Call for Papers

Responsibility and Accountability in a Digital Era:

Do collective and artificial intelligences change the deal?

10th Organizations, Artifacts and Practices (OAP) Workshop

#OAP2020

When: June, 25th-26th 2020[1]

Where: San Francisco, California (USA), OAP workshop at ICSI (University of California, Berkley) and pre-OAP at Stanford University

In partnership with: PSL, Université Paris Dauphine (DRM), ESSEC Business School, emlyon business school and University of Berkley (ICSI).

Co-chairs

Pierre Laniray (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine)	**Juho Lindman** (Stanford University)
Dekai Wu (University of California, Berkley)	**Philippe Monin** (emlyon business school)
Julien Malaurent (ESSEC)	**Nathalie Mitev** (Kings College London)
François-Xavier de Vaujany (PSL université Paris-Dauphine and New York University)	

---

[1] We will oranize a pre-event (June, 23rd-24th) that will consist in a learning expedition and a set of opening events at Stanford University.

Theme and objectives of OAP 2020

In recent years, the development of Artificial Intelligence systems coupled with the fast expansion of monitoring technologies have highlighted the dangers inherent to automated (social) rating systems, in particular potentially racist, sexist, and any other discriminatory biases, embedded in immersive technologies. It led to inappropriate behaviors from customers, employees and society at large.

In November 2018, France discovered how a simple yellow vest could be turned into a powerful symbol. After a decision to increase fuel tax, the first "gilets jaunes" protests emerged. They started on social media before becoming visible on the streets. Everywhere in France, the "gilets jaunes" expressed their anger. Events have since taken a dramatic turn in larger cities, such as Paris.

On November 21, 2018, Carlos Ghosn, CEO of the Renault-Nissan alliance, was placed under arrest. Nissan explained that "over many years" Ghosn had been under-reporting compensation amounts to the Tokyo Stock Exchange securities report.

What do these events have in common? They all epitomize, we contend, a pressing concern for our society, namely the extension of responsibility. Beyond the judiciary sphere, we contend that the spatial and temporal extension of responsibility in a digital era is a key issue for managers, politicians and activists alike.

A possible way to analyze this issue of responsibility lies in the work of the French philosopher Paul Ricœur who delved into the question of responsibility (see "The concept of responsibility: an attempt at semantic analysis"). In the French civil law, responsibility is understood as the obligation to repair a damage caused by someone who will be judged guilty of the damage caused. In the French penal law, responsibility is the obligation to face the corresponding punishment. Being responsible thus amounts to submitting oneself to both these obligations. This is premised on a key assumption (for "imputing") related to the author of an action, namely their knowledge of the law… "Nul n'est censé ignorer la loi". In turn, this implies distinguishing between free (based on free will) and natural (beyond free will) causes; "Then only, freedom and imputability coincide" (Ricœur, 1994, p. 34).

Extending these philosophical issues, the stress on the possibility (in the French civil law) of "fault" introduces a new scenario. One can be responsible, but not guilty (this is the famous "responsible but not guilty" pronounced by Georgina Dufoix in the 1990s). As such, the subjective link between an action and its author requires a systematic discussion. One could know or not, be aware or not… Alterity and the problem of solidarity with others (in particular vulnerable people) also enter the equation.

Importantly, responsibility is about time and space. On that point, Ricœur notes a major shift in the judiciary interpretation of responsibility: "An unlimited extension of the scope of responsibility, the future vulnerability of a man and its environment becoming the main focal point of a responsible concern. By scope, we mean the extension, both spatial and temporal, given to the notion of effects of our actions." (1994, p. 44). Surely, in a world made of digital infrastructures, small and big organisations, collective and artificial intelligence, the perspective opened by Ricœur is fascinating. It goes well beyond corporate social responsibility (CSR) and most questions related to "traditional" business ethics. The scope of acts is more than ever extended in the past and the future; imputing responsibility is both highly retrospective and

prospective. The ways in which our society has changed since the 90's (when Ricœur wrote his piece on responsibility) make this point even more urgent.

Algorithms or chatbots do not distinguish between "good" and "bad" people, good and bad comments, and so on. They are managed by people and other software. In what context does an inappropriate behavior occur? Who and "what" should be blamed for it? What is our responsibility as citizens? Should we judge just the sentences produced today? Should we remove the tool and punish the people who fed the system with bad and inappropriate behaviors, with a full knowledge of what they did and a knowledge of the law? Should we also impute responsibility to the engineers who opened the door to artificial learning? From a more prospective perspective, shouldn't we also blame the companies investing massively in AI and performing more and more the idea of autonomous intelligence? Where should we stop this assemblage of people and things in our responsibility-focused narration? The more we retrospectively and prospectively dig into our present and the more it seems interwoven with automats and technologies.

