<div align="center">**A Critical Plot Twist:**</div>

<div align="center">**Changing Characters and Foreshadowing the Future of Organizational Storytelling**[1]</div>

Abstract

In this review, we explore the evolution of scholarly research about organizational storytelling over the past 40 years in a sample of 165 papers published between 1975 and 2015. We contend that organizational storytelling has established a conventional foothold beside the dominant, scientific narrative of organization studies. Meanwhile, the voice of critical storytelling in organizations has emerged, confirming (and extending) five organizational storytelling themes identified by Rhodes and Brown's (2005a): sense-making (and subverting); communicating (and manipulating); change, learning (and challenge); power (and dissent); and identity, and identification (and alienation). Our review reveals the growing influence of critical management studies, emphasizing the role stories play in disrupting conventional narratives, enriching our understanding of present and future storytelling in organizations and of organizations in general.

Key words: Organizational storytelling, Story, Critical storytelling

Introduction

In the early twentieth century, as organization studies was attempting to establish its technical footing, the field might have seemed an unconventional venue for storytelling. Early uses of storytelling in research were confined to a limited number of folklorists (Gabriel 2000). Theories such as Taylor's scientific management (1911) and Weber's rational bureaucracy (1922) strongly influenced the early development of the field, which sought systematic certainty over speculative stories. As organization studies developed into a social science laboratory, and its raw material became the behaviors, relationships, and motivations

---

[1] The authors are equal contributors to the development of this work and are listed alphabetically.

of human beings, stories might have been perceived as anecdotally interesting but unserious for research and theory-building. Those attitudes began to open up later in the century to the subjective experiences and emotions of stories and their storytellers (Brown *et al.* 2009), reinforcing the potential of storytelling to tap into meaningful phenomena about organizational life that could not be captured as richly with the scientific method. Yet, even at the beginning of this century, scholars still felt the need to justify their use of stories as 'real' science (Rhodes and Brown 2005a). In this review, we explore the evolution of research about organizational storytelling over the past 40 years and speculate about the future. We argue that the field has developed to the point that it has established a conventional foothold beside the dominant, scientific narrative of organization studies. Meanwhile, it has attracted a multiplicity of researchers and perspectives, developing a burgeoning counter-narrative of critical organizational storytelling that challenges conventional science, structures, and stories of organizations to advance our understanding of them in all of their storied complexity.

Background

Human beings are "storytelling animals" (Gottschall 2012) with the capacity to "[see] the present rising out of a past, heading into a future; [to perceive] reality in narrative form" (Novak 1975, pp. 175-176). Scholars have come to regard stories as one of the "crowning achievements of human development" (Bruner 1990, p. 67). Telling stories is an organic communicative tool that shapes social relationships and contexts in which the tales are told; one of those contexts is organizations. Stories in organization studies have come to be recognized as 'the preferred sensemaking currency of human relationships' (Boje 1991, p. 106), and storytelling is no longer "the preserve of old grandmothers during those long Nordic winter nights" (Gabriel 2000, p. 4). Aligned with other fields, organization scholars have produced a blossoming volume of research on stories and storytelling in organizations.

As Rhodes and Brown (2005a) argued in this journal, storytelling has been applied by organization scholars to the study of a broad range of organizationally relevant topics, including change management (e.g. Rhodes *et al.* 2010; Driver 2009), learning and development (e.g. Abma 2003; Taylor *et al.* 2002), knowledge management (e.g. Patriotta 2003; Swap *et al.* 2001; Geiger and Schreyögg 2012), marketing and branding (e.g. Hernández-Serrano *et al.* 2002; Randazzo 2006), business ethics (e.g. Kennedy and Lawton 1992; Rhodes *et al.* 2010), entrepreneurship (e.g. Boje and Smith 2010; Martens *et al.* 2007), leadership (e.g. Boal and Schultz 2007; Weischer *et al.* 2013), strategic management (e.g. Brown and Thompson 2013; Bowman *et al.* 2013), and more.

While the story, and its telling, remain common threads across this research, not even its basic elements have broad consensus. For example, the very definition of 'stories' is contested[2]. Gabriel (1991) defines stories as "narratives through which events, at times major, at others trivial, become charged with symbolic significance" (pp. 857–858); while Boje (1995, p. 1000) defines story as "an oral or written performance involving two or more people interpreting past or anticipating experience," Boje (2008, p. 13) values antenarratives – fragmented and ambiguous stories that challenge linear approaches to time. Czarniawska (1998) and Gabriel (2000) emphasize the role of plots in stories, and Czarniawska (1998) defines a plot as "an original state of affairs, an action or an event, and the consequence state of affairs" (p. 2).

To integrate the findings of the many studies on organizational storytelling, scholars have tended to review organizational storytelling research following roughly two agendas: (i) classifying types of stories and research designs in storytelling; and (ii) synthesizing the thematic findings of studies that focus on organizational storytelling or a specific aspect of it. Following the first agenda, Collison and Mackenzie (1999) distinguish between metaphor,

---

[2] See Dawson and Sykes (2018) for a thorough overview of how Gabriel and Boje conceptualize stories and storytelling.

biographical or anecdotal, and creative characterization as three types of organizational stories. Simmons (2001) also identifies multiple types of organizational stories: 'why I am here,' 'I know what you are thinking,' 'who I am' stories and 'the vision,' 'value-in-action,' and 'teaching' stories (as cited in Whyte and Classen 2012, p. 953). Rosile and colleagues (2013) introduced the storytelling diamond as the six aspects of storytelling in organization research design: "narrativist, living story, materialist, interpretive, abstractionist, and practice all as integrated by the antenarrative process" (p. 1).

Aligned with the second agenda, Dawson and Skyes (2018) critically evaluated the significance of time and temporality to the processes of sensemaking and storytelling in their review. They argued that time has not received the attention it deserves in this literature and that it is time to unpack and move beyond the linear conceptions of time and temporality in this literature to allow theoretical development. They outlined a range of temporal modalities and identified an agenda for future research that recognized multiple concepts of time and temporality. Also aligned with the second agenda, Rhodes and Brown (2005a) examined the contribution of narrative as a methodological approach to the management field and organization theory. They recounted the development of narrative approaches in organization theory and assessed how this stream of research informed organizing processes. Their review provides five thematic areas in organization studies in which narrative research has made a substantive contribution: "(1) sensemaking, (2) communication, (3) learning/change, (4) politics and power, and (5) identity and identification" (p. 170).

We believe that the broad range of articles published on the topic, including many in the past decade, justifies an updated review to bring them together, allow for a deeper synthesis, determine the available gaps, inform future studies, and guide practice. We agree with Lee *et al.* (1999) that every field should "pause periodically and take stock of what they have been doing and where they are going" (p. 161). This allows for a fresh look at the

accomplishments of the field and sheds light on pathways worthy of further exploration. To this end, in this paper, we tell a story of organizational storytelling[3] over a period of 40 years (1975–2015) to account for a plot of research growth and proliferation against the setting of a science-dominated discipline. While our review looks backward at scholarship that was published prior to Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) work, we also comment upon significant new trends in the storytelling literature after their benchmark work, and we speculate about a future of storytelling in organizations that offers a vision for the next 10 years of scholarship.

We define organizational storytelling as an ongoing (Czarniawska and Joerges 1997) process of narrative sense-making (Boje 1991; Boyce 1996; Colón-Aguirre 2015) and meaning- (Czarniawska and Joerges 1997) and knowledge- (Gabriel 2000) construction among and between the members of an organization to understand the past, share the present, and shape the future (Boje 2009). While some might regard the distinction between 'narrative' and 'story' to be merely semantic or, as with Rhodes and Brown (2005a), use the terms interchangeably, we focus on stories and default to that label. One practical reason, discussed further in "Methods" below, is that searching the scholarly literature for "narrative" would have yielded an untenably large sample. Another more substantive reason is that stories are a particular form of narrative. As Gabriel (2000) suggested, stories are "narratives with simple but resonant plots and characters, involving narrative skills, entailing risk, and aiming to entertain, persuade, and win over" (p. 22). Nevertheless, our sample draws from a broad array of scholars who use a variety of different labels to identify their objects of study, which we understand to be organizational storytelling. Although much of what we say about organizational storytelling might also hold for storytelling in general, we focus especially on the organizational context. This is not just because we are organization scholars, but also

---

[3] Our work focuses on organizational *storytelling*. We look at the practice, purpose, and application of telling stories, as opposed to exploring actual stories. Moreover, we use the terms 'storytelling' and 'organizational storytelling' interchangeably, unless otherwise noted.

because the literature we are exploring is particularly sensitive to the ways in which storytelling influences the interactions of organizational leaders and members within and across the boundaries of organizational life. Thus, our definition of organizational storytelling excludes not only storytelling that does not influence organizational life but also features of organizational life that do not belong to any organizational member's story. In the remainder of this paper, we describe our method for shortlisting the papers for the review, and then summarize and discuss the findings from our analysis.

Our present review differs from previous reviews in three major ways. First, we adopt a systematic approach that includes a more comprehensive sample of publications on organizational storytelling published in management-related journals listed in the Web of Science, providing a thorough report of our search and inclusion criteria. Second, we confirm and extend Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) work, especially emphasizing the ways in which scholars have observed how stories play a critical role in subverting conventional narratives in order to enrich our understanding not only of storytelling in organizations but also of organizations in general. Third, as we will report, the timing of our analysis occurs in a period of flourishing and diversifying interest in this topic and on the cusp of possibly seminal change in the technological means by which organizational stories are told.

Methods

Although Aristotle (1941) contends in his *Poetics* that a story has a beginning, middle, and end, not all storytelling scholars (e.g. Boje 2011) agree. This story of organizational storytelling is unfinished and will continue to evolve, but storytellers and scholars alike agree that a story told at a point in time has boundaries. The boundaries of our research story were imposed for conceptual coherence (influencing our search terms and disciplinary focus) and practicality (bounding our search in time and quantity). Notwithstanding the relative paucity

of dedicated organizational storytelling research before the aforementioned papers with which our sample begins, our initial database searches yielded far more results than we could handle. Most of them contained two or more of our keywords, but some were not using them in a technical sense. For example, many researchers refer to stories generally, but comparatively few among them research organizational storytelling in particular. The blurry lines in between forced us to be disciplined in defining the boundaries of our research story.

