

# MATERIAL STORYTELLING - LEARNING AS INTRA-ACTIVE BECOMING

Professor Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen, Aalborg University, Department of Learning and Philosophy, Sohngårdsholmsvej 2, DK-9000 Aalborg, Phone: +4530623009, Email: [kmj@learning.aau.dk](mailto:kmj@learning.aau.dk)

Assistant Professor Anete M. Camille Strand, Aalborg University, Department of Communication and Psychology, NORDKRAFT Kjellerups Torv, DK-9000 Aalborg, Phone: +4551719587, Email: [astrand@hum.aau.dk](mailto:astrand@hum.aau.dk)

## INTRODUCTION

Karen Barad's post-humanist agential realist account of mattering (Barad, 2007) has far reaching implications for understanding intentionality, memory, and learning in organizations. We argue for a diffractive methodology of material storytelling as a supplement and alternative to narrative and storytelling approaches to organizational learning. This is accomplished by considering human beings as material-discursive of-the-world becomings rather than narrative beings or historical-discursive constructions.

We define our approach to storytelling as iterative intra-active 'living stories' (Boje, Jørgensen & Strand 2013). Living story is in a time, a place of collectively lived participation with the world that is here and now (e.g. Jørgensen & Boje, 2010). Living stories are stories-in-the-making and an ingrained part of the theatre of action. It is a performative, enacted and embodied material way of being that is a part of identity in-the-making including "gender-in-the-making" (Barad 2007, p. 87), as well as race-in-the-making and class-in-the-making. Living stories are 'material stories' in the sense of being made up of material-discursive (re)storying actions in organizations (Strand 2012, p. 46).

Organizational learning is thus seen as changes in the living relationalities that constitute the specific spacetime-matter configurations that at any moment and in any situation make up the organization. 'Spacetime-matter' highlights here the inevitably entangled state of multiple spatial, temporal and material dimensions that configure performativity in organizations and at the same time are results and governing forces of what people do.

It implies further that material storytelling relocates learning from what takes place in the human mind to what takes place in here-and-now performances. Focus is in other words relocated from conceptual thinking towards everyday practices, which are seen not seen as the results of human or discursive agency only but are seen as the results of diffractive interferences of the material and the discursive and where spatial and material dimensions also have agency.

This leads to a third implication, which is that learning does not take place through reflection or reflexivity but is the result of a diffractive process in the here-and-now moment of becoming. While reflection and reflexivity are human-bound concepts and emphasizes processes of the human mind, diffraction gives a more adequate varied and complex insight into what creates learning, and it thus opens up other ways of designing learning processes in organizations.

This is the fourth implication, which is an argument for a multimodal approach to organizational learning. Instead of relying on oral or written language alone, a material storytelling invites us to play with the apparatus of the whole situation and in particular to integrate spatial, material and bodily dimensions in designing the learning process.

The article develops the methodology of material storytelling in five steps.

**First**, key notions of storytelling in organizations are presented. Intentions are to specify some initial considerations regarding what characterizes storytelling including material storytelling as a textual field.

**Second**, we position material storytelling as a third approach different from a narrative approach and a historical-discursive approach to storytelling and organizational learning. As a part of this positioning these two latter approaches are presented and discussed at some length here.

**Third**, the notion of material storytelling is developed from Karen Barad's work. We argue that material storytelling is special here in that stories are seen as co-configured through the entangled state of agencies of bodies, artifacts and spaces. It has dramatic consequences for our conception of organizational learning because terms like memory, intentionality, learning etc. are conceptualized as something that do not belong to individuals but instead are seen as embedded and embodied in the apparatus of the whole situation.

**Fourth**, we draw out the implications of a material storytelling approach to organizational learning. We argue that the move towards material storytelling implies a decentering of the human subject as the source of learning. Importantly this implies a movement from focusing on reflection and reflexivity towards a diffractive approach to organizational learning where focus is relocated from the human mind to the apparatus of the whole situation. We also argue that even if human beings are decentered, the approach is definitely not anti-human but rather implies another way of thinking about ethics.

## STORYTELLING IN ORGANIZATIONS

In a discussion of the philosophical implications of Michael Frayn's play 'Copenhagen', - about Werner Heisenberg's controversial visit to Niels Bohr in Copenhagen in occupied Denmark in 1941 - Karen Barad makes the following remark based on Bohr's indeterminacy principle as opposed to Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.

'...in Bohr's account intentionality cannot be taken for granted: intentions are not preexisting determinate mental states of individual human beings....attending to the complex material conditions needed to specify 'intentions' in a meaningful way prevents us from assuming that 'intentions' are (1) preexisting states of mind, and (2) properly assigned to individuals. Perhaps intentionality might better be understood as attributable to a complex network of human and non-human agents, including historically specific sets of material conditions that exceed the traditional notion of the individual. Or perhaps it is less that there is an assemblage of agents that there is an entangled state of agencies' (Barad 2007, pp. 22-23).

This part highlights some important principles of her post-human agential-realist account of mattering. Accordingly intentionality cannot be properly assigned to individuals. Intentionality is better understood as attributable to a complex network of human and non-human agents. These are not to be thought of as an assemblage of agents but rather as an entangled state of agencies. Implications in relation to organizational learning are far reaching. When we cannot assign intentionality to individuals, we cannot assign memory or learning to individuals.

Accordingly we are not in charge of organizations as if organizational practices first erupt in the human mind and then materialize and congeal. Rather organizations are material-discursive sites of engagement, where our actions are results of complex intra-actions of historical, spatial and material dimensions, and where the individual and collective melt together and dissolve each other as separate entities. They are entangled with one another, which for Barad does not mean to be intertwined with another but that that they lack an independent self-contained existence. What we refer to as individuals or organizations emerge through and as part of their entangled intra-relation; they are not pre-existing entities.

Barad's argument is complex and has implications for many different scientific research areas. Here we will relate her work to our fields of interests, which are storytelling and organizational learning. More specifically we will develop the term 'material storytelling' by reading storytelling theory and Karen Barad's agential realist account through one another and draw the implications in relation to organizational learning. What emerges is an intra-active account of storytelling where learning becomes the results of living restorying actions that emerges from entangled states of human and non-human agencies.

It implies attending to this complex network of historical, material and spatial dimensions in order to account for what organizations know and what and how they learn, and which we have to take into account when we design learning in organizations. For now we will place material storytelling within narrative and storytelling theory and then draw out some positions and their implications for organizational learning.

First of all, we consider material storytelling as material-discursive account of what Bakhtin calls the unique once-occurrent being-as-event (Bakhtin 1993, p. 2). This means that material storytelling emphasizes the spontaneous in-the-now moment performances. It implies the recognition of difference, multiplicity as well as lived experience in the moment of becoming before this performance is stabilized, fixed and reduced in theories, narratives and other accounts of what happened.