This is also epitomized by the recent social movement of the 'Yellow vests' in France. This movement, which largely emerged in and by means of social media, is a complex assemblage of people, heterogeneous slogans, deep frustration and despair. There are obviously many micro-organizations inside Facebook and people sharing roles offline, on the street, at crossroads, and in the streets. But as suggested by Valiorgue and Roulet, the movement remains largely disorganized, more or less purposefully. We see again here a very interesting, troubling issue: nobody is responsible for the worst. A member of the 'yellow vests' protest, often invited on TV shows, recently said: "I am not responsible", just before explaining that next Saturday awful things may happen. But how can a social movement become political without being responsible? And the argument is 'reversible': the French president and the government claim a kind of irresponsibility. No roles in front, no legitimate spokespersons, so no legitimate dialog. Indeed, the yellow vests movement is particularly intriguing and probably very different to our two other examples. Less technological than the chatbots, less organized than the Ghosn story, yet much more visible and interwoven with moral sources of responsibility than both of them.

Ricœur's invitation to explore responsibility is fascinating, because it paves the way to the exploration of key questions for management and collective activity. It opens the door to ontological discussions around the materiality, time and space of the experience of responsibility. We move from the question of *being responsible* to that of *becoming responsible*. Responsibility is continuously produced by assemblages A of assemblages B, thus blurring the boundaries between A and B. How to responsibilise people also becomes a fundamental question. This is the agenda that we suggest to discuss during this unique edition of OAP.

OAP Stanford 2020 is not limited to the theme of responsibility and accountability. Any contribution bringing a material, post-material, ontological view to this (non exhaustive) list of issues is welcome:

- ✓ 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
- ✓ 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
- ✓ Sociomateriality and ontologies
- ✓ Experience of responsibility in the digital era
- ✓ Ethics of and through AI
- ✓ Solidarity and sense of togetherness in a digital world
- ✓ Historical perspectives on cybernetics and digital technologies

OAP 2020 will also welcome submissions on its **traditional topics**: materiality and sociomateriality of management, organizations and organizing, space and time of collective activity, ontologies and ontogenesis, performativity, regulation, managerial techniques, among others.

Scientific committee

Jeremy Aroles (Durham University), Ingrid Erikson (Syracuse University), Ella Hafermalz (VU), Pierre Laniray (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine), Juho Lindman (Stanford University), Julien Malaurent (ESSEC), Elisa Mattarelli (UNIMORE), Nathalie Mitev (King's College London), Philippe Monin (EM Lyon), Sytze Kingma (VU), Patricia Thornton (University of Texas), François-Xavier de Vaujany (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine and New York University)

Organization committee

Vincent Berthelot (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine), Albane Grandazzi (GEM & Ecole Polytechnique), Ingrid Eriskon (Syracuse University), Pierre Laniray (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine), Juho Lindman (Stanford University), Julien Malaurent (ESSEC), François-Xavier de Vaujany (PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine and New York University). Students of the master 128 of PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine will also be part of the OC.

Submission to OAP 2020

Those interested in participating must submit an extended abstract of no more than 1,000 words on the EasyChair system at this address: https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=oap2020

The 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 February, 3rd 2020. Authors will be notified of the committee's decision by February, 28th. Contact: workshopoap@gmail.com

Location and registration

OAP 2020 will take place at the University of Berkeley (June, 25th-26th) and at Stanford for our pre-OAP (June, 24th).

Registration will start in early February 2020.

There are **no fees** associated with attending this workshop.

REFERENCES

Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2014). *The ethics of artificial intelligence*. The Cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence, 316, 334.

Bower, K. W. (2000). Ethics and Computing: Living Responsibly in a Computerized World. IEEE Press, 2001.

de Vaujany, FX. and Aroles, J. (2018). Carlos Ghosn, algorithms and 'gilets jaunes': becoming responsible, *The Conversation*, December 2018

de Vaujany, F. X., & Mitev, N. (2017). The post-Macy paradox, information management and organising: Good intentions and a road to hell?. *Culture and Organization*, 23(5), 379-407.

Etzioni, A., & Etzioni, O. (2017). "Incorporating ethics into artificial intelligence". *The Journal of Ethics*, 21(4), 403-418.

Introna, L. D. (2009). "Ethics and the speaking of things". *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(4), 25-46.

Introna, L. D. (2002). "The (im)possibility of ethics in the information age". *Information and organization*, 12(2), 71-84.

Jonas, H. (1973). "Technology and responsibility: Reflections on the new tasks of ethics". *Social Research*, 31-54.

Lindgreen, A., Swaen, V., & Johnston, W. J. (2009). Corporate social responsibility: An empirical investigation of US organizations. *Journal of business ethics*, 85(2), 303-323.

Malaurent, J., & Avison, D. (2017). Reflexivity: A third essential 'R' to enhance interpretive field studies. *Information & Management*, 54(7), 920-933.

Martin, K. E., & Freeman, R. E. (2004). "The separation of technology and ethics in business ethics". *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53(4), 353-364.

Nonaka, I., Chia, R., Holt, R., & Peltokorpi, V. (2014). Wisdom, management and organization. *Management Learning,* 45(4), pp. 365–376

Pangaro, P. (2011). Invitation to recursioning: Heinz von Foerster and cybernetic praxis. *Cybernetics and Human Knowing*, 18(3-4), 139-142.

Ricoeur, P. (1994). « Le concept de responsabilité: essai d'analyse sémantique ». *Esprit* (1940-), 28-48.

Ricoeur, P. (2003). « Responsabilité et fragilité ». *Autres Temps*, 76(1), 127-141.

Wiener, N. (1950). *The Human Use of Human Beings*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt