

**TOWARDS A POSTCOLONIAL STORYTELLING THEORY OF
MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION**

Accepted 9/28/2011 at Journal of Management Philosophy

David M. Boje, Bill Daniels Ethics Fellow; Professor, Management Department, New Mexico State
University. dboje@nmsu.edu 575-532-1693

Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen, Associate Professor, Department of Education, Learning and
Philosophy, Aalborg University. kmj@learning.aau.dk, +4530623009

Anete M. Camille Strand, Ph.D. Assistant Professor, Department of Communication, Aalborg
University. astrand@hum.aau.dk, + 4551719587

TOWARDS A POSTCOLONIAL STORYTELLING THEORY OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION

ABSTRACT

The contribution to management philosophy is to develop a postcolonial storytelling theory that foregrounds ontology. We do this by drawing together parallel developments in agential realism, quantum physics, and tribal people's storytelling. We argue that these developments resituate the hegemonic relationship of narrative representationalism over material storytelling practices. Implications are two-fold. First, it dissolves inherent dualisms presumed in the concept of interaction among entities like actor-structure, subject-object, discursive-nondiscursive in favor of a profound ontology of entanglement and intra-action of materiality and discourse. This implies a democratization of material and human voices in that agency does not belong solely to the human domain. Second, postcolonial phenomena are understood as the results of entangled genealogies in which plural voices are present. This includes an awareness of material storytelling and antenarrative resistance and contestation to imperial and colonizing narratives but also the intra-action among material storytelling and master narratives and the spatial alignment among them.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this essay therefore is to draw parallel theory work of indigenous postcolonial interrogative of storytelling materiality and those of quantum physics agential realism into an approach for the study of management and organizations, in what is defined here, as '*postcolonial storytelling*.' The contribution is to show how a storytelling attentive to material conditions, can be a significant challenge to representational, structuralist narrative work in management and organization studies.

Diverse and rich resources of postcolonial interrogative spaces and temporalities have barely been mined for productive dialogue with management and organization studies (Jack & Westwood, 2009). Postcolonial theory has focused on representational narrative discourse to the exclusion of

material-agentive-storytelling practices, and in particular those of ‘*native*’ American ‘*indians*’ (e.g. Allen, 1992; Owens, 2001; Cajete, 2000; Vizenor, 1998).¹

The thesis is that discourse, without materialism, is seduced by representationalism, and that, in particular, managerialist discourse erases and marginalizes material-agentive aspects of storytelling. The premise is that much of the recent work in postcolonial study focuses on discursive representationalism, without inquiring into the material ordering. Following Karen Barad’s (2007: 181) “space, time, and matter” are viewed here as “mutually constituted through the dynamics of iterative intra-activity” rather than as an *interaction*. Ironically, it is in the ‘*native*’ American storytelling writing, which has been largely ignored in postcolonial theory and management philosophy, that one finds an important *intra-activity* of storytelling and materiality that is considered agential.

contend that Dorothy Smith (1990) as well as Barad (2007) go beyond the hegemonic relationship of discourse over materiality and introduce a “new materialism,” which we see as one way to rethink postcolonial theory and method with major implications for management and organization studies.

Storytelling, here, is defined more broadly, as something agential such as the iterative intra-active-material-storytelling domains of ‘*living stories*’ and ‘*antenarratives*’ in the theatre of action, which go beyond the classical narrative focus on structuralist and representationalist elements and retrospection (Boje, 2001, 2008). In the linguistic turn, narrative is just words, in texts, language, grammar, and structures of representation. McCloskey (1990) contends that economists are storytellers, who often construct narratives of beginning, middle, and end, but with their own preferred endings. Living story, on the other hand, is in a time, a place of collectively lived participation with the world that is here and now. Living stories are stories-in-the-making, part of the theatre of action, a performative-enacted-and-embodied material way being that is a part of “gender-in-the-making” (Barad, 2007: 87), as well as race-in-the-making, class-in-the-making, and (post) colonialism-in-the-making.

¹ Throughout lowercase ‘*indians*’ and ‘*native*’ is used, following Vizenor (1998) to denote a resistance to the colonizer and their Euramerican hyperreal simulations, since the Americas is not Columbus’ India & ‘*native*’ is still being colonized

Antenarrative is defined as ‘before’ narrative stability, and as a ‘bet’ that material transformation has storytelling agency (Boje, 2001, 2008). Antenarrative is more about what Gioia and colleagues (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Gioia, Thomas, Clark, & Chittipeddi, 1994; Gioia & Mehra, 1996; Gioia & Thomas, 1996) refer to as ‘prospective’ sensemaking than the ‘retrospective’ approaches in management (Weick, 1995) or the (classical) narrative representationalism and structuralism.

Antenarrative is performative in its materializing engagement with the world and being part of its becoming (materialization), and what Bakhtin (1993) terms ‘eventness.’ Antenarratives have material agency and answerability for remaking, and reshaping the world into many possible futures (Morson, 1994).

Antenarratives are a bridging of narratives stuck-in-place to living stories, on-the-move, founding spaces (de Certeau, 1984). Antenarratives processes are iterative, performative, in “spacetime-mattering” ways of making/marking the future, whereas living story (story-in-the-making) is an enactment of differences “making/marking here and now” (Barad, 2007: 315, 137).

A postcolonial storytelling theory for management and organization studies achieves several results.

First, it draws attention to how storytelling and materiality are profoundly entangled and intra-active rather than interactive. This implies a democratization of material and human voices in that materiality is granted a far more powerful voice in understanding organizational action.

Second, a postcolonial storytelling theory perceives phenomena in organizations as a web of complex relationships and entangled genealogies, which comprise both colonizers and colonized/neocolonized. Postcolonial storytelling thus produces an awareness of antenarrative resistance and contestation to imperial and colonizing narratives. Story-in-the-making and antenarrative-in-the-making are both active participants in the process of materialization, not just a discursive representation, and is oppositional to reified, static, petrified narrative representations in management studies (Czarniawska, 2004).

This makes it possible to study the intra-play of dominant colonizing and postcolonizing retrospective-narratives with the liberatory countermoves of living stories and antenarrating.

The essay is organized as follows:

First, we argue to go beyond representationalism and replace it with an approach we call postcolonial storytelling characterized by the intra-activity of materiality and discourse.

Next we review the indigenous, postclassical narrative, and quantum physics approaches to material-agential-storytelling.

Third we develop implications for management and organization studies.

BEYOND REPRESENTATIONALISM

Arendt contends that the ability to speak a language is what makes an actor an actor. It is through the spoken word that the actor identifies what he does, has done and intends to do (Arendt, 1998, pp. 178-179). Wittgenstein (1983) uses the concept *language games* to describe how meaning is co-constructed; a process characterized as inter-subjective, unfinished, unresolved, dialogical, multiple, spontaneously emergent, situational and contextual.

As such language is seen as weaved with actions and deeply embedded in a material world. None-the-less the term “language games” has probably been complicit in producing a hegemonic perception of language over materiality where agency subsequently has been located in the realm of speech like Arendt suggested.

