin America, and particularly huge in Brazil, given the institutional and economic prolonged crisis the country is going through, providing a rich environment for sociomaterial analysis. Paradoxically, our insight is that these projection into more concrete, societal, political debates will be a way to go beyond pointless philosophical discussions for the sake of philosophical debates, and could strengthen sociomateriality and the materiality turn.

As we are planning to bring an OAP workshop to Brazil in 2019, it is timely to broaden the focus from what is happening in organizations to what is shaking and destabilizing our communities and society, integrating a number of social and political issues that could be also seen as 'sociomaterial', such as the politics of materiality and embodiment (Irni, 2013; Dale, 2005), the politics of performativity (Boucher, 2006) or the broader issues of organizing, infrastructures and practices interrelated to the rising new world of work and the sharing economy.

Another interesting point that the integration of Latin American voices to the OAP debates could bring is a potential critique to dominant Euro-modern ways of thinking about academic production and consumption. The possibility of decentering the prevailing academic discourse and envisioning new possibilities of argumentation could reorient imaginaries and practices. For instance, the strong stream associated with post-colonial and post-development thinking provides a view of profound and radical delusion and disappointment with the exploitative thinking paradigm that has dominated Europe and the Americas for the last 500 years, based on the process of colonization, imperialism, neoliberalism and marked-based globalization with a focus on economic growth in spite of human well-being (Esteva 1992; Escobar, 2011; Gomes, 2012). This dominance also characterizes academia (Alves and Pozzebon, 2013; Alcadipani et

al., 2013). Not only for language reasons, but mainly due to experiential, historical interpretive frames that are quite distinct, researchers operating in the so-called developed regions dominate the intellectual debate and impose their rules and vocabulary. We are not romanticizing alternative, local, indigenous discourses – with their own situated understandings, shaped and developed in accordance with their particular historic and cultural experiences – but just outlining their barriers to be heard by 'global' Western-based researchers and to escape of their subaltern condition (Pozzebon and Fontenelle, 2018).

OAP Sao Paulo 2019 is open to a broad of dialogues that go beyond organization issues. It involves to bring a sociomaterial view to:

- ✓ Political struggles and social resistance;
- ✓ Hegemonic roots of knowledge production and consumption and the alternatives
- ✓ The pervasiveness of technology and changes in labor conditions
- ✓ Historical roots of technology 'evolution' and societal disruptions
- ✓ Post-colonial and post-developmental thinking
- ✓ Algorithms shaping social life
- ✓ Political dimensions of performativity
- ✓ Everyday politics of movements, mobilities and gestures in the city
- ✓ Third places and collaborative spaces in the city
- ✓ Open knowledge and open innovation in developing countries
- ✓ New forms of collective movements and their infrastructures
- ✓ Sociomateriality and ontologies
- ✓ Ontologies of indigeneous people and their relationship with past and contemporary instruments

Submission to OAP 2019

Those interested in participating must submit an extended abstract of no more than 1,000 words on the EasyChair system. This abstract must outline the applicant's proposed contribution to the workshop. The proposal must be in .doc/.docx/.rtf format and should contain the author's/authors' names as well as their institutional affiliations, email address(es), and postal address(es). Deadline for submissions will be January, 15th. Authors will be notified of the committee's decision by February, 28th.

Location and registration

OAP 2019 will take place at the campus of FGV/EAESP (More information can be found at this address:
Registration will start in early March.
There are **no fees** associated with attending this workshop.

REFERENCES

Alcadipani, R, Dar, S, Gantman, E. & Yousfi, H. (2013). Challenging Anglo-Saxon dominance in management and organizational knowledge. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas,* 55(2), 126-129.

Alves, M.A. & Pozzebon, M. (2013). How to resist linguistic domination and promote knowledge diversity?. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas,* 53(6), 629-633.

Alvesson, M. & Karreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, *53*(9), 1125-1149.

Anderson, W. (2002). Introduction: postcolonial technoscience, *Social Studies of Science*, 32(5-6), 643-658.

Barad, K. (2013). Mar (c) king time: Material entanglements and re-memberings: Cutting together-apart. In Carlile, P. R., Nicolini, D., Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.), *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies*, Oxford University Press, pp. 16-31.

Bernstein, R. J. (2010). *The Pragmatic Turn*. Polity.

Bhaskar, R. (1979, 2014). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences*. Routledge.

Bijker, W. E., Hughes, T. P., & Pinch, T. J. (1987). *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. MIT Press.

Boucher, G. (2006). The politics of performativity: A critique of Judith Butler. Parrhesia: a journal of critical philosophy, 1, 112-141.

Callon, M. (1990). Techno-economic networks and irreversibility. *The Sociological Review*, *38*(S1), 132-161.

Carlile, P. R. & Langley, A. (Eds.) (2013). *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies* (Vol. 3). Oxford University Press.

Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1995). Narration or science? Collapsing the division in organization studies. *Organization*, *2*(1), 11-33

Dale, K. (2005). Building a social materiality: Spatial and embodied politics in prganizational control, *Organization*, 12(5), 649-678.

de Vaujany, F. X. & Mitev, N. (2013). Materiality and Space: Organizations, Artefacts and Practices. Palgrave Macmillan.

de Vaujany, F. X. & Mitev, N. (2015). "The post-Macy Paradox, Information Management and Organising: Good Intentions and a Road to Hell?, *Culture and Organization*, 1-29.

de Vaujany, F. X. & Mitev, N. (2016). Introduction au Tournant Matériel, in de Vaujany, F.X., Hussenot, A. & Chanlat, J.F. (Eds) (2016). *Les Théories des Organisations*, Paris: Economica.

