

34

TRANSORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

David M. Boje

Mark E. Hillon

Boje, D. M. & Hillon, Mark. 2008. Transorganizational Development, Chapter 34, pp. 651-654, in Tom Cummings (Ed) Handbook of Organizational Change. Sage.

Transorganizational networks emerge and transform through storytelling, yet until quite recently storytelling as an engine of transorganizational development (TD) has only seen limited attention by organization change consultants. The current consulting interest is in the use of storytelling for knowledge mining and management. As we shall demonstrate, transorganizational networks provide the virtual and face-to-face arenas in which storytelling transactions can take place. The transorganizational network is forever restorying, forgetting, and rehistoricizing to exploit its social and economic interfaces, and storytelling serves as the currency of exchange for collective memory. In essence, the fragmented bits of story are the narrative embodiment of organization.

This chapter is organized into three parts. The first reviews the origins and history of TD theory and practice from the early 1970s to today. The second explores storytelling organization

theory and presents two prevailing models of TD networks in order to connect antenarrative and narrative analysis to TD theory and practice. To conclude the chapter, we present an overview of current TD consulting methods and propose a new Story Space model of transorganizational networking as a tool to analyze a network of firms embedded in a community of storied action and development phases and cycles of network formation and metamorphosis.

History of TD

Since its inception, TD as an academic field has been focused on how storytelling affects networking behavior and transformation in organizations. At the practical level, TD networking involves a very broad range of consulting strategies. Examples include information technology reengineering, knowledge management, learning organizations, appreciative inquiry, participative democracy, socioeconomic management [Please change to “socio-economic approach to management (SEAM)” as the reference is to a specific consulting method], sociotechnical [Restore original] systems, network organization design, supply and value chain management, military cyber–war game simulations, and various postmodern approaches such as restorying spectacles of mass production and consumption with more ecocentric and socially responsible ethics (Boje, 1999c).

TD theory work began with the collaborative work of several University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) faculty members. In 1972, UCLA’s Samuel A. Culbert, J. Max Elden, Will McWhinney, Warren Schmidt, and Bob Tannenbaum called for transorganizational praxis as a means to go beyond traditional organization development.

Transorganizational networking is defined as planned change in the collective relationships of a variety of stakeholders to accomplish something beyond the

capability of any single organization or individual (Culbert, Elden, McWhinney, Schmidt, & Tannenbaum, 1972).

Transorganizational development is defined as a collective story shaped and co-constructed by the network of participants. Each stakeholder organization negotiates the meaning of the collective story. Each story is a fragment, a perspective on the whole. Some are problem based, issue based, solution based, or just fantasy based. Each is a candidate to become the dominant collective story (Boje, 1979, 1981).

Thayer made a similar call for TD work in 1973. In 1978, Kurt Motamedi was visiting UCLA and joined in the wake-up call for the evolution from interorganizational design to TD (Motamedi, 1978). Boje joined UCLA in 1979 and began to work with TD, focusing on storytelling in grassroots TD interventions. Boje's (1979, 1981) story theory work with Michael Jones of the UCLA folklore and mythology department extended the storytelling aspects into the ICEND model of consultation to large interorganizational networks for long-term change:

- I: Interactive, share stories around issues
- C: Communicative, stories of the collective
- E: Experiential, stories of joint actions
- ND: Network development

The basis of the ICEND model is that when people convene to interact, communicate their stories, and form common experience, a network for action and change develops around their collective storytelling (Boje, 1982). Three subsystems are formed. In the first subsystem, an outside process consultant facilitates the formation of the second subsystem, an internal problem-

solving networking cycle, so that people can crystallize issues, identify leaders, and form a temporary organization of organizations that will transform the current organizing patterns into the third subsystem, an extended network involvement cycle.

Cummings (1984) reconstructed Motomedi's and Boje's TD theory work into a sociotechnical system framework with a TD process model consisting of three stages: identification, convention, and organization. These three stages seem to have been adopted in some form or other by the majority of subsequent researchers (Sink, 1991). However, the initial thinking on TD assumed that the development of TD systems entailed a new approach in both theory and practice from OD in single organizations. Cobb (1991) and Sink (1991) showed through their work on organization coalition building that TD practice did not entail more than a broader perspective and a reassessment of some fundamental assumptions. Perhaps TD analytical research methods needed time to evolve, as Cobb's (1991) critique of organization coalition research characterized many studies as rigor without relevance because researchers tended to approach organization political processes from the rational utility-maximizing agent perspective.

The call for TD has been heard most recently by organizations awakening to the realities of global economic restructuring. Perlmutter (1991) speaks of the process of globalization as a growing system of networked interdependencies in every aspect of life. Likewise, Cooperrider and Pasmore (1991) argue that the rapid rate of global social change results in large part from thousands of non-bureaucratically organized groups seeking similar aims. They cite Perrow (1972) in their explanation that "bureaucracies are dedicated to eliminating all unwanted extraorganizational influences upon the behaviors of their members, are created to deal with stable, routine tasks in an efficient manner" (Cooperrider & Pasmore, 1991, p. 1044). Thus,

assumptions of bureaucratic and hierarchical network organization may also have stymied past TD research efforts.

