



LAPIN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF LAPLAND



University of Lapland

This is a self-archived version of the original article. It may differ somewhat from the publisher's final version, as the self-archived version is typically the accepted author manuscript.

Becoming Fragile

Jutila, Salla; Höckert, Emily; Rantala, Outi

Published in:
Researching with Proximity

DOI:
[10.1007/978-3-031-39500-0_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39500-0_3)

Published: 01.01.2023

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Citation for published version (APA):
Jutila, S., Höckert, E., & Rantala, O. (2023). Becoming Fragile. In O. Rantala, V. Kinnunen, & E. Höckert (Eds.), *Researching with Proximity: Relational methodologies for the Anthropocene* (pp. 43-57). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39500-0_3

Document License
CC BY



Becoming Fragile

Salla Jutila, Emily Höckert^{ORCID}, and Outi Rantala^{ORCID}

Staying proximate with:	Experimenting with personal memory work to create a joint yet fragmented story.
Methodological approach:	Fragility, sensitivity, openness, togetherness-in-difference.
Main concepts:	Recognise and appreciate shared fragilities.
Tips for future research:	Fragile ways of becoming.

S. Jutila (✉) · E. Höckert · O. Rantala
Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lapland, Rovaniemi, Finland
e-mail: salla.jutila@ulapland.fi

E. Höckert
e-mail: emily.hockert@ulapland.fi

O. Rantala
e-mail: outi.rantala@ulapland.fi

© The Author(s) 2024
O. Rantala et al. (eds.), *Researching with Proximity*, Arctic Encounters,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-39500-0_3

We have been writing and revising this chapter with ever-growing feelings of fragility about our common future and security. Concerns about the environmental crisis have been topped with the pandemic and shattered peace in Europe. Times are tense, filled with historical events that will lead to traumatic memories for many. Instead of celebrating strong, omnipotent individuals and heroes, we agree with the Finnish sociologist Kaisa Kuurne (see Viitanen 2022) that these crises reveal the human need to search for security, comfort, and meaning from others.

This text springs from our discussions pondering our roles as tourism researchers and social scientists in the Arctic in the midst of ecological crisis and heated societal discussions. Perpetually, expanding worries about the fragility of our ecological condition have both challenged and encouraged us to seek new perspectives that expand ethics and responsibility to multispecies communities (Engelmann 2019). Quite different from the prevailing approaches to controlling, sustaining, or managing environment, this search has led us to materially and relationally oriented readings that put into question the privileged position of humans as mastering centres of the world (Blanc 2016; Kinnunen 2022). The theoretical foundations of posthumanist and feminist new materialist scholarship disrupt the learnt binaries between human and non-human, culture and nature, making ‘humanity’ a fragile idea as such (Caffo 2017; Umbrello 2018).

Our chapter seeks both comfort and guidance from Nathalie Blanc’s (2016) *Frailty (A Manifesto)*, which suggests reaching towards and counting on fragility as the path to follow. It is, in Blanc’s view, in the moments where we recognise our weaknesses, dependencies, and solidarities—the fragility of life—enable us to gain strength. Blanc’s poetic writing invites us to approach fragility as being akin to a grace that manifests in the ‘moments of weakness that people become aware.’ She writes:

Fragility is the precarious aesthetics of our links and interdependencies. This aesthetic frees itself from the idea of autonomy, and our ties become being/living things. I am, and I grow in the act of transforming myself and my environment. Sensitive aesthetic decisions give meaning to my world. Therefore, on a purely aesthetic level, it is essential to link the individual and the collective, to construct a way of thinking in common.

We wish to use this chapter as an opportunity to become and stay proximate with the idea of fragility as a collective, strengthening, and

innovative space. As all three of us feel at home in the ethnographic tradition of weaving our intimate stories, places, and relations into our writing, we find it exciting to slow down with those moments of weakness that are shaping our research endeavours in the Anthropocene. We approach fragility as a relational notion that can help us to gain new understandings of our entanglements with the more-than-human world and as a vital element of inclusive, sensitive, and careful research orientations. It also merits mentioning that our choice to focus on fragility instead of vulnerability has been, to a large extent, based on our reductive understanding of the latter as a negative condition where one is seen as being en route to harm or violation by the strong, determined, and active (Gilson, 2016; see also Mackenzie et al. 2014). Only later, with the help of our brilliant colleague Veera Kinnunen (e.g., Kinnunen et al. 2021), have we begun to learn how feminist scholarship has been developing more nuanced understandings of vulnerability as a fundamental condition of existence in an interdependent, more-than-human world (Butler 2004; Gilson 2016; Meriläinen et al. 2021). Hence, yesterday's ignorance can be used as a textbook example of living and knowing without certainty in a fragile and fragmented manner (Blanc 2016).