In conducting our literature review, we used the process outlined by Callahan (2014) by capturing who conducted the search, when the search was conducted, where we searched, how we found articles to include, what we found, and why we chose to include (or not include) articles. One author conducted the search for English-language articles published 1975-2015. We chose the past four decades as our time boundary because, among other influences, the 1974 publication of *Working*, Studs Terkel's seminal book of journalistic narratives about work, raised public and scholarly consciousness of the power of storytelling about work and organizations. This is consistent with Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) contention that scholarly interest in storytelling as method emerged in the 1970's.

For the database search, we used the Web of Science as the primary database for our search. It includes all journals ranked in the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) and provides access to journals in multiple disciplines that publish management-related articles. Although we acknowledge that limiting our search to one database might exclude some relevant non-Web of Science-indexed journals, given the broad range of papers we intended to include in the review, we felt it reasonable to limit our search.

Our search terms included 'story' OR 'storytelling' OR 'fiction,' AND 'workplace' OR 'organization' (OR 'organisation'), OR 'company' among the title, keywords, and abstracts of peer-reviewed papers indexed in the database. We narrowed our categories to management, business, applied psychology, industrial relations, and political science to

increase the likelihood that our search would capture articles about *organizational*
storytelling. To ensure we did not miss relevant articles that met our criteria but did not
appear in our searches, we also hand-searched selected management journals, including
Organization Studies, *Human Relations*, *Management Learning*, *Organization*, and the
Academy of Management Journal, because they have historically published storytelling
research.

Our initial search yielded 1,335 results. Although broadening our search to include
other keywords (e.g. 'narrative') or types of sources (e.g. books) might have yielded a
handful of additional relevant works for our sample, it would have made the initial results
(from which our final sample was filtered) untenably large. In some cases, works that did not
meet our criteria for inclusion in the sample served as important background material.

In the next stage, we screened papers based on three criteria. First, we examined *how*
the article used the concept of 'stories' and excluded those that used 'stories' or 'narrative'
strictly in the context of method, without direct relevance to organizational storytelling.
Second, we examined whether the paper had a focus on how storytelling was or could be
applied in organizational contexts. Third, we ensured the papers were either empirical
(qualitative or quantitative) or conceptual/theoretical (not a perspective or editorial). We
operationalized our inclusion criteria with three distinct steps. Initially, one author read the
title, abstract, keywords, and research purpose of all the articles and decided if the paper
accommodated the three screening criteria. The papers that passed the first round were
labeled 'Yes' (148); the ones that did not yield a clear judgment from that author were
labeled 'Maybe' (95). The other two authors both screened the 'Maybe' papers. Articles that
both the other authors rated 'Yes' were shortlisted for inclusion in the review (17), resulting
in 165 papers. We used RefWorks to organize the shortlisted papers. The authors and dates of
publication for the 165 articles can be found in Table 4.

We organized the papers in a matrix for publication year and journal, author, research purpose and question(s), research focus, study context, sample, participants, and key findings. The three authors then took a randomly selected sample of 15 papers and independently reviewed the papers for key themes, after which we engaged in a discussion to determine our shared position on interpreting observed themes. This enabled one author to review the remaining (150) articles to incorporate into the matrix key themes for all 165 articles. As we reviewed the table to observe patterns, we realized that female authors appeared in the dataset more frequently after 2005. Thus, we added another analytic category: the gender of the authors.

Our preliminary analysis identified where and when articles were published, who published them, and what important themes emerged from the 165 articles. In total, the 165 articles in our sample appeared in 61 journals. *Organization* (18), the *Journal of Organizational Change Management* (16), *Human Relations* (14), *Organization Studies* (11), *Management Learning* (8), *Organization Science* (6), *Journal of Business Ethics* (6), and *Gender Work and Organization* (6) published the highest number of articles in our sample. As explained below, the salient findings include themes resonant with Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) seminal literature review on narrative and storytelling, an observable trend toward critical perspectives in the literature, and a significant shift in the gender balance of authorship.

Findings

We position our findings against the backdrop of Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) review of narrative in organizational research, in which they studied the state of storytelling from the mid-1970's through the early 2000's. Our analysis of the 165 journal articles from 1975-2015 both confirms and extends their work.

One of Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) key contributions is the temporality of narrative; suggesting that there is not one single organizational story, but rather networks of them that evolve as the temporal context changes. Although their emphasis on temporality suggests that Rhodes and Brown (2005a) were sensitive to the potential for storytelling to reinforce and resist existing power structures, the preponderance of their analysis refers to narratives as representing, constructing, and legitimizing those structures. Appropriately, their analysis was a product of its time, and research in the decade after their review first appeared reveals a shift in the literature on organizational storytelling. While the seeds of the shift were present before 2005, the impact did not become apparent for years to come.

At the time, Rhodes and Brown (2005a) were confronted with skepticism that stories 'counted' as 'real' science. They contended that the tension facing scholars writing about storytelling was that of 'science' versus 'stories'. More than a decade later, the pressure to justify narrative as a legitimate avenue of and for research does not carry the same stigma (Gabriel 2008). Citing Czarniawska (1999, 2004), Gabriel and Connell (2010) note that science is built from stories, and vice versa, in such a way that the tension between science and stories is transformed. When storytelling no longer had to be justified as legitimate against a post-positivist orientation to research, new tensions could emerge. We contend that an emergent way to conceptualise the tension within the storytelling literature is convention versus criticality.

On one hand, we concur with Rhodes and Brown (2005a) that stories conform to and legitimize conventional power structures. Our study reinforces the key organizing structure of their review, showing that narrative illuminates several conventional themes in organization studies research – sense-making, communicating, change and learning, power and politics, and identity and identification. And, yet, we also note a distinct increase in storytelling articles that represent a critical perspective that seeks to examine and critique the

conventional organizational contexts in which they originate, rather than to explain and conform to them. Critical organizational storytelling may therefore confront and deconstruct power structures, resist oppression, and challenge stories and storytellers. This is consistent with Gabriel's (2008) call that storytelling needed to be discomforted – that scholars needed to recognize and resist the temptation to be lulled into presenting stories as unproblematized 'truth.' The field has listened to that call; critical management perspectives comprise nearly one-fourth of the articles in our sample, and most of those appeared in 2005 or after. Further, our study reveals a substantive increase in voice for women authors, who comprise a far greater share of authorship of the critical articles compared to conventional ones in the period we examined.

In this discussion, we will report our findings associated with both critical orientation and author gender. We begin by highlighting the context of critical management perspectives in the storytelling literature—where it appears and who produces it. Because our work builds upon the thematic findings identified by Rhodes and Brown (2005a), we then adopt those same themes to discuss the nuanced critical management perspectives taken by storytelling researchers. Certainly, articles that reinforce dominant paradigms continue to appear in the literature; however, we focus our work primarily on the emerging, critical perspectives that can be gleaned from the post-Rhodes and Brown (2005a) body of work.

The voice of critical organizational storytelling research

Our sample of 165 papers is described in further detail below. Its composition is evidence of the growth and proliferation of organizational storytelling research in the period we are studying: We identified two publications before 1990, 10 between 1991 and 1995, 14 between 1996 and 2000, and 19 between 2001 and 2005. Subsequently, we observed the volume of publications increase to 39 (23.6% of our total sample) between 2006 and 2010,

and to 81 (49%) between 2011 and 2015. This is evidence of the growth in interest in organizational storytelling research in general, but as described below, we are particularly interested in a subset of that research proliferation which adopted a 'critical' lens.

We defined as 'critical' those articles that gave emphasis to "challenging [hegemonic] practices, exposing assumptions, revealing illusions and questioning tradition" (Sambrook 2004, p. 614). Articles published in the critical theory tradition are typically interested in questions that address issues such as, 'In whose interest does this serve?' (Brookfield 2013). Critical management scholars seek to provide voice and emancipation to marginalized workers (Alvesson and Willmott 1992). Because of their close association with critical intent, traditions such as feminism (e.g. Butler 1988, 2004), queer theory (e.g. Sedgwick 1985), and critical race theory (e.g. Crenshaw *et al.* 1996) helped refine our understanding of what constituted 'critical' in our review. In the context of this review, critical *organizational* storytelling may disrupt dominant organizational narratives, contest perceptions of membership and belonging, and even disorder linear plots and defy sequential time. In doing so, however, it connects and potentially reshapes organizational experience through retelling organizational stories.

Of the 165 articles in our sample, we characterized 39 of them (24%) as having a 'critical' lens. While a number of articles, including some reviewed by Rhodes and Brown (2005a), mentioned issues that were critical in nature, we only characterized an article as 'critical' if that was a dominant characteristic of the work. We identified only seven articles published before 2005 as critical; the remaining 32 were published between 2005-2015. It is not surprising that critical perspectives were generally later to appear amongst storytelling research. Fournier and Grey (2000) note that critical management studies only took a scholarly foothold in the 1990s.

The earliest date in which a critical storytelling article appeared in our sample was 1995, with an *Academy of Management Journal* work (Boje 1995) and an *Organization Studies* piece (Boyce 1995). The first issue of *Organization* appeared in 1994; the sub-title for the journal is "the critical journal of organization, theory and society." As expected, this journal published the most critical storytelling articles (8). The *Journal of Change Management* had the next highest number with 6; *Gender, Work and Organization, Organization Studies* and *Human Relations* each published 4 critical articles. The majority of critical articles were published in journals ranked 3-star (19) or below (10) in the 2018 Chartered Association of Business Schools Academic Journal Guide.

Another characteristic of these articles is how women authors have come to find their voice and play a more dominant role in the critical storytelling literature. This is particularly evident when reviewing how the authorship these 39 articles compares to the authorship in the total sample of 165 articles. In terms of total authorship (including multi-authored articles, regarding which we counted each author once), men outnumbered women among articles before 2005; the ratio of male to female publication was slightly less for articles since 2005 (see Table 1). This trend is also consistent in the articles 2005 and after that do not take a critical focus (see Table 2). This is not too surprising given the academic profession's slow but measurable progress toward greater gender equity in recent decades.

Looking solely at research on critical organizational storytelling, the numbers of both articles and authors were rather small before 2005, but the gender of authors was nearly equal since 2005 (see Table 3). This suggests not only an absolute rise in female authorship but that a substantial share of research on critical organizational storytelling may have to do with female researchers' engagement with forms of resistance to existing conventions. As a marginalized group, women may be finding their voice in critical organizational storytelling.

