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‘Responsibilisation’ refers to the process by which individuals or specific groups are made responsible of certain societal issues, often by shifting the burden from larger societal structures, such as the State to individuals or communities (Shamir, 2008). This concept is closely linked to neoliberalism, which in its turn emphasises free market, deregulation, limited government intervention and thus, individual responsibility (Carvalho and Rodrigues, 2006; Wood, 1997).

The concept of ‘responsibilisation’ has been criticised and challenged for various reasons by scholars and policy makers. Recent studies have criticised equality regulations within the neoliberal regimes and propose alternatives (Vincent et al. 2024). Neoliberal regimes rely on the principles of free markets and de-regulations, tend to increase and reproduce global inequalities, rather than eliminating them ([Stiglitz, 2012](https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.brunel.ac.uk/reader/content/18d42652ea4/10.1177/09500170231217660/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml?hmac=1706268022-KpxpyAwhW7eqY350EDVWy2QwsNJmAm9Pylt%2FE651tmA%3D#bibr104-09500170231217660)). By individualising responsibilities, there is a risk of neglecting the role of the political, economic and social structures, that promote to these disparities. For instance, in the UK context, the Disability Discrimination Act (1995) made employers legally responsible for making reasonable adjustments to accommodate workers with disabilities (Esping-Anderson, 2015 ). However, some employers were unprepared to take on these responsibilities, while others overemphasised the business case, echoing the neoliberal stance. As a result, Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) policies have been created without implementing necessary regulations (Dickens, 1999; Jonsen at al. 2013; Vincent et al. 2023).

The ‘moralisation’ of market, developed under the neoliberal regime, has given rise to the practice of ‘responsibilisation’ as ‘a call of action,’ a government technique which encourages individuals to take certain dispositions (Shamir, 2008). Consequently, we observe the proliferations of social movements ([Soytemel, 2013](https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.brunel.ac.uk/reader/content/18d42652ea4/10.1177/09500170231217660/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml?hmac=1706268022-KpxpyAwhW7eqY350EDVWy2QwsNJmAm9Pylt%2FE651tmA%3D" \l "bibr103-09500170231217660)) and solidarity initiatives ([Daskalaki, 2017](https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.brunel.ac.uk/reader/content/18d42652ea4/10.1177/09500170231217660/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml?hmac=1706268022-KpxpyAwhW7eqY350EDVWy2QwsNJmAm9Pylt%2FE651tmA%3D" \l "bibr30-09500170231217660); [Meliou,2020](https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.brunel.ac.uk/reader/content/18d42652ea4/10.1177/09500170231217660/format/epub/EPUB/xhtml/index.xhtml?hmac=1706268022-KpxpyAwhW7eqY350EDVWy2QwsNJmAm9Pylt%2FE651tmA%3D#bibr77-09500170231217660)), that represented social demands, although structure inequalities still persist. For instance, in the aftermath of social disasters, it is common to witness public and charity organisations providing support, while the government actions remain inconsistent. Social disasters are not random, and often result from social, political and economic structures. Consequently, disrupted communities face difficulties in recovering without a structural support (Rodriguez and Barnshaw, 2006).

The stream encourages the submission of papers that explore current challenges related to EDI using the lens of ‘responsibilisation’ and offer new alternative solutions. The stream welcomes both empirical and theoretical papers, with an emphasis on inter-disciplinary research.
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