As inspiration for our examination, we use memory recalling, looking back, and writing about our material and embodied experiences as tourism researchers at the University of Lapland. Collective memory work is a methodology focusing on participants and emphasising social meanings and one's own experiences (Fortin et al. 2021, 1; Boluk et al. 2022). The feminist memory-work method (Onyx and Small 2001) highlights the collective construction of memories through sharing, discussing, and theorising about them as a whole instead of concentrating merely on the fragments of individual biographies (Small 2004, 256). Hence, instead of assuming that the researcher narrates neglected experiences that exist prior to the telling, feminist new materialist researchers see that the very process of telling co-constitutes the writer, reader, and focus of the study (Barad 2007; Rosiek and Snyder 2018; Valtonen et al. 2020).

We began our collective memory work by writing about our memories and experiences as researchers. We then invited each other to our stories by reading them aloud and reflecting on the memories jointly. After coming together, we revisited our personal memory works, shared insights, and made some additional remarks on them. Our reflections and analyses were guided by a variety of questions, such as: What does fragility and its acceptance have to offer to research? How does fragility relate to

sensitivity? Is becoming fragile inevitable in situations of multiple crises and emergencies in the Anthropocene? And, most of all, what can we learn about researching-with fragility? Our current answers to these questions were then woven into the following ‘multivocal’ (see Kramvig 2007) and fragmented story about different forms of fragility in our memories. Applying collective memory work on and with fragility thus offered us the chance to experiment with collaborative fragmented writing—that is, a research method that we have started to call a *collective fragility work*.

FRAGILITY AS UNCERTAINTY

During the first reading round, we were looking for similarities and resemblances among all three memories. We found many—despite our different backgrounds and the different stages we are at in our academic careers—that helped us to understand our current experiences with doing research in the Anthropocene. Our very first epiphany was that none of us had originally planned on having a career in academia, nor within tourism:

When I was young, I didn’t even think about an academic career as an option. I thought I should do something more practical, something I was able to do by hand.

Salla

I have never had clear plans about what I want to do or accomplish. I was not interested in an academic career before someone else pointed out that it could be my thing.

Emily

Each of us ended up studying and researching tourism at university by coincidence through convoluted and multifaceted paths, drawn in by practical work experience, vocational tourism studies, or after applying to many different degrees. This lack of planning led to feelings of instability and uncertainty, questions about whether we have made good choices and are in the right positions. Our collective memory work illustrates that, regardless of the stage of our academic careers, this kind of uncertainty, dubiety, and incompleteness continues to be constantly present in our work, always taking on new forms. Although the reasons behind our feelings of fragmentation vary, the scale of the emotions appeared to be similar:

I have no idea where I belong. This is a fundamental challenge in my research making. On the one hand, I don't even want to belong anywhere, but on the other hand, it would be much easier to have a clear mission, ambition, and aim to move towards. And for sure it would be easier and more consistent to go down the path together with a research community sharing similar viewpoints and ambitions.

Salla

At the University of Lapland, tourism research is situated in the Faculty of Social Sciences, and the three of us all specialise in tourism, which we have combined with sociology, environmental social sciences, cultural history, geography, and international relations research. At other universities, tourism research is often categorised in business schools or geography departments. It could be said that tourism research is multidisciplinary at its origin, which can be both a strength and something that renders it fragmented:

Who has the right to decide what knowledge is good knowledge, what the right way to do research is, what kind of research is scientific, high quality, or critical enough? There is always a person at a higher level—a more erudite professor, a better-known international researcher, a better acquainted doctoral student, a more engaged leader—that has the power to define what is good and enough. This is something that makes me fragile.

Outi

We began our academic careers with unspoken goals of finding our own strong voices that could overrule our feelings of fragility: that is, to hide all that could be perceived as a lack of sufficient knowledge and experience. Nevertheless, through our memory work, we began to see fragility as a valuable feature to be preserved throughout our academic careers:

I have gained confidence that things will work out even though you have no idea what you are doing or where it will get you. In fact, this is a quite good start for open-minded and honest research. It can also be seen as an ability to shape one's thinking and not to be afraid of new knowledge that challenges that which was previously learned.