Monological and Dialogical Models of Story and Narrative Methods for TD Theory and Practice

Storytelling organization theory work had its beginning in 1991 with Boje's *Administrative Science Quarterly* study of storytelling in an office supply firm. The storytelling organization was defined as a "collective storytelling system in which the performance of stories is a key part of members' sense-making and a means to allow them to supplement individual memories with institutional memory" (Boje, 1991, p. 106; also see Boje, 1995). Storytelling organization writers come to the topic from a variety of philosophical positions. For example, Bob Gephart Jr.'s (1991, p. 37) study of leader succession defines the storytelling organization as "constructed in the above succession stories as a tool of program for making sense of events." Mary Boyce's (1995) storytelling organization work is based in social construction philosophy. Michael Kaye (1996) worked with Boje's story writings to develop them into a successful consulting practice; Kaye says stories can shape the culture of organizations." For a review of the differences in these storytelling organization theories and studies, see Boje, Alvarez, and Schooling (2001) and Boje (2001a,[[AUTHOR: There's no Boje 2001 in References; please add.]] [Reference added] 2003a). Next, we will examine the two dominant storytelling organization models for TD theory and practice.

Model 1: Monological TD

The first model is called monological TD because it follows a control-based knowledge management approach to scan a network of multiple organizations through contracts and

exchange relationships, retrieving tacit knowledge into a shared database. Attention to knowledge management and organization learning is not new, as the historical move toward globalization continually creates technological upheaval, resource discontinuities, and inefficiencies of crisis proportions for all forms of social and economic organization (Schein, 1996). Organization communication network analysts have long looked at individuals as nodes in day-to-day work processes. Transorganizational network analysis was a natural next step as nodes became whole organizations, even if represented by individuals. The governance of individuals in organizations also progressed to governance of organizations in transorganizational networks. A prominent example of this evolution is Porter's value chain or web, which is merely a transorganizational network governed by negotiated terms of exchange.

Storytelling is the currency or medium of exchange in both OD and TD relationships. Barry (1997) argues that storytelling and restorying past stories are - major aspects of organization change, and TD consulting tends to focus on what Barry and Elmes (1997, p. 439) call the "technofuturist genre" of strategy as story. This genre is part of an epic narrative using quasiscience [Restore original]network mapping approaches such as temporal sequencing of who consults whom, who sends e-mail to whom, and who trades how much with whom. These are transactional data maps in which the domain of storytelling is at a very abstract and aggregate level. For example, Porter's "cost leaders" and "focusers" and Miles and Snow's "defenders" and "prospectors" are abstract characterizations of antagonists and protagonists that universalize and essentialize (Boje, 1995) system actor behavioral profiles into simple frameworks, typologies, and mappings.

This monological storytelling organization model is rooted in the knowledge management field rather than the narrative research just reviewed. There is a burgeoning field

called knowledge engineering, a consulting practice that grows in the realization that knowledge is a tremendous business asset and that the way to get at this knowledge is through stories.

Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) four-part socialization, externalization, combination, and internalization (SECI) model was very influential in consulting circles in launching the knowledge engineering business. In knowledge (re)engineering, stories are increasingly thought of as a place to mine tacit knowledge assets. Knowledge engineers seek to develop data storage and retrieval systems to appropriate tacit knowledge from workers with specialized task knowledge, thereby making - [the knowledge]- redistributable instantaneously to whoever needs them [Restore original]at another time and place. The problem we observe is that stories are too elusive and contextualized to be captured like objects, and what ends up being stored is [often]not all that useful.

One of the premier purveyors of storytelling knowledge management consulting is Dave Snowden, director of IBM's Cynefin Centre. He has discovered that narrative can be a pathway to tacit knowledge and "can also act as a source of understanding, disrupt entrained thinking, [and] provide a repository of learning" (Snowden, 2001, 4). **[[AUTHOR: Page number of quote?]]** He views this approach as an improvement over the failure of business process reengineering to deliver on its promised benefits for managerialist decision support (Snowden, 2002). The third generation (Snowden, 2002, p. 2) requires the clear separation of context, narrative, [Restore original]and content management and challenges the orthodoxy of scientific management. Complex adaptive system [Restore original]theory is used to create a sense [Restore original]making model that uses the self-organizing capabilities of the informal communities and identifies a natural flow model of knowledge creation, disruption, and use.