Material storytelling is a material-discursive account of Jørgensen & Boje's (2010) term 'living story', which is different from narrative in the sense that the term narrative only comprises particular characteristics of stories. We regard narratives as institutionalized and stiffened story lines that endure over time. To give an example what we mean by narrative we can take organizational learning as a textual field. In an important account of organizational learning, it is seen as eleven competing narratives, which prescribe what organizational learning is, how it should be management and carried out (Gherardi & Nicolini 2001).

These narratives may be seen as an established institutional memory of organizational learning characteristic of one particular academic community upheld by particular more or less shared narratives. They are examples of the stiffening and stabilization of story lines in theories, narratives and other accounts, while the practices of organizational learning are much more complex and at every moment are transformed by many different forces inherent in any situation. Over time these changes will also change organizational learning as a field and how people relate, identify and practice organizational learning.

Storytelling - including material storytelling - is interested in these the spontaneous in-the-now moment performances and in as such interested in the continual reconfiguration of the organizations where extant practices are reproduced, contested, renewed, destroyed or forgotten. Storytelling is interested in the everyday practices of organizations and how they confirm, renew, challenge or destroy established narratives of what the organization is, where it should go to and how it should work in order to fulfill its visions and missions.

Organizations and its strategies, structures, systems, technologies, concepts, rules and regulations are stabilized and fixed storylines – narratives - that serve as important collective memories through which members confirm their own recollections and for them to endure over time (e.g. Santos 2001, p. 165). But organizations are also continuously resisted, contested, reconfigured and renewed at each moment and at very different locations and situations in a play of multiple forces where the organization continuously transforms itself.

While narrative is about continuity within experience, storytelling entails a process of differentiation within continuity (ibid); or it entails processes of dis/continuity, which is the expression used by Strand in her description of material storytelling (Strand 2012). Stories entail narratives but also their contradiction, renegotiation and their renewal or destruction. Storytelling is about the communication of tradition and habit (Brown & Duguid 2001, p. 43) but also about creating something new (e.g. Denning 2007).

It is in this way that storytelling has been considered the means of the oppressed because it implies multiple and contestant voices to established narratives. Tony Morrison considers storytelling as the means of the oppressed against authoritarian language embedded in the rationalist discourse of modernity. This is considered a dead language that thwarts the intellect and suppresses human potential. Such "...oppressive language does more than represent violence; It is violence; does more than represent the limits of knowledge; it limits knowledge" (Morrison in Tally 2001: 17). Storytelling is a resisting force against rationalist language, which according to her has left human kind morally bankrupt (Morrison in Tally 2001, p. 13).

Similarly Walter Benjamin claims that storytelling is a kind of memory different from the rational kinds of communication, namely information, that he claims dominate Western capitalist societies. For him the art of storytelling is coming an end (Benjamin, 1999, p. 83) and what is lost is the ability to exchange experiences (ibid). The art of storytelling is for Benjamin an authentic, natural, spontaneous and locally anchored practice. It implies an ethical commitment, compassion and companionship, which is complete lost in modern rationalistic modes of communication (e.g. Jørgensen, Canal & Klee 2012).

Storytelling is what makes people subjects in the processes of becoming in denoting how the matters of the world are personalized, interiorized and exteriorized as noted by Arendt (1958, p. 50; see also below). More specifically, storytelling denotes processes of subjectification that are simultaneously entangled with processes of desubjectification. We are in other words not advocating for the presence of an independent self but precisely an 'entangled self' configured through multiple entangled material-discursive forces.

The problem is however that the processes of desubjectification according to Agamben have become more powerful in the Modern Age as a consequence of trying to reduce the human body to a political, economic and technological instrument. The dramatic increase in the apparatuses (dispositifs) of our times (a concept Agamben has from Foucault) aimed at the governance and control of performances leaves little room for genuine storytelling.

What we are witnessing instead is an incessant aimless motion of a governmental machine (Agamben 2009, p. 23) implying that societies are undergoing '...massive processes of desubjectification without acknowledging any real subjectification' (ibid, p. 22) except in spectral or larval forms (ibid, p. 21). As such, Agamben believes that contemporary men are among the most docile and cowardly social bodies that have ever existed in human history.

Genuine storytelling requires a subject and is in itself a process of subjectification. Otherwise any kind of performance would be nothing but an 'anonymous murmur' (Agamben

1999, p. 143) – a floating of ‘dead’ performances stripped of from all intentions and will powers. Storytelling reveals the flame of ‘an immemorable ethos’ and goes ‘beyond all biography’ (ibid, pp. 142-143). Nonetheless, storytelling does not take place independently of the apparatuses of our times and the borderlines that it produces between the ‘I’ and the human and non-human other is in a quantum physical sense an illusion in the sense that these ‘cuts’ are only the results of intra-action - they are not pre-existing entities.

By twisting Agamben’s notion of discourse into material-discursive understanding, we can say that storytelling is distinct in the sense that material-discursive apparatuses (e.g. see later) comprise both actual and potential performances – what is actually said and done and what is potentially said and done. As such these apparatuses are inscribed in what is said and done as fragments of memory ‘... that is always forgotten in the act of saying “I”’ (ibid, pp. 143-144) meaning that the material-discursive is inherent to practice even if it is not directly visible or outspoken.

Storytelling is an alternative to the many rational and ‘dead’ narratives that the modern world of knowing has produced of what an organization or a society is, how it should be understood and how it should be improved. It means that people have the capacity for ‘action’, which is not just the name that one attributes to any activity. Rather, it denotes the potentiality of new beginnings in each and every here-and-now moment (Arendt 1958, p. 184). It is based on the fact that plurality is the specific condition of all human life in organizations and elsewhere (ibid, p. 7). For Arendt, action happens and begins with storytelling by which the thoughts of the minds, the passions of the heart and the delights of the senses are transformed, de-privatized and de-individualized (ibid, p. 50).

Storytelling is thus a theory of new beginnings by emphasizing the openness of the moment, the plurality of potential interpretations and the possibility of many different futures. It constitutes a radical theory of organizational learning where the focus is twisted from systems, strategies and structures to storytellers. It is an appreciation of this difference, which is at the heart of storytelling. It implies a focus on the development of people in their specific historical, geographical and material conditions and their relationalities before focusing on systems, structures and organizations.

In the next section we will position material storytelling in the literature by relating it more closely to two other storytelling approaches: one that is grounded in a conception of being as narrative being (experience as narrative); one that is grounded in a conception of being as a historical-discursive construction.