Emily

Our three writings sparked a discussion about how researchers' work is like that of artists or novelists: it requires personal engagement and thus exposes the personal to the public gaze and critique. Recognising our common experiences of fragility enabled us to engage with the arts of imagination and speculative thinking (see Haraway 2016). What we have also come to realise is that overlooking or hiding our fragility might risk the loss of our common creativity, increasing our feelings of stress and even opening us up to extreme embodied experiences of fragmentation. Here, our *collective fragility work* as a research approach enabled us to sense the grace of recognising our shared fragility. We could also easily agree with Blanc's (2016) suggestion that 'the more we grow, ripen, age, the more the sense of fragility increases.'

FRAGILITY IN THE DAMAGED WORLD

Planetary concern is another common thread in our stories—a concern that, at times, transforms into anxiety:

Does my research and the knowledge I'm creating through my research have any significance in solving these enormous challenges? What if I'm producing knowledge that is unethical or harmful from some viewpoints?
Salla

As Timothy Morton (2016) has put it, the climate crisis is a hyperobject that has entered everything and is all over the place. Our personal memories reveal this concern as a background factor, maybe a subconscious one, that drives us to and within our academic work in the field of tourism. The crisis forces us to think, sense, imagine, and act differently. Not least, it challenges us to do our research in various ways and engage with new areas of knowledge production yet unknown to us.

Does it help anything that I'm trying to define my own viewpoint to problematise within this crisis? Where to stick, what to do, how to do it, what is directing my decisions? Would it be more natural for me to read and listen to thoughts and knowledge created by other researchers, to be the one who acts and does something concrete about this crisis based on the knowledge created by sagacious academics?
Salla

The overreaching damage of the ecological change reveals the fragility of human existence in unforeseen ways. Here in the north we are not living on an island soon to be covered by the sea, nor do we fear that our houses will be swept away by a tropical storm, yet even so we live with colossal, uncomfortable, ever-growing concerns that make us feel fragile. We are facing warmer and shorter winters and more cloudy weather, both of which impact the tourism industry that is currently focused on winter experiences and the northern lights. Living with the warming climate (which is estimated to warm up four times faster in the Arctic—e.g., Rantanen et al. 2022) generates a sense of urgency, a need to act. At the same time, we all hesitate over how we should speak about the fragility of ecological systems with our children while maintaining their feelings of safety, hope, and continuity.

Epistemologically and methodologically speaking, the ecological crisis challenges us to confess, in a radical break from positivism, that we do *not* know. In fact, despite having access to various methods of measuring the accelerating change, nobody really knows what is to come (Morton 2016). This admission reveals the fragility of our knowledge systems and requires us to find new ways of knowing that are not based on certainty (Blanc 2016):

I think that this moment of deep confusion in the middle of my PhD research made me simultaneously fragile and strong. It was an epiphany to be able to do this simultaneously: to find strength by embracing fragility and uncertainty.

Emily

On a very basic level, we must continue with the act of looking out and creating connections with the unfamiliar world in crisis, despite—or, even more, *because of*—the fact it can reveal our fragility. Our stories are aligned with a strong desire to turn our gazes out from our human-centred selves and reflect upon the symbiotic entanglements between us (see Haraway 2016; West et al. 2021). In the book *Arts of living on a damaged planet*, Heather Swanson et al. (2017, M3) encourage us to engage in common learning through multiple practices of knowing to study the conditions of liveability in these dangerous times. In Swanson et al.'s (2017, M8) words, 'The co-species survival requires arts of imagination as much as scientific specifications.' They question the idea of a world composed by individuals with distinct bodies and interests

(Swanson et al. 2017), underlining the importance of symbiotic makings as the beginning of ‘staying with the trouble’ (Haraway 2016). They locate one of the difficulties of our times in the fragility of these symbioses that make life possible (Swanson et al. 2017, M5):

The new materialist approach and relational ontology go hand in hand with my own worldview and my values. It feels good to stay in these discussions when climate change or loss of biodiversity depress me. These discussions create a framework in which I feel safe and comfortable. However, doing research within this framework feels challenging.