Table 1. Representation of author gender of all articles in sample

	Articles Before 2005 (36)	Articles 2005 & after (129)
MALE	44 (68%)	162 (62%)
FEMALE	21 (32%)	98 (38%)

Table 2. Representation of author gender of traditional articles in sample

	Articles Before 2005 (30)	Articles 2005 & after (97)
MALE	35 (65%)	132 (65%)
FEMALE	19 (35%)	71 (35%)

Table 3. Representation of author gender of critical articles in sample

	Articles Before 2005 (7)	Articles 2005 & after (32)
MALE	9 (82%)	30 (53%)
FEMALE	2 (18%)	27 (47%)

Thus, in summary, many more articles using a critical lens appear in the literature following Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) original review of the storytelling literature. Furthermore, women are contributing to that body of critical organizational storytelling literature at a significantly higher rate than they are to more conventional perspectives on storytelling.

Critical organizational storytelling themes

As noted previously, our analysis reconfirmed all five areas of organization studies set forth by Rhodes and Brown (2005a). What is unique about our findings, however, is the manifestation of the critical lens as a transcendent story in the evolution of organizational

storytelling. We explore this manifestation by addressing each of the five themes discussed by Rhodes and Brown (2005a), using a label that suggests the spectrum of conventional to critical for each theme. We highlight first a summary of the original description of each theme and provide a few exemplars of a dominant paradigm article (most of which appear in the post-2005 literature); however, we emphasize the critical nuance that more recent research adds to each of the themes. It is important to note that, as with Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) original review, there is considerable overlap in the concepts of themes, and an article may represent multiple themes. Therefore, in some places, we use the same article to signpost more than one theme in the critical organizational storytelling literature.

Sense-making (and subverting)

Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) treatment of sense-making, as an area within organization theory to which narrative research is directed, primarily focuses on the construction of stories to lend coherence and structure to the storyteller's subjective experience of organizational being. These stories may vary from individual to individual, suggesting that there is no one authoritative interpretation or correct perspective, and, as noted previously, they may evolve over time.

On one hand, our study reinforces this conception of storytelling as sense-making. For example, multiple studies characterize sense-making as facilitated by the identification of patterns. In one musical analogy, sense-making is metaphorically described as taking a polyphony of voices and stories and creating harmony from them (Cunliffe and Coupland 2012). A typical perspective on sense-making through storytelling depicts it as a process through which an individual sense-maker goes in order to link her or his individual experience with the dominant organizational narrative that is the repository of "institutional memory" (Boje 1991, p. 106). Sometimes, this dominant narrative is characterized as "sense-

giving" (Peirano-Vejo and Stablein 2009, p. 443), as when leadership cultivates a stable process to facilitate negotiation of a shared story that is conducive to organizational growth and development.

Yet, there is a more volatile process that we call 'subverting' that arises when individual and organizational narratives misalign and cannot be easily reconciled. When subverting disrupts a dominant narrative, storytelling may "contes[t] official change stories" (Reissner 2011, p. 598). Dominant managerial narratives may become so ingrained that the emergence of conflicting narratives goes unrecognized (Haley and Boje 2014), resulting from the "inertia" left by "self-reinforcing…self-legitimizing 'truths' that the organization may be unaware of (blind spots)" (Geiger and Antonacopoulou 2009, p. 412). Conversely, when hidden stories are recognized and heard, they "can provide a source for…solutions to problems of meaning, mixing, and matching symbolic resources from different epistemes," facilitating a process of bridge-building (Islam 2013, p. 33). In this way, subverting can yield sense-making, but whereas the conventional sense-making story involves reconciliation of diverging narratives, the critical subverting story requires deconstruction (or destruction) of a dominant narrative for a new, shared story to emerge.

Communicating (and manipulating)

Similar to their exposition of sense-making, Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) perspective on narrative as a communication mechanism primarily emphasizes its constructive role creating and legitimizing organizational power structures. Like the anti-realist philosophical dictum that 'to be is to be perceived,' storytelling as communication is a way of explaining to an audience what their experience means. Their analysis observes the role of communicative stories "as vehicles for community memory…organizational norms…and corporate culture" (p. 172).

Consistent with this earlier work, we found instances of stories referred to as a 'tool,' 'technique,' 'strategy,' or 'method' of communication, most often wielded by leadership exercising its power to control the organizational narrative. For example, leaders sometimes use storytelling to connect organizational members "to a larger community and a higher purpose" (Driscoll and McKee 2007, p. 209). They may achieve that through storytelling-as-performance, as when storytelling is integral to the construction of a leader's charismatic identity and ability to persuade (Sharma and Grant 2011). One conceptual study blurs the line between stories and leaders, proposing that "when a story displays leadership, we can view a story as a leader…and [it] may 'do' things that we often recommend leaders do" (Parry and Hansen 2007, p. 282).

Once again, however, we observed a continuing story of critical perspectives toward processes of creating and legitimizing organizational power structures that transformed communication into manipulation. In general, the more the environment offers legitimacy and resources, the more institutionalized the dominant managerial narrative becomes. Moreover, the more institutionalized the dominant managerial narrative becomes, the more conflicting narratives are likely to be disregarded (Haley and Boje 2014). The presence of competing stories can motivate intentional manipulation of followers' values to conform to the dominant story (Driscoll and McKee 2007), and it can give rise to "blind spots" that maintain the existing, dominant order (Geiger and Antonacopoulou 2009). In either case, excessive conflict can ultimately lead to the dissolution of an untenable, dominant narrative.

One study in our sample (Auvinen *et al.* 2013b) identifies four types of manipulation in leadership storytelling: stories which use humor, pseudo-participation, seduction, and pseudo-empathy. Storytelling that resists convention may constitute a means to "escap[e] from the bureaucratic and epistemic structures" of a dominant discourse (Islam 2013, p. 30). They may give voice to "a darker side…of excluded voices" (Boje 1995, pp. 997-998) not

represented in the storytelling of the powerful. We contrast manipulation with communication, and often that manipulation is wielded intentionally by those in positions of power to maintain and consolidate an organizational social order that serves their goals – sometimes even abusively and self-interestedly. Yet, leadership manipulation through storytelling can also be an unintentional kind of self-deception, a form of confirmation bias in which the story serves to reinforce what the storyteller hopes to be true. This can be especially true in circumstances of change, when upheaval disrupts an existing social order that then needs to be reassembled in a way that is coherently understood by organizational members.

Change, learning (and challenge)

Rhodes and Brown (2005a) suggest that narratives of change and learning "inform managerial rhetoric" (p. 173) and serve as a means to manage cultural change. Stories in this thematic area help people deal with change, and provide a framework for self-control to maintain alignment with managerial interests. The accompanying analysis of learning primarily depicts the institutional use of stories as "stores of collective memory," used "collectively and contextually to change and improve practice" (p. 174). While there is some mention of counter-narratives – in the form of opposition to grand stories, organization development 'counter' stories that give voice, and construction of inconsistent narratives – the focus on change and learning of the storytelling in the body of work analyzed by Rhodes and Brown's is largely dedicated to reinforcing management's story of change.

In our analysis, we too observe substantial evidence of storytelling as an implement of management to own the narrative of the organization's evolution, functioning as an instrument for articulating a rationale for effecting change that it has initiated or undergone. Rationalizing change efforts often appear through multiple discrete or interconnected stories.

Steuer and Wood (2008) explore how employees variously adopt discursive strategies that resonate with and facilitate the official story of their respective organizations. Küpers (2013) and Bryant and Frahm (2011) highlight the interconnectedness of stories through multiple metaphors or genres that create a polyvocality (Boje 2008 as cited in Bryant and Frahm 2011) of storylines that make change more effective for organizations. Both approaches facilitate managerial interests in effecting change.

But this conventional perspective of organizational change can be, and has been, challenged. For example, one paper caricatures management storytelling about such actions as downsizing, in which management generally discounts the unfavorable impact of its actions on individual employees and their communities in favor of a story that seeks to legitimize, justify, and normalize actions that purport to have the broader organization's interest at heart (Rhodes *et al.* 2010). In this example, anticipating ethical challenges to its decision to downsize, management uses storytelling manipulatively, as a means by which to discourage further discussion so as to prevent challenges to its preferred story of justification. In a learning context, leadership stories can be ingrained in the organization through formal mechanisms like training and development (e.g. Abma 2003; Gray 2007; Taylor *et al.* 2002).

Stories from the less powerful may face an uphill battle for legitimacy; one study finds that stories that fit with the dominant story are more likely to be credible and impactful. However, leadership's receptivity only to stories that fit its preferred narrative can restrict the organization's ability to change because it lacks openness to new narratives (Näslund and Pemer 2012). This self-reinforcing storytelling can be detrimental to progress, as when it is used to restrict advances in gender roles (Murgia and Poggio 2009). Yet, critical stories from within may emerge naturally and necessarily, either to help organizational actors whose experience is at odds with the dominant story deal with contradictions, or to give voice to stories that belie official change stories (Reissner 2011).

Power (and dissent)

In their consideration of politics and power in organizations, Rhodes and Brown (2005a) examine the ways in which co-constructed stories serve to create and reproduce power structures in organizations. Stories operate as a discursive disciplinary form in which dominant narratives emerge and take center stage in organizations. On the one hand, the power of storytelling can unify a physically and ideologically divided group; on the other hand, stories can be used as political tools to consolidate power in hegemonic ways. As a tool, stories can be used in research by both participants and researchers. Rhodes and Brown (2005a) caution scholars to be conscious of the "reflexivity inherent in the research enterprise" (p. 178) and the power that they hold to influence the construction of stories. They describe politics and power from both conventional and critical perspectives in this theme. Not all works on power and politics have a critical mantle, and that pattern holds true after their 2005 review as well.

As an example of the power of stories from a more conventional perspective, Gabriel and Connell's (2010) work addresses both the ethics of researching with stories and the emergence of dominant narratives in co-constructed stories. They engage in making sense of how collaborative Japanese poetry (rengas) reveals role clashes, unplanned incursions and diversions, (in)active listening, and undue researcher influence while also providing insight into how the construction and deconstruction of stories can facilitate management learning. The construction of storytelling can also shed light on the "social positioning" (Whittle *et al.* 2009, p. 427) power of storytellers. These authors give a nod to stories with a "more critical approach" (p. 438), but their main focus is on how stories evolve over time and, in doing so, the storyteller's moral standing in the organization can shift from hero to villain to victim. These stories have an interest in power or politics in terms of exploring patterns without

necessarily challenging them – in other words, a conventional approach to how power plays out.