Snowden (2002) became interested in storytelling in 1999 when he learned about Shaw et al. (1998)[[**AUTHOR: There's no Shaw 1998 in References; please add.**]] [Reference added]working at 3M, whose article made storytelling fashionable. Snowden sought to codify esoteric and tacit story knowledge using solicitation questions that could be analytically translated into levels of abstraction. Snowden adapted Polanyi's (1974)[[**AUTHOR: There's no Polanyi 1974 in References; please add.**]] [Reference added]work on tacit knowledge to Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) four-part SECI model. The idea was to develop a technology to capture storied tacit knowledge. Snowden (2002, p. 12) summarizes,

The ability to convey high levels of complexity through story lies in the highly abstract nature of the symbol associations in the observer's mind when she/he hears the story. It triggers ideas, concepts, values and beliefs at an emotional and intellectual level simultaneously. A critical mass of such anecdotal material from a cohesive community can be used to identify and codify simple rules and values that underlie the reality of that organization's culture.

Stories are collected in what Snowden calls story circles, a knowledge mapping exercise to gather the unofficial elements of knowledge in an organization. Snowden and Denning conduct an "Organizational Storytelling and Narrative Patterns" story elicitation and analysis master class for managers and executives. Participants learn how to assess tacit knowledge stories with archetypes and manage differences between official stated knowledge and the "shadow organization" of informal knowledge. Denning (2000)[[**AUTHOR: Denning is dated 2000 in References; which is correct?**]] includes sessions on how to create and perform springboard stories. They end with how to create and exploit narrative databases.

In an Orwellian twist on the storytelling organization, concerns within the U.S. Homeland Security community for early detection of “strategic surprise” have fostered initiatives such as the Novel Intelligence From Massive Data program of the Advanced Research and Development Activity agency. According to project documents from the Information Awareness Office (2002, p. 21), data mining and the conversion of surveillance traces into story have advantages for analysts seeking to persuade policymakers:

Conveying information in a story provides a rich context, remaining in the conscious memory longer and creating more memory traces than decontextualized information. Thus, a story is more likely to be acted upon than “normal” means of communication. Storytelling, whether in a personal or organizational setting, connects people, develops creativity, and increases confidence. The use of stories in organizations can build descriptive capabilities, increase organizational learning, convey complex meaning, and communicate common values and rule sets.

Thus, we see that whether for analytical or developmental objectives, the currency of influence and sensemaking in transorganizational networks is storytelling.

Model 2: Dialogical TD

The second approach built on storytelling organization theory is called dialogical TD because of its focus on developing a sense of multi[Restore original]voiced inclusion among multiple organizations. Instead of static networks, transorganizational relations are envisioned from Sloterdijk’s (1993, 1998, 1999) new philosophical standpoint, looking at how organizations form spaces of togetherness and commonality called spheres. Our work here builds on Illich’s

(1993) research on oral society and its transition to image screens and Bakhtin's (1968, 1973, 1981) concepts of monophonic and polyphonic novels.

The second TD model includes the more polyphonic (multi[Restore original]voiced) strategy-as-story approaches, involving a dialogical and mutual authorship of strategic understanding of networking dynamics. This can mean “surfacing, legitimizing, and juxtaposing differing organizational stories” and differing stakeholder logics (Barry & Elmes, 1997, p. 444). Postmodernist and critical theory perspectives on collective narration and expert narration of strategy as story [Restore original]focus on how people are central to or marginal to the strategic discourse that dominates a given context. The dialogical approach is used to develop narrative spheres of common interest through such practices as search conferences and story networking. Storytelling is used to construct and restore network development and change rather than simply to extract tacit knowledge for unilateral competitive advantage. Thus, storytelling is essential to both consulting approaches, even though it is operationalized quite differently. However, the contribution we seek is an approach that looks at multiple storytellers in multi[Restore original]organizational settings.

The dialogical approach develops the polyphonic (multi[Restore original]voice) and polylogical (multi-logic) aspects of TD consulting to balance grassroots involvement with a rigorous appreciation of power dynamics. We see this balance as very much rooted in storytelling practices, for it is through story work that transorganizational participants develop their in and out groups and their potential willingness to engage in joint action.

Polyphony and carnivalization are two pivotal aspects of Bakhtin's (1981, p. 263) master trope, heteroglossia, the social diversity of speech types and multiple voices. Heteroglossia

means that dialoging in and between storytelling organizations occurs in situ, in a matrix of a particular time and place, and in the nexus of contextual social, political, economic, and historical discourses that situate a given meaning then and there, versus any other meaning of the same word enacted under different circumstances. This is quite a contrast to the knowledge management model of storytelling organizations, where springboard stories are constructed and stories are mined and assembled into knowledge databanks, to be used to instruct and socialize employees.

The first aspect of heteroglossia, polyphony, refers not only to multiple voices but also to the presentation of multiple logics; the polyphonic and polylogic forces of dialogism are opposed by monological tendencies in social discourse. The consulting problem we see in transorganization work is how to bring organization participants with differing logics and perspectives together to fashion a shared collective story of themselves and their potential for action.