Salla

Heather Swanson et al. (2017, M7) suggest starting from noticing both lively and destructive connections: landscapes of entanglements, bodies with other bodies, and time with other times. This process means cultivating a curiosity that enables us to notice the strange and wonderful without the desire for conquest or to fully know the ‘other’ (see also Levinas 1969). Along the lines of *noticing*, Anna Tsing et al. (2017) encourage us to listen for different modes of storytelling, including the quiet ones whispered in small encounters. This act can mean, without any limitations, listening to and learning the stories of stones, ants, lichens, blueberries, and fellow researchers not used to sharing their hopes and fears. That is, it is listening with curiosity, wonder, openness, and care to the unfamiliar and the troubling.

TOGETHERNESS-IN-DIFFERENCE

Doing research together with a research community or multiple communities was raised in our reflective discussion as one possible answer to the concerns and anxieties presented above. Togetherness in research-making, being-with and researching-with multispecies research communities, both relieves and requires fragility. In the best possible scenario, togetherness creates hope and strength, but it also requires openness, understanding, acceptance, and appreciation of difference. However, noticing and recognising only what is already known blocks us from attuning to worlds otherwise (Gan et al. 2017, G10). We should thus not focus only on the similarities among our stories but have the courage to stay proximate with fragile alterity (see also Harrison 2008).

In order to recognise the ambivalences and diversity of our experiences, we continued our memory work by also sensitising ourselves to the differences in our stories (see, e.g., Irni 2013). First, we acknowledged that our personal writing styles and ways of documenting our memories varied quite substantially. Our personal memories about our experiences as tourism researchers could be written as an exploratory reflection based on hesitant questions, asking where I am now and how I ended up here. It could also be based on the steady, subjective experience of understanding fragility as strength. This kind of memory could even be written by picking out the most fragile parts and dimensions of an advanced academic career and reflecting on them through different academic discourses. Recognising our diverse writing styles opened our eyes to see that, despite the fact we have experienced and handled fragility within our research paths differently, our emotions are similar. We came to realise how comfortable we feel in our current research team, where we listen each other with openness and respect without hurrying to understand and ‘know’ the other:

John Law and John Urry argue in one of their articles that as researchers we should ask what kind of realities we want to create—maybe it is a question of whether we would like to live in a future with clear borders and limits, where we all can fit in statistics—or do we need a different world?

Outi

We also distinguished that our writings differ in terms of methodological and theoretical experience. We have divergent concerns depending on how ‘entrenched’ we are in feminist and new materialist discussions:

I’m now involved in a book project that is heavily shaking research traditions and methodological traditions. I have hardly adopted different methodologies and methods of analysis, the ‘parts’ of which qualitative research is traditionally thought to consist, and now I’m rummaging all these around. Do I have competence in this?

Salla

According to the Finnish National Board of Research Integrity, research informants should have the right to withdraw themselves at any time from the research. When moving into times of post-qualitative methods, it is far from simple to follow this kind of conduct. Feelings of fragility arise—Am

I enacting responsible conduct for the research that I'm committed to in terms of project applications and as a researcher at the university?

Outi

Noting the divergences in our academic experiences made us ask whether it is necessarily desirable to find a restricted academic community, a certain discussion to which one belongs. Instead, might it be preferable to avoid adhering too strongly to particular research community or academic discourse in order to retain and strengthen one's openness towards both human and non-human others?

Despite my new appreciation of fragility, I have struggled when encountering those who do not share this kind of approach. I remember many moments when I have been hurt or shocked—and after that, being disappointed in my reaction of being hurt or shocked. In other words, I have felt unwanted fragility in situations when my way of being and doing research has been questioned.

Emily

As a researcher, it is common to be part of communities that share similar values and approaches to research. In our case, this tendency could mean finding a research community accepting and appreciating of fragility that shares a common understanding about it. However, when writing about inclusion and togetherness in research-making in the Anthropocene, it is rather contradictory to think that we should stay with researchers who are nice and easy to be around and research with. Excluding and avoiding those who contradict our own viewpoints is anything but inclusive. Besides, romanticising fragility may misguide us towards seeing fragility only as beautiful, an ability enabling connection with others. This softening creates safe environment, but it excludes opportunities to share and understand contrary thoughts, worldviews, and values.

Moreover, fragility can be far from beautiful, as it may also cause feelings that hurt the researcher. There has been discussion about the dangers of requiring the opening of one's wounds for the sake of authentic research (see Liboiron 2021; Tuck 2009). Personal pain should certainly not be an indicator of good research. Thus, we cannot demand anyone to expose their fragility, but rather ask acceptance and appreciation for it:

How could we try ourselves to produce that type of research where fragility and sensitivity are required—without despising those others who may not yearn for it? How do we build connections, discussion between these factions?