In contrast to the articles that treat power more conventionally, a substantial number of articles in our sample explore power from a critical perspective. Storytelling in this context frequently looks at dissent and resistance toward hegemonic and repressive systems and relationships. One study in our sample invokes how storytelling can be a hegemonic tactic and observes that those who tell stories may be subjects who, in the words of Foucault, "exercise" (for the hegemonists) or "submit to" (for those lacking hegemonic power) "power relations" (Boje *et al.* 1999, p. 341). In a study of the social structure of police forces, a masculine narrative serves to reinforce male domination and discourage female participation, providing an example of how storytelling can be a "barrier" to positive change and organizational justice (Fletcher 1996, p. 36).

While storytelling is often wielded as a device to maintain and consolidate political power, it is also a powerful means of political dissent. At the very least, the presence of competing discourses can reveal "dissonance" between organizational members and leadership. When those dissonances are identified, stories can aid in the explication of unresolved organizational tensions that can disrupt organizational practices (Boyce 1995). A study of workplace bullying finds that unsupportive co-workers could reinforce existing hierarchies but that supportive co-workers' responses to stories of workplace bullying could embolden the target of bullying and open up possibilities for action to cultivate individual development and organizational change (Tye-Williams and Krone 2015). Another study describes how stories told from the perspective of a non-dominant race can obviate ignorance of racism as an excuse, thus encouraging more democratic organizational practice (Jungkunz and White 2013). Fictional stories, like the novels of Franz Kafka, which often depict individuals lost in an invisible institutional hierarchy, vividly show the subjective experience

of distance from power, manifesting hidden features of organizational experience that may be invisible from the top of that hierarchy (McCabe 2015). While stories can thus be an informal tool of empowerment for those who lack formal political power in the organization, they can be a double-edged sword for those middle managers who may feel pressure to represent the narrative of upper management but risk being viewed as insincere by their subordinates (Sims 2003).

Identity, identification (and alienation)

Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) perspective on identification finds that narrative is a way to lend continuity to the changes that an individual within an organization experiences over time. In this sense, even while roles can change and lead to the construction and evolution of new identities, the presence of a story cultivates a sense of belonging – even "integration" or "fusion" between the individual and organization (p. 176).

Having a coherent story to tell about one's organizational experience is akin to belonging, having a 'fit' with the organization (Billsberry *et al.* 2005). Such stories also serve to cement a sense of fitness for an organizational role as well, especially that of leadership. One study of two global brands observes how visual storytelling is used to facilitate acceptance among a variety of stakeholders to effectuate buy-in to leadership identities and their strategies (Boje and Smith 2010). Discursive stories can be used to legitimize an individual as 'the leader' within varying contexts of organizational reality (Clifton 2014).

Yet, despite a generally conventional orientation, Boje and Smith (2010) also observe how organizational critics can deploy similar storytelling mechanisms to tell a different story. One study describes those who leave the organization as having lost their share of the collective sense (Boyce 1995), an experience of alienation rather than identification. In as much as shared stories can facilitate coming together, "epistemic impasse" can signal the

need for new stories to overcome tensions (Islam 2013, p. 29). That is to say that non-belonging occurs when individual identity is discontinuous with the narrative of organizational identity. For example, organizational policies that do not reflect organizational culture – in other words, when the talk does not match the walk – can alienate organizational members. One study of men who had taken parental leave shows that even though support for male parental leave was formally sanctioned by legislation, the symbolic gender order is an ingrained organizational narrative that constitutes a significant informal barrier that has also to be overcome (Murgia and Poggio 2009). Several studies of various types of fictional narratives emphasize the potential for creative storytelling to explore the "shadow sides of organizations" that may not be given full expression in nonfictional experience, including female experience (Rippin 2015), queer identity (Steyaert 2015), and other topics important in critical management education (Śliwa *et al.* 2015).

Implications

Rhodes and Brown conclude their review (2005a) by revisiting the tension between science and story that they identify at the outset of their study. They pose a challenge to the positivist position that science and story are incompatible. Narrative, they argue, "can provide a different, and valuable, form of knowledge that enables researchers to engage with the lived realities of organizational life" (p. 182) that deepens, complicates, and enlarges the data about organizational experience to enable the study of organizations. It can "generate different and potentially competing stories which highlight that knowledge about organizations is actively constructed rather than a stable entity to be explicated" (p. 178). In the narrative of the story we are telling, then, Rhodes and Brown (2005a) offer a critical challenge to the dominant narrative of positivism by making room for the story beside management science. They demonstrate the value of storytelling to management science by showing its capacity to

illuminate several thematic areas of organization studies: sense-making, communication, change and learning, power and politics, and identity and identification. One way to tell their story is to say that they challenge the positivistic paradigm of organization studies by finding how narrative research can conform to the conventions of that paradigm.

We observed in our findings how the tension between science and story has evolved into a tension between convention and criticality. If the now-dominant narrative of organizational storytelling research is that stories can be reconciled with science and reaffirm the conventions of management studies, then one way to tell our story is to say that we use organizational storytelling research as it has continued to evolve to take Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) challenge to management science a few steps further. Our story is at once both a necessary continuation of their narrative as well as a critical challenge to their story.

One way in which our story of organizational storytelling goes further is to illuminate a critical perspective on each of the five areas of organization inquiry at the heart of Rhodes and Brown's (2005a) analysis. In our telling, for each dominant narrative there is the prospect of a critical counter-narrative, the potential that sense-making narratives that are untenable may lead to subverting, that communication may be experienced as manipulation, and so on. Our story should not be understood to suggest that there are only two narratives within each area of inquiry. Rather, with Rhodes and Brown (2005a), we understand that there is a multiplicity of narratives competing to be heard, and, building upon their analysis, we suggest that those narratives exist along continua in each thematic area, from conventional to critical.

Our emphasis on research that highlights critical storytelling voices is also important because it is still apparent that storytelling is often misappropriated by those in power to preserve and maintain conventional power structures. Indeed, for a long time, researchers have noted the potential dark side of storytelling – that we could be "seduced" by stories that "offer a smoke screen against awkward questions that we prefer to avoid" (Gabriel 2000, p.

4). In the intervening years, the increasing enthusiasm among leaders for storytelling as a management tactic creates the danger that business advisors "may portray storytelling in management practice in a one-sided, over-positive fashion" (Reissner and Pagan 2013, p. 18). Recognizing the range of storytelling that occurs in organizations, from conventional to critical, reminds us of the numerous unheard stories behind the leadership "storyselling" (Lapp and Carr 2008, p. 532) that sometimes masquerades as storytelling. As Izak *et al.* (2014) argue, "[t]he criticality of the diverse approaches to story and storytelling is inherent in their intention to reveal the storyteller's strategies and hidden agendas" (p. 2).

Although we have followed the categorization of thematic areas covered by Rhodes and Brown (2005a), another way in which our story goes beyond theirs is to deconstruct the conventional areas of inquiry upon which their analysis rests. We believe that the 'story' implied by disciplinary distinctions in scholarship can be both helpful and harmful. It can be helpful insofar as creating siloes of scholarly examination enables depth and focus, creating the scholarly literatures to which we give names and ascribe vocabularies of study and practice. Yet, in establishing these specialties, we imply a story about what is really true about the world, which can be explained and clarified in siloes that do not actually exist in experience. To the extent, then, that research is "prestoried" (Boje *et al.* 1999, p. 340), disciplinary distinctions have also the potential to distort truth. Storytelling offers a potential critical path toward integration among the disciplines. As implied earlier, we found in narrating our findings using the five thematic areas above that it is often difficult and even unnecessary to distinguish sense-making from the act of communication, that communication may be a form of "sensegiving" (Humphreys *et al.* 2012, p. 41). Similarly, communication about change is sometimes revealed to be a form of management manipulation, opening the door to challenges to political power structures in contestation to change. Meanwhile, experiences of organizational identity and belonging are invoked by all of these other

phenomena. In other words, although we do not mean to suggest that experts in each of these discrete areas of study are insensitive to the connections between them, we do mean to suggest that storytelling is a means by which we and they can make sense of those connections. Storytelling, especially storytelling with a critical perspective, offers a narrative of continuity between diversification and unification of our academic foci, and, as we have already seen, between dominant and dissonant organizational narratives.

Future research directions

Storytelling is a democratic resource; it is available to anyone with a story to tell. The mechanisms of organizational narrative control are not equally available, but, as we have seen, even a private story told by an individual to make sense of organizational experience can offer anything from a modicum of justification for one's being in the organization all the way to the seeds of resistance to overthrow an illegitimate, dominant narrative. Therefore, it is not surprising that critical perspectives emerge as a strong force in storytelling research. Because the period of time covered by our study has seen an evolution – from radical social inequality about gender and other marginalizing factors, to greater awareness of and yet persistence of that inequality – it is not surprising that women disproportionately represent a growing share of the authorship of critical organizational storytelling research. Academic and social conventions enabled us to assign authorship in terms of binary gender labels, but this only scratches the surface of the potential to explore the gender and other identities of authors, audiences, and organizational actors involved in storytelling. Our sample not only reveals a growing body of scholarship by and about women but also exploring other experiences of otherness in organizations. Still, this represents a small quantity of overall organizational storytelling scholarship, and we encourage more storytelling research to give voice to other

under-represented identities, including but not limited to immigrants, disabled workers, LGBTQ+, race, and others.

In the years since Rhodes and Brown's review, a 'science of stories' has advanced to help explain how fictional literature engages us in unreal worlds to influence behavior in the real world. This emerging field not only further reconciles the tension between science and story but also has untapped potential for organizational storytelling. Studies suggests that, in the ability of stories to transport us to other narrative worlds (Green *et al.* 2012), they can cultivate our ability to relate to other people (Kidd and Castano 2013), our capacity for empathy with them (Mar 2011), and our emotional intelligence about them (Oatley 1999). While this research focuses particularly on literary stories, it may also be instructive in relation to our understanding of how organizational storytelling can reinforce existing power structures or resist them. One potential area for future research suggested by our analysis is to extend the science of stories to a science of organizational stories, to explore further how storytelling could influence interpersonal relationships, organizational empathy, and emotional intelligence. This research could explore the organization-level effects of storytelling. For example, some articles in our overall sample described the use of real case studies and fictional literature as training resources. While the use of these tools is consistent with the science of stories and their impact on individuals, we know relatively less about whether storytelling interventions can have the desired impacts on groups of individuals within organizations.