Barad contends that language has been granted too much power (2007, p. 132). She refers to this obsession with language as representationalism where focus is on correspondence between descriptions and reality (Barad, 2007, p. 135) and which according to Barad characterizes both social constructivist and traditional realist approaches. These have implied an emphasis on narrative rationality (Czarniawska, 1997, p. 22) where reality is ordered in a linear relationship of beginning, middle and end.

This has implied that narrative in Benjamin's words (1999, P. 86) has been removed from the realm of everyday speech characterized as living storytelling consistent with spontaneously emergent practices of actions in which multiple voices are embedded and characterized as intra-actions of word, eye, hand and soul.

Instead of liberation of a plurality of voices, a tyranny of monologic narrative rationality has emerged as dominant groups have colonized how we should speak, how events should be interpreted, what is appropriate and in-appropriate language etc., no matter how matter is composed.

In other words, representationalism is a discursive construction that has gradually been removed from the realm of everyday speech as an effect of the apparatus of modernity of separating things into entities and of constructing dualities of language (actors, meaning) and materiality (structures, matter).

Arendt (1998) proposes that language is multiple and that meaning is co-constructed through storytelling and that this storytelling is always concerned with the matters of the world. She however maintains the term *interaction* and thus the idea that separate entities, i.e. language and matter interact where language is ruling over matter.

Barad suggests that instead of using the term interaction, we should use the term intra-action; a term that implies the entanglement of both language and matter; i. e. actor and structure, human and nature etc.

Subsequently we prefer to use the term *material storytelling* (Strand, 2010) to emphasize the intra-action of the material and the discursive and where the relationship between the discursive and material is resituated and democratized such that (1) both are presumed to have agency and (2) where it is recognized that practices are material-discursive.

We find examples of material storytelling in "native American Indian" storytelling, which however has been marginalized in organization and management studies and in post-colonial scholarship according to Louis Owens. He refers to Edward Said (1993) "... this celebrated father of

postcolonial theory dismisses Native American writing in a single scathingly imperial phrase as ‘that sad panorama produced by genocide and cultural amnesia which is beginning to be known as “native American literature” (2001, pp. 172-3).

Homi Bhabha is totally silent about indigenous Native American writing. The lone exception is Trinh Minh-ha’s (1989) inclusion of Leslie Marmon Silko’s storytelling, and giving passing note to native American writers Momaday, Joy Harjo, Vizenor, and Linda Hogan.

One notable exception to this exclusion of indigenous storytelling is found in Jack and Westwood’s (2009: 277) reference to indigenous ‘storytelling research’ as an agenda described by Smith (1999) to decolonize methodology” indigenous projects situated within this agenda with names such as claiming, testimonies, storytelling, remembering, intervening, gendering, democratizing, protecting.” However, there are no ‘native’ American writers included, and ‘native’ American writing is not addressed.

Perhaps postcolonial theory had more of a focus on narrative devices early on, and then refocused more on discursive representationalism. Edward Said’s (1979: 21) *Orientalism*, has over 30 references to narrative, such as, “The things to look at are style, figures of speech, setting, narrative devices, historical and social circumstances, *not* the correctness of the representation nor its fidelity to some great original.”

In another example, Said (p. 162) is critical of how “narrative order” is manipulated to writer’s such as Lane, by adding detail to foil narrative movement in order to delineate some characterization of Egyptian, an narrative is only then a formality: “What prevents narrative order, at the very same time that narrative order is the dominating fiction of Lane’s text, is sheer, overpowering, monumental description” that makes “Egypt and the Egyptians totally invisible” to the reader.

Similar narrative critique is made of Chateaubriand’s “egoistic Oriental memoirs” (p. 175). Said’s most severe critiques is the way Burton “steer a narrative” (p. 195) in an colonizing way, by acquiring detailed knowledge, about the ‘Orient by living there, actually seeing it firsthand” (but still in “domination over all the complexities of Oriental life” as “his victory over the sometimes scandalous system of Oriental knowledge, a system he had mastered by himself” (p. 196) In short,

Burton “had taken over the management of Oriental life for the purposes of his narrative” order (p. 196).

One reason for a marginalization of indigenous material-agential-storytelling-practices is the focus on discourse in postcolonial studies has oftentimes privileged European-American ideologies of representation over the study of materiality and history. Colonialism involves material practices, such as “physical conquest, occupation, and administration of the territory of one country by another” (Prasad, 2003: 5).

Prasad points out that the material practices of contemporary imperialism (or neocolonialism despite decolonizing resistance) have taken new forms (other than colonial occupation) such as the role of powerful administrative institutions such as WTO, World Bank, IMF, and so on. Prasad’s edited book contains many references to indigenous writers in Asia, Africa, Australia and New Zealand, but ignores ‘native American indian’ ones.

Next we review the indigenous, postclassical narrative, and quantum physics approaches to material-agential-storytelling, then come back at the end of the article to develop implications for management and organization studies.

TOWARDS AN INDIGENOUS MATERIAL-AGENTIAL-STORYTELLING PRAXIS

For most indigenous peoples, story is not the same as Western (or classical) narrative, possibly because “Indigenous peoples across the world have other stories to tell” such as “the history of Western research through the eyes of the colonized” or how “counter stories are powerful forms of resistance which are repeated and shared across diverse indigenous communities” (Smith, 1999: 2).

Rather, storytelling for indigenous peoples is a methodology to “resist new forms of colonization” and a means of “critical analysis of the role of research in the indigenous world” (p. 5). Smith is not finished with colonialism and prefers to decolonize, rather than postcolonizing. She rejects “the idea that the story of history can be told in one coherent narrative” (Smith, 1999: 31). To decolonize for Smith (1999: 34-5) means recovering stories of the past that were marginalized, “telling our

stories form the past, reclaiming the past, giving testimony to the injustices of the past” as strategies “employed by indigenous peoples struggling for justice.”

While there has been indigenous scholarship recognized in postcolonial theorist’s work, there has been widespread neglect of ‘native’ American ‘indian’ critical scholarship (lower-case on purpose, following Vizenor, 1998). We look to this next.

Lower-case ‘*native*’ American ‘*indian*’ Storytelling

Much of the ‘native’ American writing about storytelling has a focus on materiality, not found in classical Western narrative, and at the margins of postclassical narrative and postcolonial writing. Gerald Vizenor (1994, 1996, 1998, 1999), for example, applies poststructuralist (Derrida, Foucault), postmodern (Baudrillard, Debord), critical theory (Adorno) and dialogical theory (Bakhtin) to invoke a version of living stories that is a resistance to dominant colonizer narrative.

Vizenor’s (1998: 1) approach is in the concept of “storiers of presence... that actuate the sovenance and totemic observance of nature.” In his new vocabulary, the word ‘*Indian*’ with a capital ‘I’ for Vizenor is a hyperreal “simulation and loan word of dominance” indicating ‘absence’ continued in U.S. master narratives, whereas ‘*indian*’ in lower-case is “an ironic case” of ironic presence (p. 14, 27).

“The *indian* has no native ancestors; the original crease of simulation is Columbian”: “The native stories of survivance are successive and natural estates; survivance is an active repudiation of dominance, tragedy, and victimry”; “*Sovenance*” is defined as “that sense of presence in remembrance, that trace of creation and natural reason in native stories” and is not “aesthetic absence or victimry” (p. 15).