Dialogism (i.e., multiple logics) is the condition in which every word and gesture is understood as a part of the great whole with a multiplicity of points of view. The consulting problem is how to create dialogue that results in collective storying and restorying. Dialogism is a force that is always naturally deconstructing social attempts to insulate participants into monological (i.e., one-logic) stories or entire monological storytelling organizations in which one story is the springboard enforced for all. In this way, the consulting process of TD becomes one of inviting more voices into the collective story construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction work of the network of players. At the same time that voices are invited into collective storying, the forces of monologism are attempting to cut off contact and marginalize voices of alternative logics to reduce all to the dominant story.

The second aspect of heteroglossia is carnival. Carnival has never been exploited as a theory of organization change and development, yet Bakhtin (1968, p. 11), points out that “all the symbols of the carnival idiom are filled with the pathos of change and renewal, with the sense of the gay relativity of prevailing truths and authorities.” Carnival is not only the theatric and storied parody and mockery of spectacle power or the satire of the grotesque oppression of modernity; [Restore original]it is life itself finding a way to revive and renew the community. The TD consulting problem is how to approach a transorganizational community in ways that will unleash carnivalesque forces of transformation and renewal.

The application of stories to strategy is widely known; what is less apparent is how to move from monologic networking to more polyphonic storytelling organizing. Barry and Elmes (1997, p. 444) argue, “Above all, polyphonic texts arise from ‘dialogical’ rather than ‘monological’ authorship; in dialogical authorship, different logics not only coexist, but inform and shape one another.” In the dialogical process of storytelling, the strategic narratives are read and written in ways that are participative and transparent for power moves. Barry and Elmes (1997, p. 447) observe that “a narrative view can also reveal how organizations become imprisoned by their strategic discourse—deconstructive analysis might be used to show how alternative meanings and constructions are silenced in favor of a dominant story, and suggest who benefits and who loses through such silencing.”

The main differences between monological and polyphonic storytelling transorganizations are the lack of push by consultants for total consensus, opening up the process for more polylogical and inclusive dialogues with many points of view. The polyphonic storytelling organization is extraordinarily multi[Restore original]voiced and multi[Restore original]logical and encourages the intermingling of points of view without finalizing leaderly

judgments that force monological consensus into some dominant story. As in *Tamara* (Boje, 1995), the dialogical storytelling activity occurs simultaneously in fragmented groupings in many rooms and buildings so that the essential activity of leadership (and consulting) is making sense of the unfolding separated dramas and the network of storylines.

The monological and dialogical storytelling TD approaches are ideal types and what consultants and narrative theorists contend with is the hybrid, the dialectic of the two. The consultant's role in the strategic process of a polyphonic transorganization is to transform monologic insulation into dialogic participation, which is an intervention into the political economy of storytelling. Sink (1991) boiled the TD practice down to two basic but critical areas: issues of power and issues of substance or meaning. For Foucault (1980), **[[AUTHOR: Foucault is dated 1981 in References; which is correct?]]** [1980] the two are more intertwined [Restore original] as power shapes what is socially and economically defined as knowledge; stories are normalizing truth fragments.

In sum, polyphonic transorganizational storytelling development is rich in pre[Restore original]story work, the formation of a story out of all the bits and fragments, called "antenarratives" (Barge, 2002; Boje, 2001; **[[AUTHOR: There's no Boje 2001 in References; please add.]]** [Reference added] Vickers, 2002). Antenarratives are the bets storytellers make that an improperly fashioned pre[Restore original]story can change the world (Boje, 2001). **[[AUTHOR: There's no Boje 2001 in References; please add.]]** **[[Reference added]]** This pre[Restore original]story work is rich in polylogical discourse and thus does not force monological narrative consensus. Antenarrative is what Bakhtin (1973, p. 27) might define as an uncompleted dialogue, not the "rounded-off and finalized monological whole" of the coherent and proper narrative. Narrative is the consensus that antenarrative emergence and exchange does

not finalize. There is a highly practical side to antenarratives for consultants in that they reflect the cohesion and fault patterns in the collective stories of an emerging and transforming network.

Storytelling Approach to TD Consulting

The first two sections of this chapter provided a general overview of the history and theoretical branching of transorganizational networks into two main storytelling models. This final section presents several alternative views on TD consulting practice.

The consulting side of storytelling has come a long way since the 1980s when Tom Peters recommended that CEOs learn 3-minute stump speeches to spur employees on to greater acts of customer service and quality (Peters & Waterman, 1982). For example, David M. Armstrong (1992), president and CEO of a 100-year-old maker of steam, air, and water systems, systematically collected an arsenal of customer service stories that he used to train employees. Armstrong's (2002) latest book is titled *Chief Storytelling Officer: More Tales from America's Foremost Corporate Storyteller*. Peters wrote on the jacket of the book, "David Armstrong has elevated storytelling into a quasi-science."

