

Commentary
Jenny K Rodriguez
15 December 2023

I was asked to reflect on two questions:

1. What is the role of the book for the feminist research community and organizations studies in general?
2. What chapters resonate to you the most?

Thinking about these questions, I reflected first on the point of feminist research methodologies for me. To me, the point of feminist research methodologies is also a question of positionalities, epistemes, and emancipatory and disruptive thinking. This handbook offers the feminist research community and MOS (not only OS!) a resource to drive novel thinking about feminist methodologies. For me novel thinking involves not only bringing new perspective but also re-thinking what we know based on what we have seen, experienced and learned: a view that honours lineages but confronts omissions, misinterpretations, and misrepresentations, recognising distinctions between dominant and marginalised voices and positionalities, and putting them in conversation to articulate other and new genealogies.

Concretely, I would argue that the handbook offers:

- First, conceptual thinking about methodology beyond method – Nancy Harding’s chapter offers insightful engagement with the philosophical underpinning of methodology.
- Second, methodological interrogations about the right now – Alison Pullen, Celina McEwen & Carl Rhodes’s reflection about practicing feminist ethics and explicitly unpacking the features of feminist ethics of care in the present historical context.
- Third, innovative methodological approaches -- Laura Candidatu and Koen Leurs’ chapter on feminist tools to challenge computational thinking is an example of this. Also, Magdalena Oldziejewska’s use of archival methods (something that has been used in gender history research but it’s not fully developed in our field).

As you would expect from a comprehensive authoritative collection, which I think this handbook is, there is something for everyone. Personally, I found in this handbook three things:

- **Continuity** – Some ideas build on things I learned in my training as a feminist scholar back in the noughties –perhaps there’s a bit of intellectual crush *déjà vu* as people whose work I cited as a doctoral student are also contributors to this handbook AND their ideas are as thought provoking now as they were then.
- **Provocation** -- I found interesting ideas that I don’t necessarily agree with (and perhaps disagree with!). To me that is a clear indication that this handbook is a space for academic debate.
- **Inspiration** – New thinking that breaks the traditional way of thinking about feminist methodologies. By that I mean, thinking that made me see possibilities of reacquainting myself, as a woman of colour, with a tradition that, once I started to break script with the training I received in the UK), did not feel saw me, understood me or represented me.

Many ideas spoke to the core of my own thinking about feminism as a methodological praxis, especially what I would call ‘feminisms otherwise’, those that speak of/from positionalities of intellectual discomfort, alterity, and historical marginalization.

With that in mind, I went about this handbook literally backwards because I started with **Sadhvi Dar and Joshua Kalemba’s chapter on a feminist praxis to disrupt the white male supremacy of business management curricula**, which I found to speak to my interest in disruptive thinking. Their Wynterian tribute is both thought provoking and useful to illustrate a way of thinking about feminist

methodology as disruptive praxis. They draw on Wynter's work to interrogate the hegemonic humanness reproduced by the business management curriculum. Their way of feminist thinking aligns well with a thinking about methodology of action for change. I found their explicit discussion on interventions, where they name the problem at hand (e.g., reproduction of hierarchies, the centring of whiteness, the celebration of competitiveness and individualism and the normalisation of commodification) to establish a good roadmap to think about feminist methodologies as broader than method but more as a disruptive episteme to challenge dominant ways of knowledge production. They frame this in relation to the possibilities of decolonizing the business management curriculum, both recognising the limitations of the ways in which decolonizing as a praxis is understood but also bringing in that feminist otherwise lens to understand what oppression is that we are facing. I think an important issue here is that oppressions are not what they used to be... their adaptive capacity is nurtured by Neoliberal capitalism in ways that creep in and before we know it, we are dancing to the tune of our domination. In this respect, their chapter shows us how to be vigilant –their example of the DA initiative to support Palestine was an excellent way to illustrate a decolonial, feminist methodology of action.