Stories connote a special sense of materiality, what Vizenor (1998: 15) calls ‘*transmotion*’ defined as “that sense of native motion and an active presence, [that] is *sui generis* sovereignty” and “a reciprocal use of nature, not a monotheistic, territorial sovereignty.” The transmotion of ledger art is a creative connection to the motion of horses depicted in winter counts and heraldic hide paintings” (p. 179).

Storied transmotion is a material “presence in stories, an actual presence in the memories of others, and an obviative presence as semantic evidence” and in a Bakhtinian sense “a dialogical circle” (p. 169) and “in a ‘dialogical context,’ the conversions of [ethical] answerability” (p. 27, bracketed addition, mine). Stories are a transmotion, and a virtual sense of presence in animated and embodied native memories that includes in a posthumanist philosophy, animal memories (p. 170).

Colonialism is a narrative of domination where conquered rights of transmotion, land sovereignty, and natural material reason are decided by conquerors (Vizenor, 1998: 181-2). “The monotheism and monologic of Western narrative is “dominance over nature; transmotion is natural reason, and native creation with other creatures” (p. 183).

Gregory Cajete’s (2000: 23) *Native Science*, also privileges story over Western narrative, theorizing its material-agentive force: “Native science is an echo of a pre-modern participation with the non-human world.” Storytelling is a way of participation in and is interdependent with material conditions of a living life-world. Colonizing “animism continues to perpetuate a modern prejudice, a disdain and a projection of inferiority toward the world view of indigenous people” (p. 27).

For Cajete (2000: 27) participation with its material surroundings gives “animism: a modern human sensibility: “indeed all humans are animists.” For Cajete, animism is [posthumanist] attention to interdependence of humans with “elegant cycles of metamorphosis, transformation, and regeneration that form the basis of all life on Earth.”

Critical to this essay is the concept of story that has material agency as well as ethical answerability. By implication, living story can be defined as an animating material perspective on nature as vitally materializing that is agentive. Living story, on the other hand, is direct material, physical experience, “a primal affinity between the human body and other bodies of the natural world” (p. 24).

Living story therefore has agency: “in this sense, community itself becomes a story a collection of individual stories that unfold through the lives of the people in that community” (Cajete, 2000: 95). This relational agential interdependence comes with an ethical answerability to give back to the

nature that sustains all life: “keeping true to all of one’s relationships, which means keeping true to all our primal responsibilities, compacts, and alliances with the natural world” (p. 74).

Euro-American Narrative, by contrast, is a second order representational experience of being in interdependent relationship with the world. Narrative is a representational blueprint or map, “detached” and “estranged” (p. 24).

Greg Sarris (1993: 4, 21-2) stresses that stories have a time, a place, and an owner and adds storytelling “... can work to oppress or to liberate, to confuse or to enlighten.” Citing Schwartzman (1984: 80) observation, that in organization settings “ stories ... can generate organizational activity (not just comment on it) and interpret and sometimes transform the work experience” (as cited in Sarris, p. 156).

Sarris breaks with the retrospective narrative, and looks to a more antenarrative temporal perspective, asking “what is going to happen” to a young Saddle Lake Cree girl whose teacher put her in the “corner with a coloring pad and crayons while the other students worked on computers” (p. 159)? Each student in Sarris’ class then added their antenarratives, co-constructing a collective story that bridged their own personal experiences as Crees, with discrimination in the schools.

In this way, the collective antenarrative was a way to talk back to the dominant institutional narratives of colonial education and to establish an ethical answerability. For Sarris, who like Vizenor, cites and extends Bakhtin’s work, there is a gap between narrative-as-text and storytelling as interactive orality about day-to-day life struggles. The relevance to Bakhtin (1973, 1981) is the focus on the “kind of internal dialogue where the interlocutors examine the nature of their own thinking ... carried over to an ever-widening context of talk, stories, and conversation” (Sarris, 1993: 30).

Robert Allen Warrior (1995) identifies ‘native’ American intellectual traditions and is critical of its essentialism (such as Ward Churchill and M. Annette Jaimes’ essentialist idealism of native American Indian being part of global consciousness shared with other indigenous people and Paula Gunn Allen’s feminism gynocentric spirit-formed consciousness).

Such essentialist positions do offer a “strong counternarrative to the received academic and popular understanding of American Indian people and cultures” (Warrior, 1995: xvii). A third stream Warrior identifies is anti-essentialist (e.g. Jack Forbes, Jimmie Durham, & Gerald Vizenor). These writers stress the analysis of material economic and sociocultural conditions lost in the essentialist discourse.

Indeed the more postmodern literature and theory of Vizenor has been so successful in its anti-essentialism, that Churchill and Jaines’ more recent work shows less concern for an essentialist global worldview, and focuses more on a hard-line political agenda.

Warrior’s main concern in promoting critical discourse is that there is (1) an avoidance of internal critique by opting to only critique non-Indian scholarship and U.S. society; (2) few works of American Indian literature have a nuanced storytelling of contemporary variety or generational history of American Indian intellectual production (p. xix); (3) the discourses continue to be obsessed with questions of Indian identity and authenticity (i.e. quantum blood essentialism) and sidestep critical discourse questions, such as an Indian future (p. xix).

Warrior stresses examples of a more critical discourse in the writing of Deloria and Mathews. Warrior’s reading is that both are focused on a “process-centered and a materially-based” approach to storytelling, which can successfully address issues raised in “postcolonial literary critical discourses” (p. xxiii). Warrior prefers a more nuanced storytelling which traces the contextual historical themes, and nuanced descriptions of the weaknesses of sociopolitical strategies in the midst of oppression.

In particular the land and community material conditions of a land stripped of irreplaceable topsoil by several draughts, a land settled by colonizers and now cluttered with oil wells, reveal that “after less than a century of Euro-American domination, the land was bereft of millions of buffalos and other animals and could no longer bear, without chemicals and modern machinery, the agricultural system that had replaced these animals” (p. 59).

Paula Gunn Allen (1992) has a material-agential-storytelling perspective missed by Warrior. The tribal ways are rooted in “the oral tradition [that] has prevented the complete destruction of the web

[of identity that long held tribal people secure], the ultimate disruption of tribal ways” (p. 45, bracketed additions, mine). Allen argues that the tribal person “knows that living things are subject to processes of growth and change as a necessary component of their aliveness” and “is not symbolic in the usual sense” because it also has a “material dimension” (p. 62).

Allen recounts how Fred Young, the Navajo physicist explained timespace: “if you hold time constant, space went to infinity, and when space was held constant time moved to infinity.... The tribal sense of self as a moving event within a moving universe is very similar to the physicist’ understanding of the particle within time and space” (p. 147).

Tribal peoples’ storytelling is to “embody, articulate, and share reality” and to “actualize” and shape its direction with “the forces that surround and govern human life and the related lives of all things” (p. 56). In a quantum physics sense, all of life is living and dynamic, and interconnected, and not an “opposition, dualism, and isolation (separation) that characterizes non-Indian thought” (p. 56).

The difference for Allen between the western narrative and tribal people’s storytelling is the western one is hierarchical and dualistic, and the other “does not rely on conflict, crisis, and resolution for the organization” (p. 59) and does not “draw a hard and fast line between what is material and what is spiritual” (p. 60).