Deetz, S. (2003). Reclaiming the legacy of the linguistic turn. *Organization*, 10(3), 421–429.

Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., & Punamäki, R. L. (1999). *Perspectives on Activity Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Escobar, A. (2010). Latin America at a crossroads? *Cultural Studies* , 24(1), 1–65.

Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princetown University Press.

Esteva, G. (1992). Development. In Sachs, W. (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. 2nd ed, London: Zed Books.

Feenberg, A. (1995). *Alternative Modernity: The technical Turn in Philosophy and Social Theory*. University of California Press.

Feldman, M. S., and Orlikowski, W. J. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science, 22*(5), 1240-1253.

Goldman, S. (1989). *No Innovation Without Representation*. Penn State University.

Gomes, A. (2012). Alter-native 'development': Indigenous forms of social ecology. *Third World Quarterly, 33*(6), 1059-1073.

Grint, K., & Woolgar, S. (1997). *The Machine at Work: Technology, Work and Organization*. John Wiley & Sons.

Harding, S. (Ed.). (2011). *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Duke University Press.

Hart, M. A. (2010). Indigenous worldviews, knowledge, and research: The development of an indigenous research paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work, 1*(1), 1-16.

Hayles, K. (1999). *How We Became Posthumans*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Introna, L. D. (2013). Epilogue: Performativity and the becoming of sociomaterial assemblages, In de Vaujany, F.X. & Mitev, N. (Eds.), *Materiality and Space*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan Press, pp. 330-342.

Irni, S. (2013). The politics of materiality: Affective encounters in a transdisciplinary debate. European Journal of Women's Studies, 20(4), 347-360.

Jasanoff, S. (2003). Technologies of humility: citizen participation in governing science. *Minerva, 41*(3), 223-244.

Jasanoff, S., Markle, G. E., Peterson, J. C., & Pinch, T. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Sage Publications.

Jones, C., Boxenbaum, E., & Anthony, C. (2013). The immateriality of material practices in institutional logics. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 39*, 51-75.

Jones, C., Boxenbaum, E., & Anthony, C. (2013). The immateriality of material practices in institutional logics. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 39*(A), 51-75.

Kautz, K., & Jensen, T. B. (2013). Sociomateriality at the royal court of IS: A jester's monologue. *Information and Organization, 23*(1), 15-27.

Knorr-Cetina, K. K., Schatzki, T. R., & Von Savigny, E. (Eds.). (2005). *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. Routledge.

Kreimer, P. (2007). Estudios sociales de la ciencia y la tecnología en América Latina: ¿para qué?, ¿para quién? *Redes*, 13(26), 55-64.

Latour, B. (2007). Can we get our materialism back, please?, *Isis*, 98(1), 138-142.

Latour, B. (2014). Technical does not mean material, *Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4 (1), 507–510.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the Social. London: Oxford.

Lemonnier, P. (2017). <u>Shall we just call them sociomaterial black boxes or take a peek inside? An anthropologist's impressionist remarks, In Mitev, N., Morgan-Thomas, A., Lorino, P., de Vaujany, F.-X. & Nama, Y. (Eds.), *Materiality and Managerial Techniques: New</u>

Perspectives on Organizations, Artefacts and Practices, Palgrave Macmillan.

Lemos, M. (2017). Collaborative agency in educational management: constructing a joint object for school and community transformation. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas. Forthcoming*

Leonardi, P. M. (2013). Theoretical foundations for the study of sociomateriality. *Information and Organization*, *23*(2), 59-76.

Lorino, P. (2013). Management Systems as Organizational 'Architextures'. In Materiality and Space (pp. 62-95). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Martela, F. (2015). Fallible inquiry with ethical ends-in-view: A pragmatist philosophy of science for organizational research. *Organization Studies, 36*(4), 537.

Mutch, A. (2013). Sociomateriality—Taking the wrong turning? *Information and Organization*, *23*(1), 28-40.

Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435-1448.

Perera, V. (2015). Engaged universals and community economies: The (human) right to water in Colombia. *Antipode* , 47(1), 197-215.

Pickering, A. (2010). *The mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science*. University of Chicago Press.

Pozzebon, M. & Fontenelle, I. (2018). "Fostering the post-development debate: the Latin American concept of tecnologia social". Third Word Quarterly, Accepted. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2018.1432351

Russo, P.T & Guerreiro, R. (2017). A percepção sobre a sociomaterialidade das práticas de contabilidade gerencial. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas. Forthcoming*

Turner, W., Bowker, G., Gasser, L., & Zacklad, M. (2006). Information infrastructures for distributed collective practices. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 15(2), 93-110.

Van Dijk, J. (2012). *The Network Society*. Sage Publications.

Wasserman, V., & Frenkel, M. (2011). Organizational Aesthetics: Caught Between Identity Regulation and Culture Jamming. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 503-521.

Willems, T.A.H. & van Marrewijk, A. (2017). Building collaboration? From co-location to dis-location, an ethnographic study in a railway control center. *RAE-Revista de Administração de Empresas. Forthcoming*

Shaffer, 'Post-Development and Poverty," 2012, 1767

Villalba, U. (2013). Buen Vivir vs development: A paradigm shift in the Andes?' *Third World Quarterly,* 34(8), 1427-1442.