## **THREE APPROACHES TO STORYTELLING AND ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING**

In order to position material storytelling as a third approach to organizational learning, we will sketch the principles of the three methodologies in the table below. It will be followed by a more thorough description of the narrative approach and the historical being-in-discourse approach. The table is inspired by 1) Clarke (2005), who distinguishes between mapping of narrative discourse and mapping of historical discourse but does not go into a material-discursive realm; 2) Taguchi (2010), who develops a Barad-inspired pedagogy and 3) Strand (2012), who takes Barad’s work into the realm of storytelling.

**Table 1 – Three storytelling approaches to organizational learning and their assumptions.**

	<b>Narrative being</b>	<b>Historical being-in-discourse</b>	<b>Material-discursive being-of-the-world</b>
<b>Reality as...</b>	Subjective construction (Interpretive)	Discursive construction (Resituative)	Material-discursive (re)configuration
<b>Learning methodology as...</b>	Reflective	Reflexive	Diffraction
<b>Learning effects...</b>	Learning as changes in experience	Learning as changes in discourse	Learning as reconfiguration of spacetime
<b>Learning as embedded in the...</b>	Mind	Discursive mind	Bodymind
<b>Learning modalities...</b>	Language	Language (discourse)	Language, body, space, materiality (apparatus)
<b>Learning methods</b>	Dialogues	Genealogy, deconstruction	Playing with alternative setups of language, space, materiality, bodies

### **Narrative being**

In arguing for a narrative framework for management ideas, Corbett-Etchevers & Mounoud argues that the central concern of narrative analysis is how the narrative operates as an instrument of the mind in the construction of reality. They build on Bruner and Ricoeur to argue that through the plot seemingly unrelated events are configured to a story with meaning (2001, p. 166). They argue that their framework contributes with an integrative view and in making sense of an enormous amount of data. They also argue that the narrative framework allows for unity as well as multiplicity in the analysis of their particular case, the consumption of management ideas at Cement Inc. (ibid, p. 166).

In many ways this article is representative of a narrative tradition characterized by a search for unity and order through the identification of dominant plots in the organization. In the article four plots of the consumption of management ideas are identified from a huge collection of source material. These four plots give an account of both adopting and using knowledge management at Cement Inc. and of individual and organizational experiences (ibid, p. 165 and p. 169). These four plots are thus considered the unitary essence of the consumption of management ideas in the particular case at hand. It is the synthesis of the heterogeneous.

Their approach is heavily inspired by hermeneutics and in particular the philosophical approach to narrative existence that was promoted by Paul Ricoeur. The idea is that we construct ourselves through narratives of ourselves in a world of other beings, animals, nature

and objects. Narrative is human time and is a condition of human existence (Ricoeur 1984, p. 52). Narratives are created through what Ricoeur calls the power of configuration. This should not be mistaken for how Barad and Haraway use the word configuration (see later). Instead configuration should be understood in a hermeneutical sense as interpretation.

Ricoeur's argument is as follows. The power of configuration – referred to as mimesis<sup>2</sup> in his framework - is the result of intermediary position between the two operations of mimesis<sup>1</sup> (pre-understanding) and mimesis<sup>3</sup> (after-understanding). The relations between mimesis<sup>1</sup>, mimesis<sup>2</sup> and mimesis<sup>3</sup> constitute in this way the dynamics of emplotment, which is the central dynamic in the relations between time (the world) and human time (narrative).

Emplotment thus emerges on the background of a prefigured time that becomes a refigured time through the power of configuration. Narratives are created within a circle of mimesis (Ricoeur 1984, pp. 71-76) where post-understandings lead back to starting points and within that dynamics incorporate pre-understandings of what he calls semantic structures, symbolic resources and temporal characteristics (see also Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje 2004, pp. 270-271).

Plot mediates in three different ways. First, it mediates between individual events and the story as a whole: "...it draws a meaningful story from a diversity of events or incidents (Aristotle's *pragmata*) that it transforms the events or incidents into a story "... In short, emplotment is the operation that draws a configuration out of a single succession (Ricoeur 1984, p. 65)." Secondly, the plot draws together heterogeneous factors such as "... agents, goals, means, interactions, circumstances, unexpected results" (ibid, p. 65). Finally, plot mediates in a third way: "... that of its temporal characteristics. These allow us to call plot, by means of generalization, a synthesis of the heterogeneous" (ibid, p. 66).

When applied to organizational learning the narrative approach focuses on the ways in which organizational stories are transformed into narrative coherence, order and plot. There is an inspiration in Heidegger's idea of Being as a unified consciousness that relates to herself/himself, e.g. Dasein (Østergaard 2012). Being is in this sense a unified narrative whole. It is human-centered in its attempt to describe human time as the center of memory, intentionality and learning.

Further a close relationship between narrative and learning is proposed. Clandinin and Connelly for instance argue that an important criterion for experience is continuity in the sense that experience grows out of past experiences and leads to other experiences: "Wherever one positions oneself in that continuum – the imagined now, some imagined past, or some imagined future – each point has a past experiential base and leads to an experiential future" (2000, p. 2).

Narrative experiences are thus important in the analysis of organizations and can in themselves be a source of resistance to dominant narratives in the organizations thereby creating the conditions for learning and change. Narrative analysis is often in the form of accounting for the narratives experiences present among the actors in organizations. As noted by Clarke, personal narratives often appear to float unanchored of contextual practices but she also notes that this not necessarily the case. In her mapping of narrative discourses, personal narratives are contextualized and situated (Clarke 2005, p. 182) and she argues for situational maps of narrating actors (ibid, pp. 190-194).

We believe that Rhodes & Price (2011, p. 242) is an example of these situational maps. They use narratives to account for the post-bureaucratic experiences of employees in a local government called Nabskville. These are referred to as contrasting narratives of organizational

change (ibid, p. 241) different from the ways this organizational change has been represented by official accounts. Although they argue that these accounts have the ‘antenarrative’ character of being emergent stories that remain open to the dynamics and contradictions of practice – a concept they have from Boje (2001) - their analysis is based on recounted experiences of people, where narrative is considered a representation of an event or series of events (ibid, p. 242).

Their analysis is thus based on what Czarniawska calls narrative rationality (1997, p. 22), which is similar to emplotment based on retrospective sense-making instead of lived experience in the moment. In this way experience becomes portrayed in a more continuous manner than what is probably the case, as we shall argue later. Their article is thus a story of learning, as situated in organizational practice as they call it, and which “...is actually enabled by and reliant on bureaucracy rather than supplanting it” (2011, p. 242).

It is a complex and less unified story different from the official accounts (ibid, p. 248) but nonetheless it seems more to be a story consisting of a plurality of narratives of unified beings rather than taking into account the more dynamic living stories in-the-making. As a unified being, the narratives are ‘sacred’ in the sense that they are not questioned. Implicitly, being is considered as having a relatively solid, unified and continued identity.