In sum, there appears to be a more important agential role of a materiality in living story and antenarrative that is beyond narrative representationalism. Living story is not merely about humans, since it is a posthumanist materiality. Nor is storying just about material words or texts, since it is orality, acting out, or a drawing that depicts transmotion well beyond the limits of Western *homo narrens*.

There are two movements that can be related to a material storytelling one could apply to management studies. First is the work of postclassical narrative (which is still wedded mostly to a representationalist discourse, but does critique classical structuralism), and the second is a brand of quantum physics, which takes a materiality-discursive approach (one that seems to be parallel to the

materiality forces, such as transmotion, reviewed in the ‘native American indian’ work). We look at these next.

Postclassical Narrative

Matti Hyvärinen (2007: 1) says classical narrative “scholars often wanted to see stories from the perspective of grammars and structures” in conventional terms, such as Propperian classification of fairytales rather than address the counternarratives that raised ethical and contextual issues.

One could add Aristotle’s *Poetics*, Russian Formalism, and American structuralism (e.g. Bruner’s, 1986: 14, story grammar) to this classical narrativists focus on the internal structure of narrative. “The vocabulary of counter-narratives, vis-à-vis master, dominant or hegemonic narratives and cultural scripts, works in a different way and aptly foregrounds the variety of narratives and resists any narrative essentialism” (Hyvärinen (2007: 1). And it is here that we shall see the Achilles heel of managerialist and organization studies is narrative structuralism.

Gerald Prince (2005: 372) declares, “In spite of this proliferation of discourses pertaining to (the systematic study of) narrative, there have been few proposals for or elaborations of a postcolonial narratology (see, e.g., Fludernik 1996; Gymnich 2002).” One could add Bamberg (2004, a, b), and Caldwell (1999) to the list. Indeed, there have been important approaches suggested in postclassical literary studies for a postcolonial narratology, but not for a postcolonial ‘material-agentive-storytelling’ approach, and none have referenced ‘native American indian’ scholarship.

That said, there are traces of a materiality theory in some of the postclassical narratology work that could, bridged to the ‘native American indian’ storytelling reviewed above, and hopefully pose something new for postcolonial studies of managerialism. Prince’s (2005) proposal for a postcolonial narratology draws upon a postclassical narrative lens. Prince wants to construct a postcolonial narratology that expands the representational narrative from written text to oral, or sign language, or moving pictures, or any combination thereof (p. 373).

However, his definition of narrative is limited to modes of narrative representation, and those that meet the standard of a minimum of plot-structural coherence, and his proposal for a postcolonial

narratology looks at representations of space, time, and motion in the minimally coherent narrative structures. Space is analyzed in narrative, but looking at if it is “explicitly mentioned and described, prominent or not, stable or changing, perceiver-dependent or, on the contrary, autonomous, characterized by its position or by its constituents” (p. 375).

Similarly, temporality is to be analyzed for its “relative explicitness, precision, and prominence” and for its temporal action: “straight, cyclical, or lopping, regressive as opposed to progressive...” (p. 375). Prince’s postcolonial narratology aims to “account for the kinds of characters inhabiting these spatial and temporal settings and to supply instruments for the exploration and description of their significance, their complexity, the stability of their designation and identity....” (p. 375).

Throughout Prince gives references to literary studies, but not to any native American literary ones or to the material-agential aspects of storytelling. Prince is not willing to move out of representation or depiction, and into material conditions of a postcolonial narratology. His version of postcolonial narratology is ironic in that it proposes to move beyond the structuralism of classical narratologies, yet in the end remains anchored to “narrative structures and configurations” which suggest “postcolonial affinities” (p. 379). Two other proposals follow this path.

Marion Gymnich’s (2002: 62) version of postcolonial narrative focuses on the linguistic representational identity “categories of ethnicity, race, class and gender are constructed, perpetuated or subverted in narrative texts.” A postcolonial narratologist, can look at the hierarchical relationship between postcolonial and minority literature, “including privileged positions within the text” (p. 69), or “characters marked by a foreign language” (p. 70).

Monika Fludernik’s (1996: 366) proposal for postcolonial narrative refers to “ethnic and postcolonial studies” that “could be analyzed from a narratological perspective.” She argues that there are several productive links between postclassical narratology and an analysis of postcolonial narratives, such as a study of the use of ‘odd’ pronouns (‘one,’ ‘you,’ or ‘we’ narratives) to illuminate a narratorial ‘we’ to get at the temporal spatial, moral, linguistic, and intellectual distances between narrator, narratee, and characters (as cited in Prince, 2005: 375).

Fludernik (1996: 366-7) looks, as well, at the category ‘person’ in first-person, second person, and multi-personed narration, and at the ‘white British’ voice and the use of ‘native English idiom’ in “more recent postcolonial texts,” and recommends looking at “ethnic protest literature” that in her view has “used traditional modes of narration, and some experimental fiction [that] is inveterately esoteric and degage.”

Outside of Prince, Gymnich, and Fludernik’s representational and linguistic identity in postcolonial narrative, postcritical work by Boehmer (1993), Durant (2004), and Mputubwele (1998) is not mentioned at all. And these others do not address an intra-play between materiality and discourse, or the kinds of materiality of spacetime in the ‘native indian’ American works reviewed above. Fortunately, there are other approaches to postclassical narratology that do venture further across the divide between storytelling and materiality.

First, Daniel Punday’s (2000) corporeal narratology focuses on the human body, paying more attention to embodiment, to ‘what’ body is being represented, instead of the structuralist elements of narrative. Corporeal narrative is a way of sorting bodies into types, such as in racist narratives obsessed with a relationship between civilization or intelligence, and skin color, or the shape of heads, noses, eyes, and lips, etc: “as in the notion that lighter skins imply intelligence and greater degrees of civilization” (p. 231).

The human body has been discussed in classical, postclassical, and postcolonial narratives, but the narratological issues have not been addressed. But, instead of material-corporeal, the focus is on how the female body, the colonized body, and the colonizers body is represented in various narrative texts: “how certain ways of thinking about the body shape the plot, characterization, setting, and other aspects of narrative” (p. 228). Punday, like Prince, Fludernik, and Gymnich, is caught up in representationalism, not in narrative’s relationship to the (corporeal) materiality of the body.

Second, extensions of Martin Bamberg’s (2004a, b; 2005) work can be made to living story intra-active materiality and agency. In ‘story-as-interactive’ discourse in conversation, it is feasible to pay close attention not only representational characterizations of race, gender, class, and power, but

to “time and space coordinates in the way that these relate to social categories and their action potential” (Bamberg, 2004a: 225).

This way of analyzing story-talk-in-interactions (Boje, 1991) traces how interactional-living-story-talk is “complicit with and/or countering dominant discourses (master narratives)” (p. 225).

Bamberg (2005) claims narrative is straightjacketed when it comes to explaining the lives of real people. Bamberg’s focus is on “what people *do* when they talk and what they *do* when they tell stories” (p. 215).

He wants to move away from the cognitive approach to narrative (privileging one active teller), as exchanges between talking heads and the classical structuralist narrative theory that reduces all to written text structural patterns embedded in context (p. 218). Stories-in-situated-interaction focalizes “human sense-making in the form of emergent processes” (Bamberg, 2004a: 225), and “order[s] characters in space and time ... revealing character transformations in the unfolding sequence from past to future” (Bamberg, 2004b: 354).