Outi

Our memory work likewise brought up issues related to comparison and competition. For instance, is it better or more effective to illustrate our results as figures and facts or to develop narratives that illustrate contemporary problems and possible solutions well? We have practiced coexisting with conflicts and contradictory thoughts and understandings (see also Hiquet et al. 2021). We feel petty, to be caught up in valuing diverse presentation formats for our results: Should we not aim to overcome the competition and work together?

Instead of raising our defences, we could react with an urge to understand the other and oneself. All standpoints are valuable, even though we would hold different worldviews. All research produces important knowledge, even though the ways of producing would differ greatly. All knowledge is needed, even the small pieces I produce. It is an important piece of a complex entity.

Salla

COLLECTIVE FRAGILITY WORK

Our memory work and theoretical readings revealed the messy relations and to some extent inseparability between the notions of fragility, vulnerability, and sensitivity. One reason for this complexity might derive from the ways these notions, and their connotations, intertwine within our native language, Finnish, as anthonyms to conventional ideas of physical or mental strength. Whereas both fragility and vulnerability can be translated in Finnish as *haavoittuvuus* and *särkyvyys*, vulnerability and sensitivity have a shared meaning of *herkkyys*. Along the way, we recognised how we all kept drawing attention to the importance of *herkkyys*, sensitivity, in our relations with multiple others while also being sensitive to ourselves. Our shared understanding of sensitivity seems to boil down to acknowledging the needs and emotions of the other and engaging with diversity and difference with curiosity and care (see also Irni 2013; Viken et al. 2021). The concept presupposes an emotional side as well; one that

has traditionally been overlooked or belittled in the academic community, which celebrates the solid, convincing, and unbreakable individual.

Denying our fragility as researchers means howling down our unconscious and embodied experiences of contempt, fear, shame, or joy. If we have begun to understand fragility—along with sensitivity and vulnerability—as a way of becoming and being, could it even become a shared strength in our academic work (Irni 2013)? A superpower derived from being deeply moved by others and appreciating the feelings that guide our work—to feel strong empathy, both for and from others? If we were able to embrace our fragility and uncertainty, to put into words what being means to us and how we practice it, we could make visible our caring and hesitant role in the world. Could acknowledging one's own fragilities and highlighting that they are shared by others be the key to approaching relational becoming—being and living in the damaged world and engaging in research from these premises?

Being and becoming fragile with colleagues may help researchers to become fragile and recognise fragility in other contexts, including with other proximate human and more-than-human beings. We suggest that the *collective fragility work* approach can allow us to experience proximate togetherness with all surrounding beings. With this thought, we would like to emphasise the collective nature of academic work, as its importance to research is seldom appreciated enough.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Blanc, Nathalie. 2016. Frailty (A Manifesto). New materialism: How matter comes to matter. <https://newmaterialism.eu/almanac/f/frailty.html>. Accessed 26 April 2022.
- Boluk, Karla, Brendan Paddison, and Johan Edelman. 2022. A collective memory work reflection on planning and pivoting to a virtual TEF111 conference. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism* 22 (1): 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2022.2029669>.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. London: Verso.
- Caffo, Leonardo. 2017. *Fragile umanità*. Giulio Einaudi Editore.
- Engelmann, Sebastian. 2019. Kindred spirits: Learning to love nature the posthuman way. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 53: 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.12379>.