Peters and Armstrong quickly emerged as proponents of the monological or managerialist approach to corporate storytelling. Storytelling consulting work has many other adherents. For example, Denning (2000)[**AUTHOR: Denning is dated 2000 in References; which is correct?**] tells CEOs how to build, craft, and perform what he calls springboard stories. Springboard stories exploit tacit knowledge so that listeners will reinvent the knowledge in their own local contexts. Like the antenarrative described earlier, the springboard story can affect a change project, putting it back on track. The monological perspective is evident because the CEO is the principal or only storyteller of the organization. Gargiulo (2002) takes Denning's approach into a slightly more academic realm but follows the same managerialist thinking; stories are an

object executives construct as a stump speech to influence social action[Restore original] but not something seen as part of the situated fabric of leading and organizing.

Boisot's (1998) information space (I-space) is a recent addition to the consulting arsenal. The three dimensions of Boisot's knowledge management I-space model attempt to describe the codification, abstraction, and dissemination[Restore original] of the tacit knowledge carried by organization stories. Codification of stories is a process of shedding excess data bits to the minimum necessary for categorization. Abstraction is a process of reducing a story to the minimum of categories necessary to capture its essence in a transferable array. Dissemination[Restore original] is a control process that depends not on the codified and abstracted story itself but on the number of agents or storytellers with access to the data. The control aspect is perhaps the most important feature of knowledge management, for without restrictions on dissemination[Restore original], the carefully codified, abstracted, and de[Restore original]storied tacit knowledge ceases to be a firm-specific asset.

Transferring tacit knowledge is problematic in practice because, as Boisot (1998, p. 57) points out, once you abstract, reduce, and codify knowledge and shed its concrete context, the fragments that are communicated to another person no longer make sense to the end user. Only to the extent that stories can be standardized are they efficient for meaning transport, thereby resulting in economic utility in other contexts. Furthermore, a critical issue knowledge engineers ignore is that when creating transferable knowledge, you cannot just dispense with thorny legal issues of story ownership rights (i.e., stories are an intellectual property of the individual as well as of the enterprise). This is de[Restore original]skilling to extract surplus knowledge value. In this way, sharing story knowledge can make people victims of the global knowledge economy; people share the storyable asset that makes them most employable at living wages.

Case (2002, p. 93) argues that virtual organization consultants are promoting “the adoption of so called virtual organization, encouraging firms to enter into temporary ‘networked’ arrangements the better to create and exploit commercial opportunities.” Case goes on to say, “From a dramatisitic perspective the social fabric may be seen to be created, sustained, ruptured and transformed *by stories*” (Case, 2002, p. 96). Case is applying Burke’s frames (or ideologies) and looking at how multiple frames evidenced in stories are able to dialogue and into an emergent collective world[Restore original]view. Case’s work is rich in story texture, as he details the virtual participants’ efforts to story their context and to manipulate their collective situation. Case (p. 109) reports that “the stories consultants tell to illustrate the potential of [virtual] technology and virtual working are fantastical” and contends that participants are seduced into “telling virtual stories about virtual working and in so doing [deflect] attention away from alternative, and potentially more critical, accounts of the implications of ‘virtual organization.’” Although virtual, such work environments still behave as storytelling organizations. More work is needed to study the practices by which consultants use and perhaps misuse story to facilitate new approaches to transorganizational development.

There is also confusion in I-space theory between the systemic knowledge, understanding, and democratic discourse that can result in collective wisdom. Knowledge is what people get from a book or lecture and understanding comes only through the experience of using knowledge in their life space, whereas wisdom is a rare insight that comes with time and ethos. We think stories can convey tacit knowledge[Restore original] but not understanding or wisdom, which require the experience of the story and its temporal in situ context and ethos to be interactively appreciated by the receiver of the story. This suggests that a more experiential and

communicative approach to story, knowledge, understanding, and wisdom is needed. This is what we propose in the text that follows.

Story Space (S-Space) Model

Story Space (S-space) is defined as the collective experiential and communicative storytelling activity within and between organizations. Storytelling is a communicative currency that combines tacit knowledge with experiential understanding and the ethos that comes from time and interactive engagement. Narrative researchers and storytelling consultants can assess the S-space of storytelling organizations as knowledge, but attaining understanding and wisdom takes more development.

An important historical genealogy of knowledge must be explored before we can specify the S-space dimensions. There has been an almost unnoticed socio[Restore original]economic turn from knowledge that is oral to knowledge that is written and, more recently, to knowledge that is visual,. The visual pattern analysis of storytelling and story networking is a new aesthetic allocation. This transition has followed a more spiral than linear succession, as the visual theatrics of a story script and the oral aesthetic are quite different from those of the written story. To develop our concept of the transition from oral to visual storytelling and consulting will necessitate a slight detour into the history of storytelling.

The move from oral knowledge to written knowledge entailed a new collective understanding: we discovered the screen, the image of text that scrolls within our mind, something we in the age of TV and motion picture take for granted. There is a point at which an oral story becomes a screen story, when story ceases to be oral and becomes a disembodied image scrolling on our mind screen.