Although the majority of narratives studied by the scholarship in our sample are real organizational narratives, as the prior point suggests, a significant subset of that sample studied fictional stories in a multiplicity of narrative forms. Novels, short stories, films, comic books, fairy tales, fables – along with other narratives that do not pretend to depict an organizational reality – are all represented in our sample. Such stories are constructed by

organizational members to imagine alternatives to the present (e.g. Gabriel 1991), used by training and development professionals to teach (e.g. Gerde and Foster 2008; Klein 2009), and examined by researchers to understand how social attitudes and organizational power structures are embedded in our fictional representations of workplaces and society (e.g. Grey 1996; Case 1999). In light of fiction's demonstrated ability to cultivate empathy and other moral emotions, and its capacity to give voice to under-represented populations, we encourage more research on the effects that fictional storytelling in particular can have for real organizations. What classic stories and myths should we revisit for their contemporary organizational relevance? Is the value of fictional storytelling connected to its aesthetic qualities and quality? Its convenience as a transportation vehicle to other places, times, and technologies? Its ability to address politically sensitive topics without implicating individuals within their own organizations? Our conception of organizational storytelling countenances many forms of storytelling, but insight into what makes some literary stories "better" than others may also reveal more about what makes some organizational storytelling particularly effective.

But, as we reaffirm the ancient power of fiction to influence our understanding of modern organizations, we are also reminded that the channels by which stories can be told continue to proliferate beyond the pages of the traditional story. The silence of our sample on social media storytelling was apparent as we imagine a decade ahead in which stories are told, untold, and retold in real time through existing and future technological applications that are influencing organizational life. Already, in the few short years following the end of our data collection period, we are beginning to see forays into storytelling in a social media environment (e.g. Grafstrom and Falkman 2017; Kassinis and Panayiotou 2017). As technological capacity to capture and store data increases, there will be greater volumes of storytelling data to study using digital methods of inquiry. Meanwhile, organizations are

wrestling with how to govern the blurry lines between the professional and personal identities of their organizational members who use social media like Facebook to share and Twitter and Instagram to communicate, and they are challenged to counter the power of anonymous chatter on Glass Door to manage their employment identities and to distinguish between real and 'fake' news about them. While "post-truth" storytelling may be just a modern reinvention of manipulation, the availability of technological platforms for storytelling portends a more chaotic marketplace in which storytelling management is a constant challenge. We see technological storytelling as an essential and exciting field of study that may further enhance the critical potential of organizational storytelling. On one hand, technological access may put more storytelling potential into the hands of the average employee and citizen, but on the other hand, that does not necessarily translate into greater power for one's story to be heard.

Conclusion

Arguably, accounting for the presence of storytelling in organizations is more important today than ever. As studies before ours suggest, storytelling is recognized as a legitimate area of inquiry by the conventions of organization studies. Yet our study also suggests that critical storytelling is an important means by which to challenge those conventions and recognize voices whose stories have historically been under-represented in organization research and practice.

In his classic 1993 treatise, *Culture and Imperialism*, the anti-colonialist literary critic, Edward Said, asserts that, as a representation of the most powerful colonialist cultures, the novel is "*the* aesthetic object…[that] is particularly interesting to study." But he also asserts that "stories…also become the method colonized people use to assert their own identity and the existence of their own history" (p. xii). That is, in the parlance of our study of

organizational storytelling, stories express the precepts of an organization's dominant narrative, but they also give voice to resistance. As our scientific understanding of how stories influence human behavior deepens, our capacity to tell stories traditionally and technologically is expanding. We hope this review stimulates further growth of inquiry into organizational storytelling as its potential to enlighten us – or, on the dark side, to misinform – also proliferates. Taking stock of how organizational storytelling supports, challenges, and even undermines scientific management suggests that understanding it may be even more important than scholars of organizational storytelling realized when they began publishing this body of work.

References

Abma, T.A. (2003). Learning by telling: storytelling workshops as an organizational learning intervention. *Management Learning*, **34**, pp. 221–240.

Ainsworth, S. and Hardy, C. (2012). Subjects of inquiry: statistics, stories, and the production of knowledge. *Organization Studies*, **33**, pp. 1693–1714.

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (1992). On the idea of emancipation in management and organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, **17**, pp. 432-464.

Anand, N. and Jones, B.C. (2008). Tournament rituals, category dynamics, and field configuration: The case of the Booker Prize. *Journal of Management Studies*, **45**, pp. 1036–1060.

Aristotle (1941). (originally published c. 350 B.C.E.). *De Poetica* (trans. Ingram Bywater). In R. McKeon (ed.), *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House.

Auvinen, T.P., Aaltio, I. and Blomqvist, K. (2013a). Constructing leadership by storytelling—the meaning of trust and narratives. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, **34**, pp. 496–514.

Auvinen, T.P., Lämsä, A., Sintonen, T. and Takala, T. (2013b). Leadership manipulation and ethics in storytelling. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **116**, pp. 415–431.

Bartel, C.A. and Garud, R. (2009). The role of narratives in sustaining organizational innovation. *Organization Science*, **20**, pp. 107–117.

Beech, N., MacPhail, S.A. and Coupland, C. (2009). Anti-dialogic positioning in change stories: bank robbers, saviours and peons. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 335-352.

Beyes, T. (2009). An aesthetics of displacement: Thomas Pynchon's symptomatology of organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **22**, pp. 421–436.

Biberman, J., Whitty, M. and Robbins, L. (1999). Lessons from Oz: balance and wholeness in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **12**, pp. 243–254.

Billsberry, J., Ambrosini, W., Moss-Jones, J. and Marsh, P. (2005). Some suggestions for mapping organizational members' sense of fit. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, **19**, pp. 555–570.

Bloomfield, B.P. and Vurdubakis, T. (1999). The outer limits: Monsters, actor networks and the writing of displacement. *Organization*, **6**, pp. 625–647.

Boal, K.B. and Schultz, P.L. (2007). Storytelling, time, and evolution: the role of strategic leadership in complex adaptive systems. *Leadership Quarterly*, **18**, pp. 411–428.

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

Boje, D.M. (1994). Organizational storytelling: The struggles of pre-modern, modern and postmodern organizational learning discourses. *Management Learning*, **25**, pp. 433–461.

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

Boje, D.M. (2008). *Storytelling Organizations*. London: SAGE.

Boje, D.M. (2009). Foreword. In Adorisio, A.L.M. (ed), *Storytelling in Organizations: From Theory to Empirical Research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. x–xii.

Boje, D.M. (2011). *Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook*. London: Routledge.

Boje, D.M. (2014). *Storytelling Organizational Practices: Managing in the Quantum Age.* London: Routledge.

Boje, D.M. and Baskin, K. (2011). Our organizations were never disenchanted: Enchantment by design narratives vs enchantment by emergence. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **24**, pp. 411–426.

Boje, D.M. and Smith, R. (2010). Re-storying and visualizing the changing entrepreneurial

identities of Bill Gates and Richard Branson. *Culture and Organization*, **16**, pp. 307–331.

Boje, D.M., Luhman, J.T. and Baack, D.E. (1999). Hegemonic stories and encounters between storytelling organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **8**, pp. 340–360.

Boje, D.M., Rosile, G.A., Saylors, J. and Saylors, R. (2015). Using storytelling theatrics for leadership training. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, **17**, pp. 348–362.

Bowman, G., MacKay, R.B., Masrani, S. and McKiernan, P. (2013). Storytelling and the scenario process: understanding success and failure. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **80**, pp. 735–748.

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

Boyce, M.E. (1996). Organizational story and storytelling: a critical review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **9**, pp. 5-26.

Breuer, N.L. (1998). The power of storytelling: storytelling in the workplace is a key to empowering employees to understand and project an organization's core values. *Workforce*, **77**, pp. 36–41.

Briody, E., Pester, T.M. and Trotter, R. (2012). A story's impact on organizational-culture change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **25**, pp. 67–87.

Brookfield, S.D. (2013). *Powerful Techniques for Teaching Adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, A.D. (2004). Authoritative sensemaking in a public inquiry report. *Organization Studies*, **25**, pp. 95-112.

Brown, A.D. and Thompson, E.R. (2013). A narrative approach to strategy-as-practice. *Business History*, **55**, pp. 1143–1167.

Brown, A.D., Gabriel, Y. and Gherardi, S. (2009). Storytelling and change: an unfolding

story. *Organization,* **16**, pp. 323–333.

Bruner, J.S. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. London: Harvard University Press.

Bryant, M. and Frahm, J. (2011). 'Kill Bill' and the change agent: a multi-genre approach to organizational stories. *Journal of Management & Organization*, **17**, pp. 797–811.

Burnett, S., Grinnall, A. and Williams, D. (2015). What have we learned so far? The development and application of an organisational learning narrative. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, **13**, pp. 160–167.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal,* **40**, pp. 519-531.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Callahan, J.L. (2014). Writing literature reviews: a reprise and update. *Human Resource Development Review*, **13**, pp. 271-275.

Carless, D. and Douglas, K. (2011). What's in a song? How songs contribute to the communication of social science research. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, **39**, pp. 439–454.

Case, P. (1999). Organizational studies in space: Stanislaw Lem and the writing of social science fiction. *Organization*, **6**, pp. 649–671.

Cayla, J. and Arnould, E. (2013). Ethnographic stories for market learning. *Journal of Marketing*, **77**, pp. 1–16.

Clifton, J. (2014). Small stories, positioning, and the discursive construction of leader identity in business meetings. *Leadership*, **10**, pp. 99–117.

Collins, D. (2012). Women roar: 'The women's thing' in the storywork of Tom Peters. *Organization*, **19**, pp. 405–424.

Collins, D. (2013). In search of popular management: Sensemaking, sensegiving and storytelling in the excellence project. *Culture and Organization*, **19**, pp. 42–61.

Collison, C. and Mackenzie, A. (1999). The power of story in organizations. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, **11**, pp. 38–40.

Colón-Aguirre, M. (2015). Stories gone cold: An analysis of untold organizational stories among reference librarians. In Izak, M., Hitchin, L., and Anderson, D. (eds), *Untold Stories in Organizations*. New York: Routledge, pp. 108–128.

Colville, I., Brown, A.D. and Pye, A. (2012). Simplexity: sensemaking, organizing and storytelling for our time. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 5–15.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N. T., Peller, G. and Thomas, K. (eds) (1996). *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement.* New York: The New Press.

Cunliffe, A. and Coupland, C. (2012). From hero to villain to hero: making experience sensible through embodied narrative sensemaking. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 63–88.

Cunliffe, A.L. (2014). *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Management*. London: Sage.

Cuno, J. (2005). Telling stories: rhetoric and leadership, a case study. *Leadership*, **1**, pp. 205–213.

Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A Narrative Approach to Organization Studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Czarniawska, B. (1999). *Writing Management: Organization Theory as a Literary Genre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in Social Science Research*. London: Sage.

Czarniawska, B. (2006). Doing gender unto the other: Fiction as a mode of studying gender discrimination in organizations. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **13**, pp. 234–253.

Czarniawska, B. (2009). Distant readings: anthropology of organizations through novels. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **22**, pp. 357–372.

Czarniawska, B. and Joerges, B.C. (1997). *Narrating the Organization: Dramas of*

Institutional Identity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dailey, S.L. and Browning, L. (2014). Retelling stories in organizations: Understanding the

functions of narrative repetition. *Academy of Management Review*, **39**, pp. 22–43.

Dawson, P. and Buchanan, D. (2005). The way it really happened: competing narratives in

the political process of technological change. *Human Relations*, **58**, pp. 845–865.

Dawson, P. and McLean, P. (2013). Miners' tales: stories and the storying process for

understanding the collective sensemaking of employees during contested change.

Group & Organization Management, **38**, pp. 198–229.

Dawson, P. and Sykes, C. (2018). Concepts of time and temporality in the storytelling and

sensemaking literatures: a review and critique. *International Journal of Management

Reviews*, **00**, pp. 1-18.

Dawson, P., Farmer, J. and Thomson, E. (2011). The power of stories to persuade: The

storying of midwives and the financial narratives of central policy makers. *Journal of

Management & Organization*, **17**, pp. 146–164.

de Burgh-Woodman, H.C. (2014). Homogeneity, "glocalism" or somewhere in between? A

literary interpretation of identity in the era of globalization. *European Journal of

Marketing*, **48**, pp. 288–313.

De Cock, C. (2000). Essal: Reflections on fiction, representation, and organization studies:

An essay with special reference to the work of Jorge Luis Borges. *Organization

Studies*, **21**, pp. 589–609.

De Cock, C. (2009). Jumpstarting the future with Fredric Jameson: Reflections on capitalism,

science fiction and utopia. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **22**, pp.

437–449.

de Poot, H. and Verwijs, C. (2005). Look who's talking: the virtues of organisational

storytelling. In Cunningham, P. and Cunningham, M. (eds), *Innovation and the*

Knowledge Economy: Issues, Applications, Case Studies. Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 822–829.

Denning, S. (2005). *The Leader's Guide to Storytelling: Mastering the Art and Discipline of Business Narrative*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Driscoll, C. and McKee, M. (2007). Restorying a culture of ethical and spiritual values: a role for leader storytelling. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **73**, pp. 205–217.

Driver, M. (2009). From loss to lack: stories of organizational change as encounters with failed fantasies of self, work and organization. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 353–369.

Etzion D. and Ferraro, F. (2010). The role of analogy in the institutionalization of sustainability reporting. *Organization Science*, **21**, pp. 1092–1107.

Fear, W.J. (2014). What is the story? The uniqueness paradox and the Patient Story in the minutes of the boardroom. *Management Learning*, **45**, pp. 317–331.

Feldman, S.P. (1990). Stories as cultural creativity: on the relation between symbolism and politics in organizational change. *Human Relations*, **43**, pp. 809–828.

Fenton, C. and Langley, A. (2011). Strategy as practice and the narrative turn. *Organization Studies*, **32**, pp. 1171–1196.

Fletcher, C. (1996). "The 250lb man in an alley": police storytelling. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **9**, pp. 36–42.

Fournier, V. and Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human relations*, **53**, pp. 7-32.

Gabriel, Y. (1991). Turning facts into stories and stories into facts: a hermeneutic exploration of organizational folklore. *Human Relations*, **44**, pp. 857–875.

Gabriel, Y. (1995). The unmanaged organization: stories, fantasies and subjectivity. *Organization Studies*, **16**, pp. 477-501.

Gabriel, Y. (2000). *Storytelling in Organizations: Facts, Fictions, and Fantasies*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Gabriel, Y. (2008). Seduced by the text: the desire to be deceived in story, memoir and drama. *Tamara Journal*, **7**, pp. 154-167.

Gabriel, Y. and Connell, N.A.D. (2010). Co-creating stories: Collaborative experiments in storytelling. *Management Learning*, **41**, pp. 507–523.

Garud, R., Dunbar, R.L.M. and Bartel, C.A. (2011). Dealing with unusual experiences: A narrative perspective on organizational learning. *Organization Science*, **22**, pp. 587–601.

Garud, R., Schildt, H.A. and Lant, T.K. (2014). Entrepreneurial storytelling, future expectations, and the paradox of legitimacy. *Organization Science*, **25**, pp. 1479–1492.

Geiger, D. and Antonacopoulou, E. (2009). Narratives and organizational dynamics: exploring blind spots and organizational inertia. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, **45**, pp. 411–436.

Geiger, D. and Schreyöegg, G. (2012). Narratives in knowledge sharing: challenging validity. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **16**, pp. 97–113.

Georges, R.A. (1969). Toward an understanding of storytelling events. *The Journal of American Folklore,* **82**, pp. 313–328.

Gerde, V.W. and Foster, R.S. (2008). X-men ethics: using comic books to teach business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **77**, pp. 245–258.

Gilliam, D.A. and Flaherty, K.E. (2015). Storytelling by the sales force and its effect on buyer-seller exchange. *Industrial Marketing Management*, **46**, pp. 132–142.

Golant, B.D. and Sillince, J.A.A. (2007). The constitution of organizational legitimacy: A narrative perspective. *Organization Studies*, **28**, pp. 1149–1167.

Gorry, G.A. and Westbrook, R.A. (2011). Can you hear me now? Learning from customer

stories. *Business Horizons*, **54**, pp. 575–584.

Gottschall, J. (2012). *The Storytelling Animal: How Stories Make Us Human*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Grafstrom, M. and Falkman, L.L. (2017). Everyday narratives: CEO rhetoric on Twitter. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* **30**, pp. 312-322.

Gray, D.E. (2007). Facilitating management learning: developing critical reflection through reflective tools. *Management Learning*, **38**, pp. 495–517.

Green, M.C., Chatham, C. and Sestir, M. (2012). Emotion and transportation into fact and fiction. *Scientific Study of Literature,* **2**, pp. 37-59.

Grey, C. (1996). C.P. Snow's fictional sociology of management and organizations. *Organization*, **3**, pp. 61–83.

Griffin, R.W. and Moorhead, G. (2012). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*. Mason, OH: South-Western/Cengage Learning.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society (Volume 1)*. McCarthy, T. (trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Haley, U.C.V. and Boje, D.M. (2014). Storytelling the internationalization of the multinational enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies*, **45**, pp. 1115–1132.

Hansen, C.D. and Kahnweiler, W.M. (1993). Storytelling: An instrument for understanding the dynamics of corporate relationships. *Human Relations*, **46**, pp. 1391–1409.

Hansen, H. (2011). Managing to beat death: The narrative construction process. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **24**, pp. 442–463.

Hansen, H., Barry, D., Boje, D.M. and Hatch, M.J. (2007). Truth or consequences: an improvised collective story construction. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **16**, pp. 112–126.

Hernández-Serrano, J., Stefanou, S., Hood, L.F. and Zoumas, B.L. (2002). Using experts'
   experiences through stories in teaching new product development. *Journal of Product
   Innovation Management*, **19**, pp. 54–68.

Hitchin, L. and Maksymiw, W. (2012). Story spaces: A methodological contribution. *New
   Technology Work and Employment*, **27**, pp. 65–77.

Hjorth, D. (2007). Lessons from Iago: Narrating the event of entrepreneurship. *Journal of
   Business Venturing*, **22**, pp. 712–732.

Holmwood, J. (2014). Reflexivity as situated problem-solving: a pragmatist alternative to
   general theory. *Sociologica,* **18**, pp. 1–26.

Holton, C.L. (1995). Once upon a time served: therapeutic application of fairy tales within a
   correctional environment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and
   Comparative Criminology*, **39**, pp. 210–221.

Humphreys, M., Ucbasaran, D. and Lockett, A. (2012). Sensemaking and sensegiving stories
   of jazz leadership. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 41–62.

Islam, G. (2013). Finding a space for story: sensemaking, stories and epistemic impasse.
   Journal of Organizational Change Management, **26**, pp. 29–48.

Izak, M., Hitchin, L. and Anderson, D. (eds.) (2014). *Untold Stories in Organizations*.
   London: Routledge.

Jalan, I., Sinha, S. and Ulus, E. (2014). Narratives of fate and misfortune in organizational
   life: stories of success and failure. *Culture and Organization*, **20**, pp. 410–429.

Jones, M.D. and Song, G. (2014). Making sense of climate change: how story frames shape
   cognition. *Political Psychology*, **35**, pp. 447–476.

Jordan, A.T. (1996). Critical incident story creation and culture formation in a self-directed
   work team. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **9**, pp. 27–35.

Jungkunz, V. and White, J. (2013). Ignorance, innocence, and democratic responsibility:

seeing race, hearing racism. *Journal of Politics*, **75**, pp. 436–450.

Kaplan, S. and Orlikowski, W. (2014). Beyond forecasting: Creating new strategic narratives. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, **56**, pp. 22–28.

Kassinis, G. and Panayiotou, A. (2017). Website stories in times of distress. *Management Learning,* **48**, pp. 397-415.

Katila, S. and Eriksson, P. (2013). He is a firm, strong-minded and empowering leader, but is she? Gendered positioning of female and male CEOs. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **20**, pp. 71–84.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kaye, B. and Jacobson, B. (1999). True tales and tall tales: The power organizational storytelling. *Training & Development*, **53**, pp. 45–50.

Keane, J.F., Graham, G. and Burnes, B. (2014). Literary praxiphorical analysis: Using science fiction and fantasy to shape organizational futures. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **84**, pp. 54–65.

Kennedy, E.J. and Lawton, L. (1992). Business ethics in fiction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **11**, pp. 187–195.

Kidd, D.E. and Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science,* **342**, pp. 377-380.

Klein, J.H. (2008). Some directions for research in knowledge sharing. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, **6**, pp. 41–46.

Klein, J.H. (2009). Ackoff's Fables revisited: stories to inform operational research practice. *Omega*, **37**, pp. 615–623.

Klein, J.H., Connell, N.A.D. and Meyer, E. (2007). Operational research practice as storytelling. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, **58**, pp. 1535–1542.

Kociatkiewicz, J. and Kostera, M. (2012a). Sherlock Holmes and the adventure of the rational

manager: Organizational reason and its discontents. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **28**, pp. 162–172.

Kociatkiewicz, J. and Kostera, M. (2012b). The good manager: an archetypical quest for morally sustainable leadership. *Organization Studies*, **33**, pp. 861–878.

Konnikova, M. (2016). *The Confidence Game: Why We Fall for It…Every Time*. New York: Viking.

Kopp, D.M., Nikolovska, I., Desiderio, K.P. and Guterman, J.T. (2011). "Relaaax, I remember the recession in the early 1980s . . .": Organizational storytelling as a crisis management tool. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, **22**, pp. 373–385.

Krieshok, T.S., Hastings, S., Ebberwein, C., Wettersten, K. and Owen, A. (1999). Telling a good story: Using narratives in vocational rehabilitation with veterans. *Career Development Quarterly*, **47**, pp. 204–214.

Küepers, W.M. (2013). Embodied transformative metaphors and narratives in organisational life-worlds of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **26**, pp. 494–528.

Küepers, W.M., Mantere, S. and Statler, M. (2013). Strategy as storytelling: A phenomenological collaboration. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **22**, pp. 83–100.

Lapp, C.A. and Carr, A.N. (2008). Coaching can be storyselling: creating change through crises of confidence. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **21**, pp. 532–559.

Learmonth, M. and Humphreys, M. (2012). Autoethnography and academic identity: Glimpsing business school doppelgängers. *Organization*, **19**, pp. 99–117.

Lee, T.W., Mitchell, T.R. and Sablynski, C.J. (1999). Qualitative research in organizational and vocational psychology, 1979–1999. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **55**, pp. 161–187.

Letiche, H., Boeschoten, R.V. and Jong, F.C.J.M. de. (2008). Workplace learning: Narrative and professionalization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **21**, pp. 641–654.

Llewellyn, N. (2001). The role of storytelling and narrative in a modernisation initiative. *Local Government Studies*, **27**, pp. 35–58.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Bednarz, Jr., J. with Baecker, D. (trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Lukosch, S., Klebl, M. and Buttler, T. (2011). Utilizing verbally told stories for informal knowledge management. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, **20**, pp. 615–642.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C. and Chia, R. (2012). Sensemaking, storytelling and the legitimization of elite business careers. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 17–40.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C., Gordon, J. and Shaw, E. (2015). Identity, storytelling and the philanthropic journey. *Human Relations*, **68**, pp. 1623-1652.

Mantere, S., Aula, P., Schildt, H. and Vaara, E. (2013). Narrative attributions of entrepreneurial failure. *Journal of Business Venturing*, **28**, pp. 459–473.

Mar, R. (2011). The neural bases of social cognition and story comprehension. *Annual Review of Psychology,* **62**, pp. 103-134.

Marshall, J. (2011). En-gendering notions of leadership for sustainability. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **18**, pp. 263–281.

Martens, M.L., Jennings, J.E. and Jennings, P.D. (2007). Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition. *Academy of Management Journal*, **50**, pp. 1107–1132.

Martin, J., Feldman, M.S., Hatch, M.J., and Sitkin, S.B. (1983). The uniqueness paradox in organizational stories. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **28**, pp. 438-453.

McCabe, D. (2015). The tyranny of distance: Kafka and the problem of distance in

bureaucratic organizations. *Organization*, **22**, pp. 58–77.

McCarthy, J.F. (2008). Short stories at work: storytelling as an indicator of organizational

commitment. *Group & Organization Management*, **33**, pp. 163–193.

Meijers, F. and Lengelle, R. (2012). Narratives at work: The development of career identity.

British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, **40**, pp. 157–176.

Metcalfe, B.D. and Woodhams, C. (2012) Introduction: new directions in gender, diversity

and organization theorizing—re-imagining feminist post-colonialism,

transnationalism and geographies of power. In Woodhams, C., Metcalfe, B. and

Callahan, J.L. (guest eds). Advancements in gender, diversity, and management

theorizing. [Special journal issue]. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* **14**,

pp. 123–140.

Mills, T. L., Boylstein, C. A. and Lorean, S. (2001). 'Doing' organizational culture in the

Saturn Corporation. *Organization Studies*, **22**, pp. 117-143.

Mittins, M., Abratt, R. and Christie, P. (2011). Storytelling in reputation management: The

case of Nashua Mobile South Africa. *Management Decision*, **49**, pp. 405–421.

Monin, N. and Monin, J. (2005). Hijacking the fairy tale: genre blurring and allegorical

breaching in management literature. *Organization*, **12**, pp. 511–528.

Mulligan, K. and Habel, P. (2013). The implications of fictional media for political beliefs.

American Politics Research, **41**, pp. 122–146.

Murgia, A. and Poggio, B. (2009). Challenging hegemonic masculinities: men's stories on

gender culture in organizations. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 407–423.

Nagel, T. 1986. *The View from Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Näslund, L. and Pemer, F. (2012). The appropriated language: dominant stories as a source of

organizational inertia. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 89-110.

Ng, W. and De Cock, C. (2002). Battle in the boardroom: A discursive perspective. *Journal*

of Management Studies, **39**, pp. 23–49.

Novak, M. (1975). 'Story' and experience. In Wiggins, J. B. (ed), *Religion as Story*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, pp. 175-197.

O'Gorman, K.D. and Gillespie, C. (2010). The mythological power of hospitality leaders? A hermeneutical investigation of their reliance on storytelling. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, **22**, pp. 659–680.

Oatley, K. (1999). Why fiction may be twice as true as fact: fiction as cognitive and emotional stimulation. *Review of General Psychology,* **3**, pp. 101-117.

O'Leary, M. (2003). From paternalism to cynicism: Narratives of a newspaper company. *Human Relations*, **56**, pp. 685-704.

Parry, K.W. and Hansen, H. (2007). The organizational story as leadership. *Leadership*, **3**, pp. 281–300.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System*. New York: The Free Press.

Patriotta, G. (2003). Sensemaking on the shop floor: narratives of knowledge in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, **40**, pp. 349–375.

Peirano-Vejo, M.E. and Stablein, R.E. (2009). Constituting change and stability: sense-making stories in a farming organization. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 443-462.

Phillips, M. and Knowles, D. (2012). Performance and performativity: Undoing fictions of women business owners. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **19**, pp. 416–437.

Phillips, M. and Rippin, A. (2010). Howard and the mermaid: Abjection and the Starbucks' Foundation memoir. *Organization*, **17**, pp. 481–499.

Phillips, N. (1995). Telling organizational tales: On the role of narrative fiction in the study of organizations. *Organization Studies*, **16**, pp. 625–649.

Phillips, N. and Zyglidopoulos, S. (1999). Learning from foundation: Asimov's psychohistory and the limits of organization theory. *Organization*, **6**, pp. 591–608.

Pio, E. (2007). Gurus and Indian epistemologies: parables of labor-intensive organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **16**, pp. 180–192.

Randazzo, S. (2006). Subaru: the emotional myths behind the brand's growth. *Journal of Advertising Research*, **46**, pp. 11–17.

Rapp, A., Ogilvie, J. and Bachrach, D.G. (2015). Sales leadership icons and models: how comic book superheroes would make great sales leaders. *Business Horizons*, **58**, pp. 261–274.

Reissner, S.C. and Pagan, V. (2013). *Storytelling in Management Practice: Dynamics and Implications*. London: Routledge.

Reissner, S.C. (2011). Patterns of stories of organisational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **24**, pp. 593–609.

Rhodes, C. (2009). 'All I want to do is get that check and get drunk': testifying to resistance in Charles Bukowski's *Factotum. Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **22**, pp. 386–401.

Rhodes, C. and Brown, A.D. (2005a). Narrative, organizations and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, **7**, pp. 167–188.

Rhodes, C. and Brown, A.D. (2005b). Writing responsibly: narrative fiction and organization studies. *Organization*, **12**, pp. 467–491.

Rhodes, C., Pullen, A. and Clegg, S. R. (2010). 'If I should fall from grace . . .': stories of change and organizational ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **91**, pp. 535–551.

Rippin, A. (2015). Feminine writing: text as dolls, drag and ventriloquism. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **22**, pp. 112–128.

Roberts, J.P. and Middleton, A. (2014). Evolving products: from human design to self-organisation via science fiction prototyping. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **84**, pp. 15–28.

Rosile, G.A., Boje, D.M., Carlon, D.M., Downs, A. and Saylors, R. (2013). Storytelling

> diamond: an antenarrative integration of the six facets of storytelling in organization

> research design. *Organizational Research Methods*, **16**, pp. 557-580.

Said, E.W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sambrook, S. (2004). A "critical" time for HRD? *Journal of European Industrial*

> *Training*, **28**, pp. 611-624.

Savickas, M.L. (2011). Constructing careers: Actor, agent, and author. *Journal of*

> *Employment Counseling*, **48**, pp. 179–181.

Savickas, M.L. (2012). Life design: A paradigm for career intervention in the 21st Century.

> *Journal of Counseling and Development*, **90**, pp. 13–19.

Sayers, J.G. and Fachira, I. (2015). Telling tales: Online comic and gripe story-sharing by

> service workers about difficult customers. *New Technology Work and Employment*,

> **30**, pp. 128–144.

Schedlitzki, D., Jarvis, C. and MacInnes, J. (2015). Leadership development: a place for

> storytelling and Greek mythology? *Management Learning*, **46**, pp. 412-426.