In such instances, organizational learning is to bring these narratives into play in organizational rework and thus creating a broader foundation and anchoring in organizational practices. This is empowerment by the relocation of power from the few to the many. In other instances organizational learning is to bring alignment between organizational narratives and the actors’ personal narratives. Here the organization is ‘the higher context’ in the sense that it is the organization’s strategies and goals that are regarded as the true narratives in the organizations.

In both cases though the approach to organizational learning can be characterized as using the past to create a desirable future. This is learning through retrospective sensemaking (e.g. Weick 1995) where the question is what we have learned from the past and how we can learn from the past to create the future. Boje has in this way referred to most organizational strategies as the results of retrospective sensemaking (Boje 2008), which is used to ‘boost’ specific interpretations of the past and ignore others to create a higher degree of consciousness of who we are and where we come from.

It creates a ‘higher’ form of memory and archetypes of “proper identities” in organizations. Retrospective sense-making is thus a way of mirroring present challenges and problems with what has taken place in the past. Therefore organizational learning is accomplished through reflection. They are often very dialogical and participatory in their designs. But as noted the narratives are sacred in the sense that the methodology applied does not call into the question the narratives of participants and organizations and therefore does not call for fundamental changes in the ways in which organizations and its participants conceive of themselves.

### **Historical Being-in-discourse**

While narrative puts the emphasis on the construction of plot, order and coherence in being, historical being-in-discourse is grounded in an ontological idea of *historical being* instead of narrative being. While this approach is configured through a critique of some of the presumptions that dominate the narrative approach, the focus is not per se on the destruction of narrative coherence; rather the focus is on the continuous reconfiguration of narrative structures through the resistance that storytelling offers against the establishment. It is that dynamic, which

defines learning and organizational learning here.

The approach is characterized by taking history seriously by locating the biographies of men and women in the historical structures in which everyday life is organized (Clarke 2005, p. 261). Focus is relocated from speaking agents to the historical and geographical circumstances in which they speak. This decentering of individuals has been labeled post-humanism and is characterized by a movement of attention from what takes place in the human mind towards an understanding of human beings as embodied and embedded in technical, medical, informatics, and economic networks; in short cultural or discursive networks (Wolfe 2010, location 99).

This approach emphasizes the 'living story' as a key term to denote the living spontaneous in-the-moment performances instead of narrative employment. Focus is on difference, multiplicity as well as lived experience in the moments of becoming as we have noted before. Living stories are not prepared performances (Taptiklis 2010, p. 110). They are situated performances of everyday talk and actions. Because of the embodiment and embeddedness in a technological and cultural world, living storytelling are both continuous and discontinuous – i.e. dis/continuous - as a contrast to the order, coherence and continuity of the narrative approach.

New layers of complexity are thus added in comparison with the narrative approach, which is criticized for relying on single points of view and for its static-ness of fixed linearity that is the result retrospective narrative sense-making told from peoples' particular positions and view points (e.g. Sole & Wilson 2003, pp. 5-6). Narratives are regarded as too simplistic representations of a much more complex reality and therefore they cannot imitate social life and represent the complexity of its connections adequately, which none-the-less is suggested by Czarniawska (2001, p. 128).

Living story invites us to explore the moment as a new beginning by emphasizing the many different voices and forces inherent to the emergent speech and actions and to configure a new more self-conscious "I" or "we" by focusing on and disclosing the historical and geographical conditions that allowed for the stiffening and fixation of particular story lines – that is narratives – in taken-for-granted assumptions of who we are and where we come from.

The mapping of historical discourses in their making is one particular way in which living story has been approached in the literature. Clarke argues that the mapping of historical discourses owes a great debt to postmodern and poststructural writers and particularly Michel Foucault, who revolutionized history through the Foucault-style genealogy (e.g. Foucault 1984; Flyvbjerg 2002; Jørgensen 2007):

"These are histories not of events but of practices, not of great men but of discourses that claim to tell truths, not of 'wars and politics' but how life is conceived and lived in daily practices" (Clarke 2005, p. 262).

In our account of living story, history is important and we also uses living story in a Foucauldian manner by using history to question and change the narratives of existence in organizations. We also propose that deconstruction is part of this approach since it is characterized by the decomposition of accounts as they occur in the interplay with other people, spaces and artifacts in particular historical circumstances, as we shall argue below.

The transition from narrative to living story in the literature is gradual but accomplished in particular through the works of Boje and colleagues (see also Strand 2012, pp. 145-149). Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje (2004) develop a theory of narrative temporality through applying two amendments to Ricoeur's work. The first amendment is an emphasis on *performance* and it proposes an expansion of Ricoeur's model to include the contexts or spaces of narrative

performance. As such they bring attention to what happens in the moment – in the now – of narrative performance. “Life is lived in the moment and much of our sense-making also occurs in the moment” (Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje 2004, p. 272).

Subsequently this amendment implies a movement towards a more poststructural or postmodern position and a movement from considering the narrative as produced by a human subject to viewing it as discursively constructed in the moment of its occurrence. This implies also that the telling becomes more dynamic and fluent as a contextual response to the situation in which it emerges (Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje 2004, p. 273).

The second amendment is an emphasis on *multiplicity*, where they argue that the perpetual referring within the threefold mimesis results in multiple threads of past narrative weaving together into multiple presents and creating multiple futures (Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje 2004, pp. 273-274). The second amendment is proposed because Ricoeur does not sufficiently deal with the dynamics within the three-fold mimesis. They suggest that there is such a dynamic that creates a “polyphonic, negotiated narrative” (Cunliffe, Luhmann & Boje, 2004, p. 274).

The two amendments mark an emerging transition from an emphasis on narrative to an emphasis on living story. Living story implies the position that we do not have a unified consciousness or self from which everything else is interpreted. Instead being is fragmented and multiple. Living story does not imply a refusal of narrative as an important part of being. However, it does perceive being as a much more complex discursive construction, which as noted cannot be adequately represented in narratives.

Jørgensen & Boje (2010) argue that living story happens as a natural spontaneous performance with other people in specific circumstances. They use it to distinguish it from the static, institutionalized and sometimes petrified story lines that are organized through narrative coherence and plot. For Jørgensen & Boje, living story storytelling implies resistance to how proper accounts should be written, told and performed in the modern capitalist corporations and societies of our times.

There reference is Derrida’s notion of story, which according to him has no borderlines. Story is at once larger and smaller than itself, entangled in a play with other stories, becoming part of the other, making the other part of itself etc. (Derrida 2004, p. 82). Importantly story gains its specific meaning in relation to the term narrative, which constitutes its homonym but none-the-less is utterly different from story.

Western narrative tradition, Derrida argues, is very different from story in representing time in a more linear fashion with a relatively stable beginning, middle and end coherence organized around a plot. Narrative is for Derrida an illusion in the sense that it puts artificial borderlines around the text. Narrative in other words stabilizes and fixes the story and is as such relatively monological and authoritarian by refusing the entangled state and the subsequent dynamic movement of stories.

Derrida is thus extremely critical towards Western narrative tradition, which in his opinion is dominated by totalizing narratives (Derrida 2002, p. 299; e.g. Jørgensen & Boje 2010). Narrative for Derrida is a simplistic and violent representation of much more complex relationships where plural voices are present. It is violent in taking charge of stories and in converting them into a homogeneous narrative whole. Narratives are thus considered the results of a demand for proper beginning – middle – end accounts that works to wring out the essence of the text (Derrida 2004, p. 72).

Therefore learning becomes a question of questioning our notions of selfhood as expressed in narratives through a confrontation with either history or now-performances. The questioning of narratives thus takes place by looking at the transitioning from narrative and living story and vice versa. Jørgensen and Boje (2010, p. 258) note that the challenge is to create living story webs of relationships thereby confronting established and dominant narratives in order to question who we are and become more aware how our beingness is conditioned on the intertwinement and entanglement with other and others' stories.

Further, they propose to look at the transitioning from narrative to living stories which means looking at how narratives are continuously challenged by other voices in living-day-to-day storytelling and how these narratives are continuously modified and reinterpreted to fit new ends and circumstances.

Relations of power are very closely linked to the construction of narratives. There is no independent narrative I. Rather we are historical products of dominant relations of power that creates being. It is not the other way around. The living story webs of relationships are thus created through genealogies of self (e.g. Jørgensen 2007: pp. 72-73) or through deconstruction (e.g. Jørgensen and Boje, 2010; Jørgensen, 2011).

A living story approach is not interested in reducing stories to a plot or wringing out the essence of a text. Jørgensen and Strand (2012, pp. 175-176) note that a storyteller is much more interested in contextualizing the text in a specific time-space and by clarifying the socio-political circumstances of the text. They note further (ibid, p. 176) that stories are produced in complex political circumstances where multiple voices are present.

As such the understanding of organizations and the people within them is accomplished by getting a sense of who people are, including their interests, intentions and motivations, by describing what they do together with other people in specific time-spaces. Narratives must in this way be understood as a simplistic image of self, a telling that must be understood in its socio-historical context and produced by voices in particular positions and with particular intentions and interests.

Genealogy and deconstruction are always systematically suspicious of narrative self. The purpose is however to create the conditions for a more *reflexive* position on our ways of thinking and acting and thus to create the condition for fundamentally rethinking narratives and futures. In this way, the historical being-in-discourse approach would argue that the perception of narratives as 'sacred' is a misunderstanding of what otherness implies. Rather the 'true' recognition of otherness lies in the attempt to place and appreciate human beings as they emerge through their performances with others in specific time-places and the use of this understanding to create other and more desirable accounts and understandings of self.

Michael White, the inventor of narrative therapy, suggests revealing the politics of the problems that brings people to therapy (2007, p. 27). His intention is to deconstruct dominant and negative narratives of self that have shaped peoples' perceptions of their lives and identities in order to allow for other stories to emerge. Even if we would not call it therapy the proposed mapping and deconstruction of personal and organizational stories is an example of questioning the truth of dominant accounts and allow for other perceptions and stories to emerge.

Organizational learning is accomplished through this creative oscillation between narrative and living story no matter if this is directed towards personal development or organizational development. It is accomplished through deconstruction of a genealogy of for example personal narratives (for instance leaders' narratives) or through the deconstruction or

genealogies of narratives of organizational problems and/or solutions (e.g. why do organizations perceive problems and solutions the way they do) (e.g. Jørgensen, 2011; Jørgensen, Strand and Thomassen, 2012).

The important problem highlighted is that organizations and people as historical products come to see realities and their problems and solutions in a particular way where some phenomena are illuminated while others are disregarded. An important aspect of a living story approach is to cast a light on these 'shadows' thus seeing new possibilities.

We will now begin to develop the term material storytelling from Karen Barad's work and to draw the implications for organizational learning.

## MATERIAL STORYTELLING

'Material storytelling' was originally coined by Anete M. Camille Strand in her PhD study where she reported on an action research project that she conducted in a Danish public institution (Strand 2012). Here she uses material artifacts, spatial configurations and bodydynamic exercises instead of more traditional organizational learning language-based methods to accomplish organizational rework. Her work is thus based on a different conceptualization of memory, intentionality and change in organizations that are different from how they have been considered by earlier approaches.

Her concept of material storytelling is accomplished by reading Boje's storytelling theory and Karen Barad's work through one another. Subsequently stories are not seen as originating in individual storytellers. Rather, the point is that stories emerge from the dynamic spacetime-matter configuration in the here-and-now moment and in turn produce spacetime-matter. As noted earlier, spacetime-matter highlights the entangled states of multiple spatial, temporal and spatial dimensions.

It implies an interest and awareness of how the spatial and material conditions condition what we do, how we interact with other and thus the governing effects of space and materiality on the distribution of roles, interaction patterns and culture in a broader sense. We learn through our bodies (including our brains) and our bodies are the outcome of our learning (Shrivastava 2010, p. 445). These bodies are entangled and intra-penetrated by discourse, materiality and spatiality.

Material storytelling implies a different material-discursive reconceptualization of what a living story is, which has implications of the exploration of the moment. While historical being-in-discourse relies heavily on history in the deconstruction of narrative structures and in the creation of new beginnings, material storytelling is meticulously attentive to the configuration of the moment as an entangled configuration of material, spatial and discursive dimensions.

Storytelling resistance and the creation of new beginnings are thus accomplished not so much through the exploration of history but through the application of space, materiality, bodies as well as discourse. Learning as an iterative performance thus becomes the result of a multimodal (i.e. Iedema 2003) process, where the new emerging "I's" and "we's" are not considered new discursive constructs embedded in separate entities; they are entangled with the spatial and material surroundings.

In other words, learning and identity reside not only in people but in the totality of the situations of which people are part including architectures, designs, systems, techniques, procedures, gestures, habits, interaction patterns etc.; Learning and identity thus reside in what

Barad refers to as the apparatus of the whole situation. Viewed in this way, the apparatus is the material-discursive configuration that enacts and constrains story performances. We will return to this point in the next section.

First we will concentrate on how stories can be understood when storytelling theory and Karen Barad's agential realist approach is read through one another. Important in this operation are the terms intra-action and entanglement. As noted before, intra-action denotes that phenomena never exist in themselves but must always be seen in relation to one another. Entanglement captures this aspect in the sense that it does not only refer to being intertwined with one another but rather "...to lack an independent, self-contained existence" (Barad 2007, p. ix).

In this respect, Barad rejects terms like interconnection or interaction because they implicitly assume that the world consists of separate entities that interact with each other. Instead intra-action denotes the dynamic mutual constituent forces of meaning/matter and time/space as the motor of change and learning. It follows that stories do not emerge in individual storytellers or are the results of collective interactions between storytellers.

Rather, stories emerge from complex multi-voiced mutual constituent agencies. Taguchi (2010, p. 47), who works with Barad-inspired intra-active pedagogy, notes that we are of-the-world in the sense of being made up from the same substances as the rest of the world. Therefore we are completely dependent on the world in both the production of knowledge and in learning about the world (ibid, p. 42).

Barad's work is important because it implies a more balanced of understanding of story than what is usual in the social sciences, where language according to her has been granted too much power. Instead, Barad would argue that story emerges from diffractive interferences of different material, natural, linguistic or bodily forces that combine in a mutual constituent relationship whereby the world and its boundaries are enacted through what Barad calls agential cuts.

Diffraction is another important aspect of Barad's framework. It is used because Barad is suspicious of terms like reflection and reflexivity because they remain caught up in a geometrics of sameness (Barad 2007, pp. 71-72). In turn, she argues that "...diffractions are attuned to differences – differences that our knowledge-making practices make and the effects they have on the world" (ibid, p. 73). Further, she notes that diffraction attends to the relational nature of difference, and this difference is not matter of essence.

She quotes Haraway in saying that a diffraction pattern does not map where differences appear but rather where the *effects* of differences appear (ibid, p. 72). Diffraction patterns are thus patterns of difference that make a difference (ibid, p. 72). A diffraction pattern is as such linked to intra-action and entanglement. It is not a pattern that emerges from the interaction of separately existing entities. Diffraction is a quantum phenomenon that presumes the inherent entangled nature of phenomena as relationally constituted. As such a diffraction apparatus does not only measure effects of difference. More profoundly, "... they highlight, exhibit and make evident the entangled structure of the ontology of knowing" (ibid, p. 73).

Now what does intra-action, entanglement and diffraction imply in relation to storytelling? To answer this question, we need to address the notion of mattering, which is a significant building block of Barad's framework (see also Jørgensen & Strand 2012, pp. 18-19). Barad takes her starting point in Judith Butler's proposal that matter needs to be understood as a process of materialization that stabilizes over time and produces the effect of boundary, fixity

and surface (ibid, p. 150). According to Barad, Judith Butler however ultimately reinscribes matter as a passive product of discursive practices.

Instead Barad suggests reinscribing matter as an active agent participating in the process of materialization (ibid, p. 151). She notes that matter is not a fixed substance, rather "...matter is substance in its intra-active becoming – not a thing but a doing, a congealing of agency. Matter is a stabilizing and destabilizing process of iterative intra-activity" (ibid, p. 151). It follows from the notion of intra-activity that matter is not a fixed property of independently existing object. Instead "...matter refers to phenomena in their ongoing materialization" (ibid, p. 151).

Matter is in other words not a linguistic construction but a discursive production in the important sense that discursive practices are themselves material reconfigurations of the world (ibid, p. 151). Discursive practices are therefore themselves fully implicated in the dynamics of intra-activity through which phenomena come to matter and therefore mattering "...is a dynamic articulation/configuration of the world (ibid, p. 151).

Materiality and discourse are thus mutually implicated in the dynamics of intra-activity. Materiality is discursive since material phenomena are inseparable from apparatuses of bodily production and discursive practices are always already material. Materiality and discourse do not stand in a relationship of exteriority to each other (ibid, pp. 151-152). Whatever you do or whatever you say are the results of iterative material-discursive intra-activity.

In other words stories are matter in being particular articulations/configurations of the world that enact a local cut and in terms of constraining and enabling what comes next and in being always already material. In any single story performance, multiple scales of time, space and materiality are threaded through one another. Stories are a congealing of agency that cut together-apart. They are iterative intra-activity that becomes through multiple and multimodal intra-acting agencies and they have temporal, spatial and material effects, e.g. spacetime-matter.

In what follows we will clarify how the material storytelling approach is different in terms of approaching, understanding and working with organizational learning.

## **MATERIAL STORYTELLING: IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING**

First of all, material storytelling has far reaching implications for working with organizational learning because the understanding of some of the most fundamental building blocks of organizational learning such memory, intentionality and learning are fundamentally reconceptualized. For example Barad, following Haraway, refuses the notions of reflection and reflexivity, because they presume the existence of human beings as independent entities and as the center points around which our knowledge practices unfolds.

Instead, the concept of diffraction points to the entangled nature of our knowledge-making practices and how they are enacted from the intra-action and entanglement of human and non-human forces; bodies, spaces, artifacts, nature and time. In other words, the entangled state of the figuration of bodies and the configurations of artifacts and spaces "tell" stories in organizations and play significant roles in organizational performance.

This means that phenomena like learning, narrating, storytelling, performing that traditionally have been viewed as human subjective constructions or intersubjective discursive constructions need to be reconsidered as mattering and as such always already material. Thinking, grasping, conceiving, learning and doing are not the effects of discourse in the

important sense that discourse is always already material; and the material is in same sense always already discursive.

The approach to organizational learning is best conceived as entangled becoming through dis/continuous iterative performances. It implies doing particular things with particular people, in particular places, with particular things and in particular situations. Organizations are not compositions of narratives and they are not historical-discursive constructs but are instead material-discursive configurations. They are the effects of diffractive relationships of history, bodies, spaces and artifacts, and they are continuously (re)configured in the moment into new material-discursive sites of engagement.

They thus also imply both a certain continuity and discontinuity – e.g. dis/continuity (Strand 2012). Organizations are simply what people do together but still they cannot be reduced to them. They are multimodally configured and relationally constituted. There is not an inner core or essence that waits to be discovered and they are not pre-social givens. The configuration of performativity in organizations relies on what we call the apparatus of storytelling inherent in any situation, which is also the organizational memory.

Barad has the notion of apparatus from Nils Bohr and it is different from Agamben's notion of apparatus or *dispositif*, which is linked to Foucault's notion of discourse. Apparatuses are for Barad material-discursive practices that are formative of meaning and matter. They are productive of and part of the phenomena produced and they are continuously reconstituted as part of the ongoing intra-activity of the world.

As such apparatuses are considered to be material configurations that reconfigure spatiality and temporality as well as mattering (Barad 2007, p. 146). In Barad's words apparatuses "...enact a local cut that produces "objects" of particular knowledge practices..." (ibid, p. 147). In other words, stories are configured from the apparatuses that make up the organization in the here-and-now moment of becoming.