Illich (1993, pp. 54–58) points out that until the late 12th century, the art of reading was an oral and body motion that did not involve mirroring the page of text onto the mind’s screen; there was no such imagination. Reading in the 12th century was a highly physical activity in which people had to read out loud, in community, while mumbling and rocking their bodies. Knowledge from a written text became understanding in an oral community; reading alone and to oneself was unknown. Reading was done in the “communities of mumblers” (Illich, 1993, p. 54) and it had its analogy in bodily motor activity, “striding from line to line, or flapping one’s wing’s while surveying the already well-known page” (p. 54). “True, silent reading was occasionally practiced in antiquity, but it was considered a feat” (Illich, 1993, p. 87).

Reading for storying was also a task for the eyes: The eyes did the “picking,” “bundling,” “harvesting,” and “collecting” of words (Illich, 1993, p. 58). People chewed words, making sounds as they turned words over in their mouths, tasting their sweetness, as they heard the sounds of their word mumbling and munching. This was oral storytelling culture, and only in the late Middle Ages did *sweetness* come to mean something to do with eating food; it was originally to do with the sweetness of chewing words (Illich, 1993, p. 56). In those early days, written textual knowledge was conveyed orally as a “vineyard and garden,” and in the Middle Ages books often had gilded pages with organic images (Illich, 1993, p. 57). In short, knowledge transfer via stories (and reading) entailed[Restore original] community and the noise of people chewing their words and then swallowing knowledge to turn it into understanding. Wisdom was an act of tracing the word from text to oral and into the vineyard, into the space of understanding the world as a knowledge connection to letters on a page. The reader was helped to trace these connections by the ornamental drawings surrounding text. Thus, a network of relations from page to world to internalized knowledge was revealed through visual drawings to create an

understanding of human relations. We have diverged briefly into history to offer the reader some idea of how different the ancient and the modern practices of storytelling and knowledge management have become. It is in this context that we would like to offer three dimensions of S-space that we think would constitute a return to the ancient collective storytelling process for sharing knowledge and gaining understanding.

Voices, Logics, and Meaning: S-Space Dimensions of Participation, Power, and Discursive Action

S-space is theorized to have three dimensions: logics of power, voices of participation, and discursive action or meaning. S-space can provide insufficient freedom of narration for one to perform anything but the dominant story; people's lives can be conscripted into a hegemonic S-space. As S-space expands from monophonic (one voice) to polyphony (multiple voices) and from and monologic (one logic) to polylogic (multiple logics), the discursive action of that space becomes richer in polysemy (multiple meanings).

Regarding voices of participation, elsewhere Boje has developed a four-voice model of leadership and storytelling. The four voices are the monological voice telling one story to all, the dialogic voice between self and other, the trio of voices that includes conscience, and the fourth voice, the "voice of the voiceless." To hear the voice of the voiceless requires us to hear what is not said, by people unable or unwilling to speak. The transorganization is a cacophony of these four voices, some from many spheres, some caught in spheres that dominate, others seeking to liberate.

To expand on discursive action and polysemy or multiple meanings, White and Epston (1990, p. 12) point out that “much of our stock of lived experience goes unstoried.” That means that S-spaces have storied and unstoried regions. This can be because

- We do not yet understand experience until we can story it.
- No story conveys the full richness and depth of our lived experience (much remains unstoried).
- Much of the story is told and understood in its performance, not as abstractable, codifiable, reducible, or diffusible knowledge.

Power and control in knowledge management has more micro beginnings. Since Taylor’s (1919)[[**AUTHOR: There’s no Taylor 1911 in References; please add.**]] *Principles of Scientific Management*, we have known that a cadre of planners and engineers can be assembled to capture the knowledge of workers to increase centralized control of work planning. In Crozier’s (1964) studies of tobacco factories in France, we have become aware that once the experiential knowledge of workers is captured in written manuals, workers have lower economic value. However, only recently have narrativists entered the debate. The codification and abstraction process is a narrative technology, an instrument of power to de[Restore original]historicize, de[Restore original]contextualize, and de[Restore original]personify knowledge from encapsulated lived experience. However, the power of narrative and antenarrative technologies can also be used in a more humanistic manner to develop organizations and transorganizational networks.

Recent developments in qualitative data analysis technologies have facilitated research and consultant inquiry work with TD. Theodore Taptiklis is a former consultant at McKinsey,

where Tom Peters got his start. In 2000, Taptiklis began work on an oral presentation software package called StoryMaker, a competitor to Groupware, N-Vivo, and Ethnograph. The competitive advantage is that StoryMaker is a mobile voice recording, retrieval, and presentation software platform. StoryMaker allows any conversation to be converted to a reusable knowledge resource, it supports detailed coding and analysis of recorded narratives, and it allows replay of story data in a variety of presentation formats. A network of computer users can upload recorded stories, analyze them, and share their notations on particular stories. Such developments are encouraging in that they may enable TD story consultants and researchers to venture further into the unstoried polysemic regions of S-space. **.[[AUTHOR: This URL is invalid; revise as needed.]]**

Conclusion

Storytelling is important to TD theory and practice in several ways. First, it is through story sharing that participants crystallize their experiences in the network under development. Visions of possible futures are formulated and alliances are contemplated in story. Second, the consultant can facilitate story sharing between the temporary organizations that undertake network change initiatives by disseminating stories throughout the extended network. As the extended network gets involved in the stories of the unfolding initiatives, the development of networking options continues. Storytelling, therefore, is the currency by which network development is achieved and large system [Restore original]change is realized. In the collective dynamics of TD, storytelling plays a critical role in facilitating change and in understanding the changes that are unfolding throughout complex networks.

In this chapter, we have traced the developments and transitions in narrative knowledge management from oral society to the global information economy. Before narrative

technologization, stories resided in oral culture. Now stories are an exploitable written knowledge asset in an increasingly visual culture. Ilich's (1993) work points out that the shifts from oral speech, to the record of written knowledge, and on to visual knowledge reflect dramatic changes in mentality and economy. The shift from oral to visual narration is part of the postmodern turn, and we have ways of glossing visually that are somehow different from those of oral and scribed glossing. Inter[Restore original]story glossing research is now possible in the computerized narrative software of N-Vivo, Ethnograph, and StoryMaker. However, how we use recording, storage, and retrieval technology has a tremendous impact on organization and human behavior. Narrative technologization is thus a new topic for theory and research in TD, and the use of narrative technologies to capture and transmit tacit knowledge has enormous consequences for the global economy.

To conclude, we have a self-critique. We are familiar enough with consulting methods to know what it will take for a dialogical approach to storytelling in TD to produce a marketable method. We recognize that mining tacit knowledge stories is an easier consulting road to follow. However, we also want to be part of the emerging field of critical management consulting that provides a more sociological understanding of the process of change and development. TD is about forming spaces in which organization actors can rediscover storytelling, it is a return to community and to interactivity, and it allows us to share the multiple voices and logics of collective memory. We believe that this is an important contribution because the processes of global change involve a dialectic of transorganizational knowledge management and dialogical consulting practices.

References

- Armstrong, D. M. (1992). *Managing by storying around: A new method of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Armstrong, D. M. (2002). *Chief storytelling officer: More tales from America's foremost corporate storyteller*. New York: Doubleday
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1968). *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1973). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics* (R. W. Rotsel, Trans.). Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Barge, K. J. (2002). *Antenarrative and managerial practice*. Working paper, University of Georgia.
- Barry, D. (1997). Telling changes: From narrative family therapy to organizational change and development. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 10(1), 30–46.
- Barry, D., & Elmes, M. (1997). Strategy retold: Toward a narrative view of strategic discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 429–452.
- Boisot, M. H. (1998). *Knowledge assets: Securing competitive advantage in the information economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*. London: Sage.

Boje, D. M. (1979, August). *The change agent as revolutionary: Activist interventions into inter organizational networks*. Transorganizational development session of the Academy of Management Meetings, Atlanta, GA.

Boje, D. M. (1981). *Organization lore in transorganizational praxis*. Invited paper for the Academy of Folklore Meetings, San Antonio, Texas, October 22–24.

Boje, D. M. (1982, December 31). A networking approach to the problem of securing hi tech jobs for unemployed minority autoworkers. **[[AUTHOR: Publisher and city of publication?]] [UCLA Working Paper]**

Boje, D. M. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of storytelling performance in an office supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 106–126.

Boje, D. M. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as “Tamara-land.” *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 997–1035.

Boje, D. M. (1997, September). *Radical transorganizational development theory and praxis: From Weber and Durkheim to postmodern*. Research monograph. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn’t cited in text; ok to delete?]]yes**

Boje, D. M. (1999a). *Holon and transorganization theory*. Available at <http://web.nmsu.edu/~dboje/TDholons.html> **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn’t cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boje, D. M. (1999b). *Transorganizational development and the death of organizational development*. Available at <http://web.nmsu.edu/~dboje/TDdeathofod.html> **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn’t cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boje, D. M. (1999c). *Who rules large system transorganizational development (TD) consulting?* Available at <http://web.nmsu.edu/~dboje/TDforbes98.html>

Boje, D. M. (2002). *Critical dramaturgical analysis of Enron antenarratives and metatheatre*. Plenary presentation to 5th International Conference on Organizational Discourse: From Micro-Utterances to Macro-Inferences, July 24–26, London. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boje, D. M. (2007). The antenarrative cultural turn in narrative studies. In M. Zachry & C. Thralls (Eds.), *The cultural turn: Communicative practices in workplaces and the professions*. (In press) **[[AUTHOR: Page numbers, publisher, and city of publication?]]**
Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing

Boje, D. M. (2003b). Protest and activism: Standing up for peace and civil liberties in New Mexico under Homeland Security and U.S.A. PATRIOT acts. In J. O'Donnell, M. Pruyne, & R. Chávez (Eds.). **[[AUTHOR: Book title and page numbers?]]** Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boje, D. M., Alvarez, R. C., & Schooling, B. (2001). Reclaiming story in organization: Narratologies and action sciences. In R. Westwood & S. Linstead (Eds.), *The language of organization* (pp. 132–175). London: Sage.

Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2002). Enron whodunit? *Ephemera*, 2(4), 315–327. Available at <http://users.wbs.warwick.ac.uk/ephemera/ephemeraweb/journal/2-4/2-4bojeandrosile.pdf> **[[AUTHOR: This URL is invalid; revise as needed.]]** **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boje, D. M., & Rosile, G. A. (2003). Life imitates art: Enron's epic and tragic narration. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 17(1), 85–125. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Boyce, M. (1995). Collective centering and collective sense-making in the stories and storytelling of one organization. *Organization Studies*, 16(1), 107–137.

Case, P. (2002). Virtual stories of virtual working: Critical reflection on CTI consultancy discourse. In T. Clark & R. Fincham (Eds.), *Critical consulting: New perspectives on the management advice industry* (pp. 93–114). London: Blackwell.

Clark, T., & Fincham, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Critical consulting: New perspectives on the management advice industry*. London: Blackwell. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Cobb, A. T. (1991). Toward the study of organizational coalitions: Participant concerns and activities in a simulated organizational setting. *Human Relations*, 44, 1057–1079.

Collins, D. (1998). *Organizational change: Sociological perspectives*. London: Routledge. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Cooperrider, D. L., & Pasmore, W. A. (1991). Global social change. *Human Relations*, 44, 1037–1055.

Crozier, M. (1964). *The bureaucratic phenomenon*. London: Tavistock.

Culbert, S. A., Elden, J. M., McWhinney, W., Schmidt, W., & Tannenbaum, B. (1972). Trans-organizational praxis: A search beyond organizational development. *International Associations*, 24, 470–473.

Cummings, T. G. (1984). Transorganizational development. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 6, pp. 367–422). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Czarniawska, B. (1997). *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Denning, S. (2000). *The springboard: How storytelling ignites action in knowledge-era organizations*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Gargiulo, T. L. (2000). *Making stories: A practical guide for organizational leaders and human resource specialists*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Gephart, R. P. Jr. (1991). Succession, sensemaking, and organizational change: A story of a deviant college president. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 4, 35–44.

Illich, I. (1993). *In the vineyard of the text: A commentary to Hugh's Didascalicon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Information Awareness Office. (2002). *Total information awareness program (TIA) system description document (SDD)*. Retrieved on June 18, 2005, from <http://www.epic.org/privacy/profiling/tia/tiasystemdescription.pdf>

Kaye, M. (1996). *Myth-makers and story-tellers*. Sydney: Business & Professional Publishing.

Motamedi, K. (1978). *The evolution from interorganizational design to transorganizational development*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings in San Francisco.

Motamedi, K. (1984). Transorganizational development. In D. D. Warrick (Ed.), *Contemporary organization development* (pp. 57–67). New York: Scott Foresman. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Motamedi, K., & Cummings, T. (1981). Transorganizational development. In *Proceedings, Academy of Management meetings in Seattle* (pp. 220–225). **[[AUTHOR: Publisher and city of publication?]]** **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] yes**

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. **[[AUTHOR: Publisher and city of publication?]] New York: Oxford University Press.**

Perlmutter, H. V. (1991). On the rocky road to the first global civilization. *Human Relations, 44*, 897–920.

Perrow, C. (1972). *Complex organizations: A critical essay*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.

Polanyi, K. (1974). *Personal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schein, H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*, 229–241.

Shaw, G., Brown, R., & Bromiley, P. (1998). Strategic stories: How 3M is rewriting business planning. *Harvard Business Review*, May-June.

Sink, D. W. (1991). Transorganizational development in urban policy coalitions. *Human Relations*, 44, 1179–1195.

Sloterdijk, P. (1993). *Weltfremdheit*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] [No – citation added]**

Sloterdijk, P. (1998). *Sphären I: Blasen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] [No – citation added]**

Sloterdijk, P. (1999). *Sphären II: Globen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp. **[[AUTHOR: This reference isn't cited in text; ok to delete?]] [No – citation added]**

Snowden, D. (2002, July). *Complex acts of knowing: Paradox and descriptive self-awareness*. IBM Global Services working paper.

Snowden, D. (2001), Narrative patterns: The perils and possibilities of using story in organizations. *Knowledge Management*. Retrieved on 13 July 2007 from:

<http://www.kwork.org/Resources/narrative.pdf>

Taylor, F. W. (1919). *Principles of scientific management*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Vickers, M. H. (2002). *Illness, work and organization: Postmodernism and antenarratives for the reinstatement of voice*. Working paper, University of Western Sydney.

White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: W.W. Norton.