Ybiskay Gonzalez, Sara Motta and Tiina Seppala's chapter on decolonial feminist solidarity/ies speaks about embodying "a foundational ethical and epistemological protocol of decolonial feminist solidarity" (p. 298), highlighting non-linearity, multiplicity, and interweaving-ness --"different ways to read and interpret as well as to engage" (p. 298), the authors call it. Their discussion of the existence of decolonial feminists on the academic margins with experiences of onto-epistemological denial, elision and invisibilisation provides a good backdrop against which the dialoguing between the three authors take place. The chapter made me reflect about how we can methodologically capture the North-South dialogue in ways that are both critical (to make justice to the feminist ethos) and pluriversal (to make justice to the decolonial one). Whilst I don't see these things as opposites, the methodological dialogue as a solidaristic encounter that is informed by the *sentir-pensar* brought to the fore the uncomfortableness of simultaneously speaking the other and speaking the one, which is a common binary. I felt the authors created, through their dialogue that solidaristic encounter and the metaphor of the meeting-place captured well what that looks like as a methodological practice.

I move to **Helena Liu's reflections for doing anti-racist research**. Helena's writing is, as usual, sharp, direct, and unapologetic (she is definitely not asking for permission!). The chapter makes the point that anti-racist research recognises the existence, diversity, and knowledges of people of colour, proposing ways in which this can be considered. She speaks of the importance of identifying cultural practices that sustain and subvert white power –this is an interesting position that aligns well with many discussions about intersectionality, which continue to advocate for the exploration of systemic oppression, rather than simply describing the oppression (yet again!). Liu relies on much of the work by Stella Nkomo who has banged on about the hegemony of whiteness in MOS as far as many of us can remember. But Liu takes these ideas and injects them with reflexive methodological insight –in particular, her questions are very useful as they offer a concrete way to address the three issues from a perspective that recognises asymmetrical power dynamics between researcher and researched, dynamics of denial, neglect and complicity in invisibility, and the creation of spaces where knowledge is desired and celebrated. In this way, Liu contributes to the problematisation of positionalities, epistememes, and emancipatory and disruptive thinking, which I mentioned at the start.

Devi Vijay's studying precarious lives – the focus on the politics of location, solidarity and vulnerability brought to the fore the idea of situatedness but also the complexity of methodological critique to challenge methodological essentialism. Precarious lives are normally singularised in ways that make it seem as if people have no way and, through our research, we must find ways to save them or solve their individual problem. I like Vijay's reminder that we are dealing with a systemic

problem, a structural problem that arises from our “interdependences with others, our mutual needs and exposures”. In this way, precariousness is not a condition, but it is a location within hierarchies of power where we are all implicated. The critique with which the chapter starts is poignant because it addresses the main flaw with the way we approach knowledge about precariousness –the idea of anti-capitalist, anti-colonial feminist epistemic practice speaks to the importance of a perspective that “takes no prisoners”. Vijay notes that the proposition is neither concessionary, nor reconciliatory or pluralistic. The starting point of interrogation of feminist epistemic practices is that they too engage with existing ideas about knower, subject, and objects, which is also a methodological practice that has been controlled by capitalist thinking. What I consider to be the main offer of this chapter is the roadmap to fracture our thinking about precarious lives from what Vijay calls a radical feminist epistemic perspective, one that attends to politics of location, solidarity and vulnerability. Her piece reminds us that not all precarity is equal so location (which I link to situatedness) is important to recognise unevenness and avoid that “view from nowhere”. The point of solidarity takes us to the idea of “common ontological condition of precarity”, which to me is fundamental to understand the importance of embracing the notion of solidarity in difference. Finally, the call to centre vulnerability as praxis so that we practically recognise how we are implicated in interdependencies and then move to disrupt epistemic practices, suggests to me a different way to understand accountability in knowledge production. Ultimately, it is a radical way to confront our own silences and ellipses.

In these four chapters, I found the authors brought to the fore the intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of subordination, challenges to dominant ideology, commitment to social justice, the centrality of experiential knowledge, and transdisciplinary perspectives, which are the five tenets of CRT (see Solorzano & Yosso, 2002; Yosso & Solorzano, 2005). As I navigate the uncharted territory of trying to continue developing work in the field of work and employment that does not reproduce co-optation and whitewashing of intersectional thinking, I think these chapters speak directly to the methodological possibilities of doing that.

References

- Solorzano, D.G. & Yosso, T.J. (2002) Critical Race Methodology: Counter-Storytelling as an Analytical Framework for Education Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 8 (1): 23-44.
- Yosso, T.J., & Solorzano, D.G. (2005) ‘Conceptualizing a Critical Race Theory in Sociology. In M. Romero and E. Margolis (Eds) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Inequalities* (pp. 117-146). Blackwell Publishing.