We turn next to a look at a parallel approach to storytelling-agential-materiality in the works of Barad and Smith, that is central to ‘native American indian’ scholarship, and except for Punday and Bamberg, peripheral to postclassical attempts to fashion a postcolonial narratology.

Karen Barad’s Materializing-agential theory

Barad’s (2007) *agential realism theory* attempts to link discourse and materializing agency to a realism that is not positivistic, and opens up understanding of quantum space, time, and materializing as an ‘intra-active’ phenomenon instead of ‘interactive.’ For Barad (2007: 139) “the notion of *intra-action* (in contrast to the usual ‘interaction,’ which resumes the prior existence of independent entities or realta) represents a profound conceptual shift.”

Barad assumes (2007: 181-2) discourse and materiality are intra-playing, and not separated, as in classical approaches to mechanistic physics or to classical discourse (& narrative). While Barad does not look at storytelling per se, she does address discourse (and storytelling is for us a domain of discourse).

The implication is storytelling, as material-discursive practice, is sedimenting historicity practices where "time has a history" (p. 180); "Time is not a succession of evenly spaced identical moments" (p. 180) as it is conceived in classical narrative. "Space is not a collection of preexisting points set out in a fixed geometry, for matter to inhabit" (p. 180). "Matter does not refer to fixed substance" (p. 151). "*Matter is a stabilizing and destabilizing process of iterative intra-activity*" (p. 151).

The relevance of materializing-agential theory to postcolonial theory can be seen in Said's (1978: 1) work where geography is not a physical fact, but a "European invention" and "one of ... [Europe's] deepest and recurring images of the Other" (as cited in Prasad, 2003: 11). By extension from Barad, it is through agential intra-actions that story-in-the-making has material interplay producing, and produced by (in part) the world.

Story-in-the-making is intra-activity, not synonymous with language or discourse, or just a speech act, or marks on a text. Story-in-the-making is intra-active with material practices. Story-in-the-making are not preexisting objects, but instead are agentially enacted intra-actively with materiality-agency, in the now and here of Bakhtinian eventness.

Instead of representational narrative or self-reflexive narrative gazing at oneself, Barad look to Donna Haraway's (1992: 299) diffractive method: "the rays from my optical device diffract rather than reflect. These diffracting rays compose interference patterns, not reflecting images."

In contrast to both retrospective-representational and reflexivity-narrative that abstracts sameness, story-in-the-making is *diffractive* of differences that make a difference in the world, and is part of world's differential becoming as "*specific material engagements that participate in (re) configuring the world*" (Barad, 2007: 90, italics in original).

Dorothy Smith's New Materialism theory Smith is concerted about relations of ruling that might be studied from a feminist standpoint, using an ethnomethodological approach to revise Marxist material conditions (see Myers, 2009 study of university women professors). Smith (1990: 43-44) looks to Marx's *The German Ideology* at three tricks, which I am adapting here to new materialism storytelling:

Trick 1 – Separate what people storytell from the actual circumstance in which it was story-in-the-making, grounded in actual material conditions of their lives and from the actual storytellers who talked it.

Trick 2 – Having detached narrative representations from material conditions, and from who talked what living stories-in-the-making and antenarratives-in-the-making, arrange the fragments into an ordered and coherent narrative abstraction full of “mystical connections” (p. 43).

Trick 3 – Change the representations into a virtual narrative, setting virtual person to narrate entities (value patterns, norms, belief systems and so forth) to which agency or causal efficacy is attributable to virtual characters who are substituted to articulate the representational entities.

These three tricks of narrative erasure of living story/antenarrative-in-the-making, substitute virtual agency/causality in what Smith (1990: 44) terms an *ideological circle*. The relevance to postcolonial theory is that a focus on discourse (representations of gender, race, class), without attention to storytelling-materiality, makes the three tricks invisible.

And it is this process of narrative hegemony that is relevant to postcolonial study because it produces material effects and is accomplished in material circuitry, albeit through virtual agential attribution brought about by managerialist and institutional sensemaking practices that mark/make sameness out of differences. The implication from Smith (1990: 36) is the narrative representationalism “neglects the sensuous, living aspects of existence” as embedded in material conditions of people’s actual storytelling practices, which constitute ideology sociohistorically.

This is not to say that narrative representationalism is groundless. Narrative representation is part of the co-ordering, of regulative managerialist sensemaking, which in Smith’s (1990: 42) terms is a kind of “‘currency’ – a medium of exchange among ideologists and a way of thinking about the world that stands *between* the thinking and the object.” For Barad (2007) it is a Cartesian duality of subject and object. See, Myers’ (2009) application of Smith’s standpoint feminism to how academic women frame success, and are framed by higher education narrative processes.

Academic reflexivity could be about being answerable (in Bakhtinian ethical sense) for one's standpoint. As Nietzsche declares, there is no neutral place to stand. Derrida (1979: 94), like Dorothy Smith and Bakhtin, also sees narrative as hegemonic because they become terroristic inquisitions, posing as a logocentrism. Living stories of resistance can disrupt monologic narrative order.

Next we summarize the philosophical implications and apply them to organization and management theory.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT THEORY

The proposed 'postcolonial material-storytelling' theory, method and intervention practices has several philosophical implications that open up several possibilities for organization and management studies.

First it draws attention to how storytelling and materiality are profoundly entangled and intra-active rather than interactive. For Barad, this is accomplished by her agential realist elaboration of Bohr's notion of apparatus.

Her account of discourse is thus different from Foucault's notion of discursive practice, which she describes as "...the local sociohistorical material conditions that enable and constrain disciplinary knowledge practices such as speaking, writing, thinking, calculating, measuring, filtering and concentrating" (Barad, 2007, p. 147).

Even if materiality is important for Foucault it is still subordinated discourse, which enables and constrain materialization and not the other way around, where materiality to a higher degree governs what can be said and done including the meaning of words and actions. According to Barad this is the difference between Foucault and Bohr where apparatuses become the particular physical arrangements and conditions that enable and constrain knowledge practices (Barad, 2007, p. 147).

So instead of a hegemonic relationship where discourse and language is above materiality, postcolonial storytelling would insist on the materiality of meaning making where a more equal and

democratic relationship is accomplished and where living storytelling thus becomes situated in activities and relations; i.e. in embedded sensemaking practices of articulation that is a critical treatment of ideological aspects of storytelling-material conditions that co-order, co-produce people's lives.

For Smith, material-discourse is an ethnomethodological accomplishment, from the *standpoint* of women. Classical narrative deprives us access the living storyability and antenarratability of sociohistorical processes. Extending Smith (1990: 42) such storytelling is to “suppress its grounds in our active engagement with the world.”

The implications of Smith/Barad's ‘new materialism’ approaches to discourse for storytelling is attending more to how storytelling works, how it puts together our world by studying how storytelling happens on ontological grounds, in the world. A story and storytelling is the result of the ontic and the semantic, it emerges from material-discursive conditions where some stories become more possible and likely than other stories.

This implies a democratization of material and human voices in that materiality is granted a far more powerful voice in understanding organizational action. This is not only accomplished by becoming more attentive of how the material conditions enable and constrain stories. The point raises much more fundamental issues.

One of the key implications of intra-activity is the entanglement of the material and the discursive, individual and social, human and nature. Postcolonial storytelling thus implies an ethics of mattering where the “I” and the “Other” always are relationally and mutually constituted. They are inevitably entangled, intertwined and weaved with each other in a way in which the dualism “I – Other” is dissolved.

Matter is already entangled with the other. It is on one's skin, bones, belly, heart etc. Accordingly, the human subject is not the locus of ethicality. “We (but not only “we humans”) are always already responsible to the others with whom or which we are entangled, not through conscious intent but through the various ontological entanglements that materiality entails” (Barad, 2007, p. 393).

Ethics is therefore not about a right response to the other but rather about a fundamental responsibility and accountability for the lively material-discursive becoming of which we are part (Barad, 2007, p. 393). Responsibility and accountability precedes intentionality and cannot be restricted to human-human encounters but must take into account the intra-action and entanglement of materiality and discourse, of object and subject and of past, present and future; i. e. spacetime-matter.

This suggests that our responsibility is greater than if it was ours alone. Barad notes by that if responsibility comprises an ongoing responsiveness to the entanglement of time, space and matter, then what seems far away in time or space, may be very close and much closer due to the complexity of temporal and spatial connections that produce what matters and what is excluded from mattering in what takes place in the here and now (e.g. Barad, 2007, p. 394).

The implications are that we are seen as less powerful and more powerful at one and the same time. We have become less powerful in the sense that our being is understood only as an intra-relational living story that is entangled and inter-changeable with nature, objects and subjects.

We have become more powerful in the sense that our actions stretch beyond situated timespace-matter and reach out to other spaces, pasts, presents and futures and our actions thus enter into the production of mattering on a far larger scale than we can possibly imagine.

The second major implication follows from the first, namely that postcolonial storytelling suggests that postcolonial phenomena and postcolonial discourse are the results of complex entangled genealogies where some voices (both human and non-human voices) play a more privileged role in material storytelling than others. These postcolonial entangled genealogies have several implications for management and organization studies.

Implication 1: In imperialist, colonizing ideologies, there is a corresponding consolidation of storytelling authority that has material consequence.

Specific narrative authority practices are opposed by living story and antenarrative practices.

Edward Said has argued that the ideology of imperialism parallels 'narrative authority' patterns of

convergence: “We shall see the far from accidental convergence between the patterns of narrative authority constitutive of the novel on the one hand, and on the other, a complex ideological configuration underlying the tendency to imperialism” (Said, 1993: 69-70, cited in Caldwell, 1999: 304).

The patterns of narrative authority integral to colonizing mobilize modes of living story eventness and antenarrative resistance of possible futures deviating from the narrative authority enactments.

Caldwell, a literary critic, says that Confiant’s (1994) novel, *L’Allee des Sourirs*, offers “a perspective particularly useful for an examination of *creolite*’s position as a postcolonial discourse” in “conflicted relation to French culture within Martinican society” (p. 308). Caldwell (1999: 304) also argues that instead of carrying the Western values of polyphony: “harmony, order, and Cartesianism” that the countermove to narrative authority is grotesqueness, a collective voicing of cacophony with “no official, unitary, authoritative discourse” that is full of “subversion, resistance, survival, provocation” in the face of colonialism.

This grotesqueness is for Bakhtin in the more dialogic manner of story. Bakhtin’s (1981: 60) approach treats all narrative as monological, and opposed to the more “dialogical manner of story.” Bakhtin (1973: 12), for example says, “Narrative genres are always enclosed in a solid and unshakable monological framework.” Another way to disrupt colonial narrative authority is for the living stories of the marginalized to disrupt the dominant narrative sequence, its “temporal key” (Caldwell, 1999: 305).

For example, in Confiant’s (1994) novel, *L’Allee Des Soupirs*, the Caribbean temporality “is not terrestrial but aquatic, a sinuous culture where time unfolds irregularly and resists being captured by the cycle of clock and calendar.” Instead of storytelling in a univocal, classically plotted linear temporal sequence, there are rhizomatic branches into pluralistic variants of the same event, and fragments of several versions of a story abolish mainstream Western practices of linear or cyclic chronology.

The linear or cyclically plotted antenarrative is too tightly organized, too easy, too coherent, compared to the Creole’s living storying plurality that breaks out of the aesthetic lines of Western

narrative authority. McCloskey (1990: 96) makes a very important and relevant point: storytelling with cyclic (stage by stage metaphors/models such as life cycle) are too abstract to be reliable in telling us about the future: "If the stories of past business cycles could predict the future there would be no surprises, and by that fact no business cycles." Other timespacemattering antenarrative patterns would include vortex and whirlpool spirals (Morson, 1994; Deluze, 1994: 21).

Narrative colonial authority is achieved by rewriting history, but the institutional myths situated in institutional domains also have [material] resource consequences (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Said suggests that the written narrative's function in imperial enterprise "after the natives have been displaced from their historical location on their land, their history is rewritten as a function of the imperial one. This process uses narrative to dispel contradictory memories and occlude violence" (Said, 1993: 131-132, cited in Caldwell, 1999: 306).

Finally, with regard to the first implication, Caldwell points to the dilemma of the storytelling theorist in postcoloniality. While Confiant's storytelling, the chronological nonlinearity, its grounding in orality, and the cacophony of structure --- exhibits non-Western postclassical narrative style, it still has a "missing narrative authority," the storytelling theorist, calling for aesthetic solution, using male storyteller, and privileging men's positions and colonialism's feminization (Caldwell, 1999: 309).

The next two postcolonial implications look at the storytelling of space and time.

Implication 2: Storytelling materializing practices create, traverse, feature, or marginalize spatial alignments among the colonizers and the colonized or postcolonized from the local shop floor to the scale of global spaces.

Since Henri Lefebvre's insistence that space and society are mutually constituted and "space is an agent of change" there is a paradigmatic shift questioning reified models of spacialization (Barad, 2007: 224). Lefebvre (1991: 26), for example says, "(Social) space is a (social) product [...] the space thus produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action [...] in addition to being a means of production it is also a means of control, and hence of domination, of power."

Castells' (1977) criticism of Lefebvre is that the approach to space is subjective Marxism (still in structuralism of Louis Althusser) rather than material. Castells focuses on how the past reaches into the present, whereas Lefebvre addresses space as a resource in more utopian, revolutionary aspects, to build an alternative future (Stalder, 2006: 144).

Michele de Certeau (1984: 118) puts place and space, narrative and story practices, and strategy and tactic into opposition. Living story concerns spaces that embody movement, gesticulating, walking, talking and finding pleasure that for de Certeau (1984: 13) "indefinitely organizes a *here* in relation to an *abroad*, a 'familiarity' in relation to a foreignness."

And for, de Certeau (1984) stories are spatializing, tours, all about movement, and founding spaces. Living stories are morphed by narrative into something highly abstract and linear as narratives go. The main function of living story is to found and to authorize (de Certeau, 1984: 123). Stories authorize by webs of material relationship practices, including many displacements, complexities, and transgressions that upset narrative place limits because they are nonlinear (do not conform to narrative beginning, middle, end plot lines).

In postcolonial studies the notion of scale as local nested within national within global is problematic. Scale is produced in and through discursive phenomena, the spatializing through material-discursive apparatuses (Barad, 2007: 245). The local, national, and global are for Barad not preexisting nested scales but ... the agential enfolding of different scales through one another" ... not as "some physical notion of size but rather are understood as being intra-actively produced through one another."

Postcolonial storytelling methods and inquiry can explore boundary transgressions where a contain spatialization or geometrical understanding of scale simply reifies the phenomena. "The relationship between the local, the regional, the national, and the global is not a geometrical nesting" (p. 246). The scales are topological matters, intra-actively produced through one another, in material-discursive apparatuses of production that involve material-storytelling practices.

We turn next to the issue of storytelling -materiality consequences for temporality in postcolonial studies.

Implication 3: Multiple story-in-the-making and antenarrative-in-the-making temporalities contest with monologic imperial/colonial temporal narratives with situated material effects.

In postcolonial theory, managerialist narratives control time in Foucauldian disciplinary regimes of power setting borders on bodies, and movements in this or that space, at this or that time. It is narrative that shapes these representations into power and control. Morson (1994) theorizes storytelling as an interplay of backshadowing (narrative) pasts, sideshadowing (living story) multiple presentnesses, and foreshadowing the future (antenarrative) field of possibilities.

Such an approach could be informed by Barad's agential realism. For Barad (2007) time, space, and matter are agential intra-actions of material-discursive (including storytelling) practices and apparatuses. "Temporality is constituted through the world's iterative intra-activity" (p. 180). Narrative construes temporality as evenly spaced events in a plot line. Narrative marks time linearly.

Barad offers several insights into petrification that can extend Czarniawska's (2004) 'petrified narratives' concept (i.e. that stronger corporate cultures have petrified narratives). First, the point is not that time leaves its mark in a petrified trail (in our case of narrative) sedimentation of external change, but rather that "sedimenting is an ongoing process of differential mattering" (Barad, p. 181).

The past and future in storytelling are not sequential, linear, and are rather enfolded participants in matter's iterative becoming. Second, the petrification metaphor does nothing to "interrupt the persistent assumption that change is a continuous process through or in time" (p. 182). Petrification narrative is a trouble notion since a "discontinuity queers our presumptions of continuity" and cannot be therefore the opposite of a continuum of petrified narrative stability (p. 182).

Third, each ring as a quantum leap of discontinuous discontinuity, does and cannot assure the quantum of when and where the ring-leap happened because it does not examine the intra-play continuity and discontinuity, determinacy and indeterminacy, or possibility and impossibility that constitutes the differential storytelling.

CONCLUSIONS

The central issue raised here is the materiality of storytelling, and its contribution to rethinking postcolonial theory and practice. For the most part a representational focus on narrative structuralism misses the exploration of the contexts of meaning production. Classical narrative, in particular evokes narrative expectations that are part of the colonization of the storytelling intercultural worlds.

Euramerican narrative textual expectations (structuralism) include the urge fix the living stories and antenarratives with a beginning, middle, and end linear plot logic, a demand to erase the contextual complexity, and to erase differences in order to abstract dead structural categories.

The orality exchanges, particularly those of the indigenous peoples are marginalized in favor of the dead narratives, that can be framed, stacked, and sorted into typologies which ignore material conditions. What remains are the representations and the resistance to decontextualized narrative and their normalized rationality (monologic) that erases the historical process of colonial production.

On the one hand, postcolonial theorist and critic claims to be an outside observe who freely chooses among possible discursive practices, labeling them colonial, neocolonial, imperialist, and the like. On the other, hand postcolonial theorists and critics argue against Cartesian boundaries between knower and known. Ironically, postcolonial concepts are embodied in human subjects, yet strangely disembodied in the analyses of discursive representations.

Postcolonial theory has been focused on discursive representationalism, not on narrative (except for a few literary studies), and certainly not at all on material-story-in-the-making and antenarrative-in-the-making (both are domains of discourse intra-active to material condition). Representational discursive strategies appear more the norm in postcolonial studies. While quite important in establishing the representations of gender, race, and class in colonialism, the discursive approach being separated from material conditions leaves agential intra-activity of storytelling-materiality unexplored.

Postcolonial theory could set the counter-narratives (Bamberg, 2004b) into a clear institutional setting. Instead of the duality of rebellious living storytellers against hegemonic narrative institutional narrative plots, one could theorize a triangle: (1) the dominant narrative line of managerial control; (2) the counter-story of individual resistance; and (3) storylines of individual compliance and accommodation to managerial control. This would give a more nuanced analysis of the contestation interaction.

Material-storytelling offers a more material-discursive approach to postcoloniality that makes a significant move beyond social constructivism, which in the main, does not attend to material conditions, to power, or worse assumes material-body and mind-sense-making are dichotomous, despite protests against Cartesian duality.

In the proposed storytelling-materiality approach, postcolonial studies could reclaim a narrative focus (such as in Said's work on Orientalism) but pursue it with more of an agential intra-play between story-in-the-making (& antenarrative-in-the-making) and materiality of (post) colonialism, its material conditions.

Postcolonial practices are enacted such the supposed boundaries between colonizer and colonized are ambivalent. The advantage to postcolonial studies is that material-storytelling includes 'native American indian' storying, which unlike the structuralist textuality (plot, characterization, etc.) concerns of Western narrative, is more rooted in the orality and ritual interactional, embeddedness practices of a storytelling community engaged in material practices. There is interplay between representational narrative and living story, brought out in the study of antenarrative processes.

In its managerial practice, storytelling is an embodiment that is materially embodied by organizations, situated in the shop floor, the board room, and the shopping mall. Postcoloniality aims to redress the structural inequalities of gender, race, class, and sexuality in the gender-telling, race-telling, class-telling and sexuality-telling practices of colonialism, imperialism, and neocolonialism.

References

Allen, Paula Gunn 1992. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon. 1st edition 1986.

Arendt, Hannah. 1998. *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bakhtin, M. 1973. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin* (ed. Holquist, M.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1990. *Art and Answerability*. Edited by Michael Holquist & Vadim Liapunov. Translation and Notes by Vadim Liapunov; supplement translated by Kenneth Brostrom. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. From Bakhtin's first published article and his early 1920s notebooks

Bakhtin, M. M. 1993. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Translation and Notes by Vadim Liapunov. Edited by Michael Holquist & Vadim Liapunov. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press. From Bakhtin's early 1920s notebooks. 1993 is First English printing. Baskin, K. (2005) "Complexity, Stories and Knowing". *E:CO* 7(3): 32-40.