- Fortin, Kendra, Chris Hurst, and Bryan Grimwood. 2021. Land, settler identity, and tourism memories. *Annals of Tourism Research* 91: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103299>.
- Gan, Elaine, Anna Tsing, Heather Swanson, and Nils Bubandt. 2017. Introduction: Haunted landscapes of the Anthropocene. In *Arts of living in the damaged planet*, ed. Elaine Gan, Anna Tsing, Heather Swanson, and Nils Bubandt, 1–15. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt1qft070.20>.
- Gilson, Erinn. 2016. Vulnerability and victimization: Rethinking key concepts in feminist discourses on sexual violence. *Signs Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 42 (1): 71–98. <https://doi.org/10.1086/686753>.
- Haraway, Donna. 2016. *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Harrison, Paul. 2008. Corporeal remains: Vulnerability, proximity, and living on after the end of the world. *Environment and Planning* 40 (2): 423–445. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a391>.
- Hiquet, Rose, Claude Bühler, and Ilona Stirnimann. 2021. Building sufficient structures together: An ecofeminist illustrated essay on conducting change towards more equality in farming. Peaceful Coexistence Colloquium, December 2021.
- Irni, Sara. 2013. Kun jälkistrukturalismi kohtaa luonnontieteistä inspiroituneen uusmaterialismin: Herkän luennan harjoitus. *Naistutkimus* 26 (4): 5–16.
- Kinnunen, Veera. 2022. Corporeal ethics in the more-than-human world (Rosalyn Diprose). In *Affect in organization and management*, ed. Carolyn Hunter and Nina Kivinen, 92–107. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003182887>.
- Kinnunen, Veera, Sandra Wallenius-Korkalo, and Päivi. Rantala. 2021. Transformative events: Feminist experiments in writing differently. *Gender, Work and Organization* 28 (2): 656–671.
- Kramvåg, Britt. 2007. Flerstedlig og flerstemt – som situeringsforsøk i lokalsamfunnsstudier. In *I Disiplinens Grenseland: Tverrfaglighet i Teori og Praksis*, ed. Torill Nyseth, Svein Jentoft, Anniken Førde, and Jorgen Ole Børenholdt, 59–72. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Liboiron, Max. 2021. *Pollution is colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mackenzie, Catriona, Wendy Rogers, and Susan Dodds, eds. 2014. *Vulnerability: New essays in ethics and feminist philosophy*. New York: Oxford Academic.
- Meriläinen, Susan, Anu Valtonen, and Tarja Salmela. 2021. Vulnerable relational knowing that matters. *Gender, Work and Organization* 29 (1): 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12730>.

- Morton, Timothy. 2016. *Dark ecology*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Onyx, Jenny, and Jennie Small. 2001. Memory-work: The method. *Qualitative Inquiry* 7 (6): 773–786. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700608>.
- Rantanen, Mika, Alexey Karpechko, Antti Lipponen, Kalle Nordling, Otto Hyvärinen, Kimmo Ruosteenoja, Timo Vihma, and Ari Laaksonen. 2022. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Communications Earth & Environment* 3: 168. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43247-022-00498-3>.
- Rosiek, Jerry, and Jimmy Snyder. 2018. Narrative inquiry and new materialism: Stories as (not necessarily benign) agents. *Qualitative Inquiry* 26 (10): 1151–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800418784326>.
- Small, Jenny. 2004. Memory-work. In *Qualitative research in tourism: Ontologies, epistemologies, methodologies*, ed. Lisa Goodson and Jenny Phillimore, 255–272. London: Routledge.
- Swanson, Heather, Anna Tsing, Nils Bubandt, and Elaine Gan. 2017. Introduction: Bodies tumbled into bodies. In *Arts of living on a damaged planet: Ghosts and monsters of the Anthropocene*, ed. Anna Tsing, Heather Swanson, Elaine Gan, and Nils Bubandt, 1–13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt1qft070.18>.
- Tsing, Anna, Heather Swanson, Elaine Gan, and Nils Bubandt, eds. 2017. *Arts of living on a damaged planet*. University of Minnesota Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt1qft070>.
- Tuck, Eve. 2009. Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review* 79 (3). <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>.
- Umbrello, Steven. 2018. Posthumanism: A fickle philosophy? *Posthumanism: Current State and Future Research* 2 (1): 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.28984/ct.v2i1.279>.
- Valtonen, Anu, Tarja Salmela, and Outi Rantala. 2020. Living with mosquitoes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 83: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102945>.
- Viitanen, Kaisa. 2022. Sosiologi Kaisa Kuurne: ‘On aika lopettaa rationaalisen ihmisen palvominen’ – Nyt tarvitaan toivoa, ymmärrystä ja kohtaamista. *Apu*, April 25, 2022. <https://www.apu.fi/artikkelit/ihmiset-uupuvat-nyt-tarvitaan-toivoa-sosiologi-kaisa-kuurne?fbclid=IwAR3pkrKWNHJdy6Ps20mKd4Zh-tH6EVAruhOqPJR9iiGbwbRSUICuwEuIMCE>. Accessed 29 March 2023.
- Viken, Arvid, Emily Höckert, and Bryan Grimwood. 2021. Cultural sensitivity: Engaging difference in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 89: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2021.103223>.
- West, Simon, Lisbeth Jamila Haider, Sanna Stålhammar, and Stephen Woroniecki. 2021. A relational turn for sustainability science? Relational thinking, leverage points and transformations. *Ecosystems and People* 16 (1): 304–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2020.1814417>.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