Donna Haraway notes in that "...figures collect the people through their invitation to inhabit the corporeal story told in their lineaments." Just above this quote she notes how she is a little girl loved to inhabit the miniature worlds and how she loved the play of scales of time and space that toys and stories made patent for her (2008, p. 4). For us, this captures how the apparatus works as a material-discursive configuration. It invites the enactment of particular stories to be told and enacted and it contains as such a potentiality of performances. It is through the particular stories told and enacted that we constitute ourselves as unique human beings – that is where we make the world into our 'own', which however does not mean that it is or becomes our own.

Haraway notes (ibid, p. 4) how the figures are at the same time creatures of imagined possibility and of fierce and ordinary reality. In other words, the material-discursive configuration embedded in the apparatus is a creature of imagined possibilities (the future) and of ordinary reality (the now). The apparatus is not a representation or an illustration of something else. Neither is it only a support, referent or source of sustainability of a particular discourse (e.g. Barad 2007, p. 151). The particular material-discursive configurations are material-semiotic nodes or knots of intra-active co-shaping of bodies, materiality and meaning.

The apparatus enacts particular stories, but it is not a deterministic relationship in the sense that certain stories become inevitable. More specifically the apparatus enables and constrains what stories can be told as a potentiality in the sense that specific inclinations for story performance are embedded in the material-discursive configuration. It is thus a question of that

the apparatus give different opportunities and limitations for performances; to stimulate, make easy or difficult, to enhance or delimit, to make more or less probable etc.

As such multiple intra-acting forces are always in play in apparatuses. The material-discursive configuration invites us to inhabit and perform particular stories. It is a diffractive energy force that emerges from the interferences of the performance inclinations that are embedded in the material-discursive configuration of an apparatus and the actualized here-and-now story performance.

In terms of analysis it calls for a different approach. Neither narratives nor historical analyses will do because there is an excess of history (time) in these approaches. We will instead argue for a detailed exploration of crucial now-moments in organizations. Barad argues for a diffractive mode of analysis where we learn to tune our analytical instruments (the diffraction apparatus as she calls it) in a way that is sufficiently attentive to the details of the phenomenon, we want to understand (Barad 2007, p. 73).

In relation to organizational learning this calls for detailed explorations of those moments in which crucial or important learning takes place because it is the only way we can get a sense of the diffractive interferences and entanglements of human and non-human forces that configure new story performances. Further we don't learn to become otherwise through reflection or reflexivity but through diffractive participation in the situation where we engage with other people, spaces and artifacts.

It follows, that learning emerges from apparatuses of storytelling. These apparatuses contain professional knowledge(s), bodies, artifacts, technologies and spaces. Working with the apparatus of storytelling of the organization is the key to organizational learning in organizations. The instruments and tools that are used matter in this respect and they are not restricted to the use of language but include using space, bodies and artifacts..

Organizational learning relies on the continuous experiments with the totality of apparatuses of storytelling. There is no privileged best way to do organizational learning, neither is it possible to define what it is precisely. What is required is the active participation and an attention to detail. In relation to pedagogy, Taguchi (2010: 61) notes that learning "... takes place right in the middle of things, in our very living and doing pedagogical practices".

Similarly organizational learning takes place right in the middle of organizations. To facilitate organizational learning requires not only use of strategies and tools that take into account the multi-modal configuration of organizations but also a close attention to the movement of the moment. Subsequently it requires improvisational and spontaneous capabilities and openness to this movement of the moment.

Material storytelling thus constitutes a new diffractive methodology for organizational learning in creating new grounds for conceptualizing and understanding the relationships between time, space, materiality and their inherent groundings in organizational learning methodologies. It emphasizes that our story performances are both discursive and material - as mattering bodies where our language, actions, our whole body is material-discursive and thus where history, space, materiality are inscribed and reconfigured in everything we do.

As such we shift our attention from what goes on in the human mind to the inherently entangled intra-active relationships between mind, body, spatiality and materiality. Learners are 'entangled becomings' (Taguchi 2010) and organizational learning becomes the results of diffractive interferences of material-discursive forces. But it would be a major mistake to assume that our approach is anti-human – rather the point is exactly the opposite.

Importantly, we see material storytelling as a new way of working with personal and organizational development in a way in which our intra-relationality with other human beings, with objects, spaces, the physical world etc. is emphasized, because ultimately material storytelling is about entangled connections, commitments and relationalities. In her account of agential realism, Barad makes an argument for what she calls an ethics of mattering, which is a material-discursive account of Levinas' responsibility ethics (e.g. Barad 2007, pp. 391-392), where the notion of ethics is expanded from an anthropocentric towards a more ecocentric notion of ethics.

The argument is that the performativity of all human and non-human bodies come to matter through the world's iterative intra-activity where boundaries, properties and boundaries are differentially enacted (Ibid, p. 392). This is however about making connections and commitments and not about othering or separating (ibid, p. 392). We are entangled becomings of multiple threads of materiality, temporality and spatiality. Therefore we are always already responsible to the others with whom or which we are entangled, not through conscious intent but simply through the various entanglements through which we make our daily living.

For Barad ethics is thus about responsibility and accountability for the lived relationalities of becoming of which we are a part (Ibid, p. 393). This responsibility transcends each and every situation and rejects the metaphysics of individualism that serves as a foundation for traditional approaches to ethics. She explains that causality is not linear distinct causality but about complex connections between innumerable forces. As such there are no singular causes and no individual agents of change.

We have to live ethics and take responsibility in each and every seemingly insignificant or significant situation. Ethics is not about a right response to the other but is rather a fundamental responsibility and accountability for the lively material-discursive becoming of which we are part (ibid, p. 393). It is not restricted to human-human encounters but must take into account the intra-action and entanglement of materiality and discourse.

Importantly we cannot transform responsibility into a very clear answer for what to do. But ethics of mattering is always a call for delving deeper into an inquiry into situations thereby recognizing the inherent complexity and the plurality of human and non-human voices that are always somehow present in each and every situation.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have argued for a material storytelling approach to organizational learning. It implies exploring the movement of the moment and to play with multiple scales of time, space and materiality that are entangled in the moment. As a new approach to organizational learning it supplements narrative and storytelling approaches to organizational learning and offers a new way of dismantling the organizational apparatus and to create something new. In supplementing narrative and storytelling approaches it works with these approaches; it does not replace them.

By that we mean that material storytelling adds several and significant layers of complexity to storytelling research and to organizational learning in granting agency to spatial, material and bodily dimensions to a much higher degree than usual in organizational storytelling research. However, the aims are still the same; namely narrative reconfiguration of organizations and through working with peoples' stories.