Bamberg, M. 2004a. Narrative discourse and identities. Pp. 213-237 in J. C. Meister, T. Kindt, W. Schernus, & M. Stein (Eds.), *Narratology beyond literary criticism*. Berlin/NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Bamberg, M. 2004b. Considering counter narratives. Pp. 351-371 in M. Bamberg & M. Andrews (Eds.), *Consider-ing counter narratives: Narrating, resisting, making sense*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bamberg, Martin. 2005. Narrative discourses and identities. Pp. 213-238 in Jan Christoph Meister, Tom Kindt, Wilhelm Schernus. (Eds.) *Narratology beyond literary criticism: mediality, disciplinarity*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.
- Banerjee, Bobby Subhabrata. 2003. The practice of stakeholder colonialism: National interest and colonial discourses in the management of indigenous stakeholders. Pp. 233-254 in Anshuman Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. NY/Hamshire, England: Palgrave-Macmillan publishing.
- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham/London: Duke University Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1999. The Storyteller – Reflections on the works of Nikolai Leskov. In Hannah Arendt (Ed.). *Illuminations*: 83-107. London: Pimlico.
- Boehmer, Elleke. 1993. Transfiguring: Colonial Body into Postcolonial Narrative. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 26, No. 3, African Literature Issue (Spring): 268-277. Published by: Duke University Press.
- Boje, D. M. 1991. "The storytelling organization: A study of storytelling performance in an office supply firm." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 36: pp.106-126.
- Boje, D. M. 2001. *Narrative Methods for Organizational and Communication Research*. London: Sage.
- Boje, D. M. 2008. *Storytelling Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Bruner, Jerome, 1986. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MASS.: Harvard University Press.
- Cajete, Gregory. 2000. *Native Science; Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Santa Fe, NM: Clear Light Publishers.

- Caldwell, R. C., Jr. 1999. Creolite and Postcoloniality in Raphael Confiant's *L'Allee Des Soupirs*. *The French Review*, Vol 73 (2, December): 301-311.
- Castells, Manuel. 1977. *The Urban Question. A Marxist Approach*, Alan Sheridan, translator. London: Edward Arnold. Original publication in French, 1972.
- Confiant, Raphael. 1994. *L'Allee des Soupirs*. Paris: Grasset.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 2004. *Narratives in social science research*: London: Sage
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1997. *Narrating the Organization – Dramas of Institutional Identity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- de Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. by Rendall, S. Berkeley, CA: University of California press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans by Paul Patton from *Difference et Repetition*, 1968 (Presses Universitaires de France). NY: Columbia University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. (1979). 'Living On – Border Lines' in *Deconstruction and Criticism* (NY: Seabury Press, edited by Harold Bloom et. al).
- Durant, Sam. 2004. *Postcolonial Narrative and the work of Mourning: J.M. Coetzee, Wilson Harris, and Toni Morrison*. SUNY series, explorations in postcolonial studies. SUNY Press.
- Fernandes, Lella. 1997. *Producing Workers: The politics of Gender, Class, and Culture in the Calcutta Jute Mills*. Philadelphia; University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Fludernick, M. 1996. *Towards a 'natural' narratology*. London: Routledge.

- Gioia, D. and Chittipeddi, K. 1991. Sensemaking and Sensegiving in Strategic Change Initiation. *Strategic Management Journal* 12: 433-448.
- Gioia, D. Thomas, J. Clark, S. and Chittipeddi, K. 1994. Symbolism and strategic change in academia: The dynamics of sensemaking and influence. *Organization Science* 5/3: 369-383.
- Gioia, D. and Mehra, A. 1996. Book Review: Sensemaking in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal* 21/4: 1226-1240.
- Gioia, D. and Thomas, J. 1996. Identity, image and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41: 370-403.
- Gioia, D. Corley, K. and Fabbri, T. 2002. Revising the past (while thinking in the future perfect tense). *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 15/6: 622-634.
- Gymnich, M. 2002. Linguistics and Narratology: The relevance of linguistic criteria to postcolonial narratology. Pp. 61-76 in M. Gymnich, A. Nunning, & V. Nunning (Eds.), *Literature and Linguistics' Approaches, Models, and Applications*. Studies in Honor of Jon Erickson. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Haraway, Donna. 1992. The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others. Pp. 295-337 in Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, Paula A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (New York; Routledge).
- Hyvärinen, Matti. 2007. Review Essay: Michael Bamberg & Molly Andrews (Eds.) (2004). *Considering Counter-Narratives: Narrating, Resisting, Making Sense*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, Vol. 8 (3). September. On line <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/viewArticle/299/657>
- Jack, G.; & Westwood, R. 2009. *International and Cross-Cultural Management Studies: A Postcolonial Reading*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

- Lefebvre, Henri. 1001. *The Production of Space*, D. Nicholson-Smith trans., Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Originally published 1974. UK: Blackwell
- McCloskey, D.N. 1990. *If You're so Smart: The Narrative of Economic Expertise*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mir, Raza A.; Mir, Ali, & Upadhyaya, Panya. 2003. "Toward a postcolonial reading of organizational control." Pp. 47-74 in Anshuman Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. NY/Hamshire, England: Palgrave-Macmillan publishing.
- Morson, Gary Saul. 1994. *Narrative and Freedom: The Shadows of Time*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Mputbwele, Makim. M. 1998. Ngugi and African Postcolonial Narrative: The Novel as Oral Narrative in Multigenre Performance (review). *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, Vol. 44 (2, Summer): 478-480.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. 1977. 'Institutional organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340-363.
- Myers, Martina H. 2009. *Institutional Ethnography: How Tenured Academic Women Talk about Success*. University of New Mexico doctoral dissertation.
- Owens, Louis. 2001. As if an Indian were really an Indian: Unamericans, Euaamericans and postcolonial theory. *Paradoxa*, Vol. 15: 170-83. Report in *I hear the Train: Reflections, Inventions, Refractions*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Prasad, Anshuman. 2003. *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. NY/Hamshire, England: Palgrave-Macmillan publishing.

- Prince, Gerard. 2005. On postcolonial narratology. Pp. 372-81 in James Phelan & Peter Rabinowitz (Eds.) Blackwell Companion to Narrative Theory. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Punday, Daniel. 2000. A Corporeal narratology? *Style*, Vol. 34 (2, Summer): 227-42.
- Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. NY: Vintage.
- Said, Edward W. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. NY: Knopf.
- Sarris, Greg. 1993. *Keeping Slug Woman Alive: A holistic Approach to American Indian Texts*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schwartzman, Helen B. 1984. Stories at work: Play in an organizational context. In Edward M. Bruner (ed) *Text, Play, and Story: The Construction and Reconstruction of Self and Society*. Washington D. C.: American Ethnological Society.
- Smith, D. 1990. *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, L. T. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London/Dunedin: Zed Books and University of Otago Press.
- Stalder, Felix. 2006. *Manuel Castells: The Theory of the Network Society*. Polity.
- Strand, Anete M. Camille. 2010. Material storytelling as identity re-work. Paper presented at The Standing Conference for Management and Organization Inquiry (Sc'Moi), Alexandria VA, 25-27 March 2010.
- Trinh Minh-ha, TMH Trinh. 1989. *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana: Indiana University Press

- Vizenor, Gerald. 1994. The ruins of representations: Shadow survivance and the literature of dominance. Pp. 139-67 in Alfred Arteaga (ed) *Another Tongue: Nation and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1996. The origins of essentialism and pluralism in descriptive tribal names. Pp. 29-39 in Winfried Siemerling and Katrin Schwenk (Eds.) *Pluralism and the Limits of Authenticity in North American Literatures*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1998. *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vizenor, Gerald. 1999. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. *Report of Manifest manners: Postindian Warriors of Survivance*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan UP (1994).
- Warrior, Robert A. 1995. *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Weick, Karl. 1995. *Sensemaking*. London: Sage.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1983. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.