That said, it is an approach, which is the most radical in emphasizing the relationality and mutuality of meaning and matter and it thus offers radical ways of conceptualizing memory, thinking, doing, being, reflecting etc. which used to be sacred domains of individuals or at least of culture as an inter-subjective discursive construction. As such, Barad has brought to life something that was either considered dead or was granted an insubstantial role in traditional organizational research; how matter matters – or the meaning of objects, nature and materiality in living and being.

## REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. 2009, *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, H. 1958, *The Human Condition*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 1993, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, Austin, University of Texas Press.
- Barad, K. 2007, *Meeting the universe halfway – Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*, Durham, Duke University Press.
- Benjamin, W. 1999, The Storyteller - Reflections on the work of Nikolai Leskov, in Arendt, H. (Ed.), *Illuminations*, London, Pimlico, pp. 83-107.
- Boje, D. M. 2008, *Storytelling Organization*, London, Sage.
- Boje, D. M. 2001, *Narrative Methods for Organizational and Communication Research*, London, Sage.
- Boje, D. M., Jørgensen, K. M. & Strand, A. M. C. 2013, Towards a Postcolonial Storytelling Theory of Management and Organization, accepted for publication in *Philosophy of Management*.
- Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P., 2001, Organizational Learning and Communities-of-Practice: Toward a Unified View of Working, Learning and Innovation, *Organization Science*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 40-57.
- Clarke, A. E. 2005. *Situational Analysis – Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn*, London, Sage.
- Corbett-Etchevers, I & Mounoud, E. (2011). A narrative framework for management ideas: Disclosing the plots of knowledge management in a multinational company, *Management Learning*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 165-181.
- Cunliffe, A. L., Luhmann, J. T., & Boje, D. M. 2004, Narrative Temporality: Implications for Organizational Research, *Organization Studies*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 261-286.
- Czarniawska, B. 2001, Anthropology and Organizational Learning, in Dierkes, M., Antal, A. B., Child, J. & Nonaka, I. (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 118-136.
- Czarniawska, B. 1997, *Narrating the Organization: Dramas of Institutional Identity*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- Denning, S. 2007, *The Secret Language of Leadership – How Leaders Inspire Action Through Narrative*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Derrida, J. 2004, Living On, in Bloom, H., de Man, P., Derrida, J. Hartman, G. H. & Miller, J. H. (Eds.), *Deconstruction and Criticism*, London, Continuum, pp. 62-142.
- Derrida, J. 2002, The Theater of Cruelty and the Closure of Representation, in Derrida, J. (Ed.), *Writing and Difference*, London, Routledge, pp. 292-316.

- Flyvbjerg, B. 2002, *Making Social Science Matter – Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1984, Nietzsche, genealogy, history, in Rabinow, P. (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, New York, NY: Pantheon, pp. 76-100.
- Haraway, D. 2008, *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Iedema, R. 2003, Multimodality, Resemiotization: Extending the Analysis of Discourse as Multi-semiotic Practice, *Visual Communication*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 29-57.
- Jørgensen, K. M., Strand, A. M. C. (2012), A Postcolonial Storytelling Theory of Organizational Learning – Schools as Storytelling Organizations, in Chikoko, V. & Jørgensen, K. M. (Eds.), *Education Leadership, Management and Governance in South Africa*, New York, Nova Science Publishers, pp. 15-30.
- Jørgensen, K. M., Klee, N. & Canal, M. 2012, The Multivoiced Classroom – A Storytelling Ethics Approach to Management Education, submitted to Amman, W. & Stachowich-Stanusch, A. (Eds.), *Innovations in Executive Education*.
- Jørgensen, K. M., Thomassen, A. O., & Strand, A. M. C., 2012, Conceptual bases of problem-based learning, in Groccia, J. Al-Sudairy, M. & Buskist, W (Eds.), *Global Perspectives on College and University Teaching*, London, Sage,
- Jørgensen, K. M. & Strand, A. M. C., 2011, Towards a storytelling ethics for management education, in Wankel, C & Stachowich-Stanusch, A. (Eds.), *Effectively integrating ethical dimensions in management education*, Charlotte NC, Information Age Publishing, pp. 253-271.
- Jørgensen, K. M. & Boje, D. M. 2010, Resituating narrative and story in business ethics, *Business Ethics - A European Review*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 251-262.
- Jørgensen, K. M. 2011, Futures and Strategic Learning – Strategy Narrative and Storytelling, in McGuire, D. & Jørgensen, K. M. (Eds.), *Human Resource Development – Theory and Practice*, London, Sage, pp. 141-158.
- Jørgensen, K. M. 2007. *Power without Glory – A Genealogy of a Management Decision*, Copenhagen, Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Jørgensen, K. M. 2002, The Meaning of Local Knowledges, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 29-46.
- Rhodes, C. & O. M. Price, 2011, The post-bureaucratic parasite: Contrasting narratives of organizational change in local government, *Management Learning*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 241-260.
- Ricoeur, P. 1984, *Time and Narrative - Volume 1*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.
- Shrivastava, P. 2010, Pedagogy of Passion for Sustainability, *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 443-455.
- Sole, D., & Wilson, D. G. 2003, *Storytelling in Organizations: The power and traps of using stories to share knowledge in organizations*, LILA Briefing Paper: Harvard University, retrieved October, 2003, from [http://lila.pz.harvard.edu/\\_upload/lib/ACF14F3.pdf](http://lila.pz.harvard.edu/_upload/lib/ACF14F3.pdf)
- Santos, M. S., 2001, Memory and Narrative in Social Theory: The Contributions of Jacques Derrida and Walter Benjamin, *Time & Society*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 163-189.

Strand, A. M. C. 2012, *Enacting the Between - On dis/continuous becoming of/through an Apparatus of Material Storytelling*, PhD dissertation. Aalborg University, Department of Communication and Psychology.

Taguchi, H. L. 2010, *Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early childhood education: Introducing an intra-active pedagogy*, New York, NY, Routledge.

Tally, J. 2001, *The Story of Jazz – Toni Morrison’s Dialogic Imagination*, Forecaast, Hamburg.

Taptiklis, T. 2010, Dancing to the Music of Story: Surrendering to the Flux of Time, in Boje, D. M. & Baskin, K. (Eds.), *Dance to the Music of Story – Understanding Human Behavior through the Integration of Storytelling and Complexity Thinking*, Litchfield Park, AZ, Emergent Publications, pp. 101-114.

Wolfe, C. 2010, *What is Posthumanism?*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Østergaard, K. L. 2012, *The Individual in the Intercultural Interplay*, PhD Dissertation, Aalborg, Aalborg University, Department of Learning and Philosophy.