Schwarz, J.O. (2015). The 'narrative turn' in developing foresight: Assessing how cultural

> products can assist organisations in detecting trends. *Technological Forecasting and*

> *Social Change*, **90**, pp. 510–513.

Schwarz, J.O., Kroehl, R. and von der Gracht, H.A. (2014). Novels and novelty in trend

> research—using novels to perceive weak signals and transfer frames of reference.

> *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **84**, pp. 66–73.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1985). *Between Men: English Literature and the Male Homosocial Desire.*

> New York: Columbia University Press.

Seidel, V.P. and O'Mahony, S.C. (2014). Managing the repertoire: Stories, metaphors,

> prototypes, and concept coherence in product innovation. *Organization Science*, **25**,

pp. 691–712.

Sharma, A. and Grant, D. (2011). Narrative, drama and charismatic leadership: the case of Apple's Steve Jobs. *Leadership*, **7**, pp. 3–26.

Shaw, G., Brown, R. and Bromiley, P. (1998). Strategic stories: How 3M is rewriting business planning. *Harvard Business Review*, **76**, pp. 41–50.

Simmons, A. (2001). The story factor: inspiration, influence, and persuasion through the art of storytelling of one organization. *Organization Studies,* **16**, pp. 107–137.

Simons, J.J.P. and Green, M.C. (2013). Distracted by details: narrative influence following conflicting stories. *Media Psychology*, **16**, pp. 221–243.

Sims, D. (2003). Between the millstones: a narrative account of the vulnerability of middle managers' storying. *Human Relations*, **56**, pp. 1195-1211.

Sims, D. (2005). You bastard: a narrative exploration of the experience of indignation within organizations. *Organization Studies*, **26**, pp. 1625-1640.

Sims, D., Huxham, C. and Beech, N. (2009). On telling stories but hearing snippets: sense-taking from presentations of practice. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 371-388.

Śliwa, M., Sørensen, B.M. and Cairns, G. (2015). 'You have to choose a novel': the biopolitics of critical management education. *Management Learning*, **46**, pp. 243–259.

Śliwa, M., Spoelstra, S., Sørensen, B.M. and Land, C. (2013). Profaning the sacred in leadership studies: A reading of Murakami's *A wild sheep chase*. *Organization*, **20**, pp. 860–880.

Steuer, R. and Wood, T. (2008). Storytellers and their discursive strategies in a post-acquisition process. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, **21**, pp. 574–588.

Steyaert, C. (2015). Three women. A kiss. A life. On the queer writing of time in

organization. *Gender, Work & Organization*, **22**, pp. 163–178.

Swap, W.C., Leonard, D.A., Shields, M. and Abrams, L. (2001). Using mentoring and storytelling to transfer knowledge in the workplace. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, **18**, pp. 95–114.

Taylor, F. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Taylor, S.S., Fisher, D. and Dufresne, R.L. (2002). The aesthetics of management storytelling: A key to organizational learning. *Management Learning*, **33**, pp. 313–330.

Terkel, S. (1974). *Working: People Talk about What They Do All Day and How They Feel about What They Do*. New York: The New Press.

Tirado, F.J., Alcaraz, J.M. and Domenech, M. (1999). A change of episteme for organizations: A lesson from *Solaris*. *Organization*, **6**, pp. 673–690.

Torres, D.L. (2013). AGILity and the organization: sense-making for organizational leadership. *SAM Advanced Management Journal,* **78**, pp. 10–20.

Tye-Williams, S. and Krone, K.J. (2015). Chaos, reports, and quests: narrative agency and co-workers in stories of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, **29**, pp. 3–27.

Tyler, J.A. (2007). Incorporating storytelling into practice: How HRD practitioners foster strategic storytelling. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, **18**, pp. 559-587.

Vaara, E. and Tienari, J. (2011). On the narrative construction of multinational corporations: an antenarrative analysis of legitimation and resistance in a cross-border merger. *Organization Science*, **22**, pp. 370–390.

Vaara, E., Sonenshein, S. and Boje, D.M. (2016). Narratives as sources of stability and change in organizations: approaches and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, **10**, pp. 495–560*.*

van den Hende, E.A. and Schoormans, J.P.L. (2012). The story is as good as the real thing: early customer input on product applications of radically new technologies. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, **29**, pp. 655–666.

van Laer, T. (2014). The means to justify the end: Combating cyber harassment in social media. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **123**, pp. 85–98.

Wachtman, E. and Johnson, S.L. (2009). The persuasive power of story. *Marketing Management,* **18**, pp. 28–34.

Ward, J. and Winstanley, D. (2003). The absent presence: negative space within discourse and the construction of minority sexual identity in the workplace. *Human relations*, **56**, pp. 1255-1280.

Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weick, K.E. (2001). *Making Sense of the Organization*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Weischer, A.E., Weibler, J. and Petersen, M. (2013). 'To thine own self be true': the effects of enactment and life storytelling on perceived leader authenticity. *Leadership Quarterly*, **24**, pp. 477–495.

Whittle, A. and Mueller, F. (2012). Bankers in the dock: Moral storytelling in action. *Human Relations*, **65**, pp. 111-139.

Whittle, A., Mueller, F. and Mangan, A. (2009). Storytelling and 'character': victims, villains and heroes in a case of technological change. *Organization*, **16**, pp. 425–442.

Whyte, G. and Classen, S. (2012). Using storytelling to elicit tacit knowledge from SMEs. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, **16**, pp. 950–962.

Wilkinson, A. and Kupers, R. (2013). Living in the futures: how scenario planning changed corporate strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, **91**, pp. 118–127.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*, 3rd edn. Anscombe, G.E.M. (trans.).

New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Wolfe, R., Wright, P.M. and Smart, D. (2006). Radical HRM innovation and competitive advantage: the *Moneyball* story. *Human Resource Management*, **45**, pp. 111–145.

Wry, T., Lounsbury, M. and Glynn, M.A. (2011). Legitimating nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, **22**, pp. 449–463.

Table 4. 165 papers included in the review

Year	Citation
1985-1990	Martin *et al.* 1983; Feldman 1990.
1991-1995	Boje 1991; Gabriel 1991; Kennedy and Lawton 1992; Hansen and Kahnweiler 1993; Boje 1994; Boje 1995; Boyce 1995; Gabriel 1995; Holton 1995; Phillips 1995.
1996-2000	Fletcher 1996; Grey 1996; Jordan 1996; Breuer 1998; Shaw *et al.* 1998; Biberman *et al.* 1999; Bloomfield and Vurdubakis 1999; Boje *et al.* 1999; Case 1999; Kaye and Jacobson 1999; Krieshok *et al.* 1999; Phillips and Zyglidopoulos 1999; Tirado *et al.* 1999; De Cock 2000.
2001- 2005	Llewellyn 2001; Mills *et al.* 2001; Swap *et al.* 2001; Hernández-Serrano *et al.* 2002; Ng and De Cock 2002; Taylor *et al.* 2002; Abma 2003; O'Leary 2003; Patriotta 2003; Sims 2003; Ward and Winstanley 2003; Brown 2004; Billsberry *et al.* 2005; Cuno 2005; Dawson and Buchanan 2005; de Poot and Verwijs 2005; Monin and Monin 2005; Rhodes and Brown 2005b; Sims 2005.
2006- 2010	Czarniawska 2006; Randazzo 2006; Wolfe *et al.* 2006; Boal and Schultz 2007; Driscoll and McKee 2007; Golant and Sillince 2007; Gray 2007; Hansen *et al.* 2007; Hjorth 2007; Klein *et al.* 2007; Martens *et al.* 2007; Parry and Hansen 2007; Pio 2007; Tyler 2007; Anand and Jones 2008; Gerde and Foster 2008; Klein 2008; Lapp and Carr 2008; Letiche *et al.* 2008; McCarthy 2008; Steuer and Wood 2008; Bartel and Garud 2009; Beech *et al.* 2009; Beyes 2009; Czarniawska 2009; De

Year	Citation
	Cock 2009; Driver 2009; Geiger and Antonacopoulou 2009; Klein 2009; Murgia and Poggio 2009; Peirano-Vejo and Stablein 2009; Rhodes 2009; Sims *et al.* 2009; Whittle *et al.* 2009; Boje and Smith 2010; Gabriel and Connell 2010; O'Gorman and Gillespie 2010; Phillips and Rippin 2010; Rhodes *et al.* 2010.
2011- 2015	Boje and Baskin 2011; Bryant and Frahm 2011; Carless and Douglas 2011; Dawson *et al.* 2011; Fenton and Langley 2011; Garud *et al.* 2011; Gorry and Westbrook 2011; Hansen 2011; Kopp *et al.* 2011; Lukosch *et al.* 2011; Marshall 2011; Mittins *et al.* 2011; Reissner 2011; Savickas 2011; Sharma and Grant 2011; Vaara and Tienari 2011; Wry *et al.* 2011; Ainsworth and Hardy 2012; Briody *et al.* 2012; Collins 2012; Colville *et al.* 2012; Cunliffe and Coupland 2012; Geiger and Schreyöegg 2012; Hitchin and Maksymiw 2012; Humphreys *et al.* 2012; Kociatkiewicz and Kostera 2012a; Kociatkiewicz and Kostera 2012b; Learmonth and Humphreys 2012; Maclean *et al.* 2012; Meijers and Lengelle 2012; Näslund and Pemer 2012; Phillips and Knowles 2012; Savickas 2012; van den Hende and Schoormans 2012; Whittle and Mueller 2012; Whyte and Classen 2012; Auvinen *et al.* 2013a; Auvinen *et al.* 2013b; Bowman *et al.* 2013; Brown and Thompson 2013; Cayla and Arnould 2013; Collins 2013; Dawson and McLean 2013; Islam 2013; Jungkunz and White 2013; Katila and Eriksson 2013; Küepers 2013; Küepers *et al.* 2013; Mantere *et al.* 2013; Mulligan and Habel 2013; Rosile *et al.* 2013; Simons and Green 2013; Śliwa *et al.* 2013; Weischer *et al.* 2013; Wilkinson and Kupers 2013; Clifton 2014; Dailey and Browning 2014; de Burgh-Woodman 2014; Fear 2014; Garud *et al.* 2014; Haley and Boje 2014; Jalan *et al.* 2014; Jones and Song 2014; Kaplan

Year	Citation
	and Orlikowski 2014; Keane *et al.* 2014; Roberts and Middleton 2014; Schwarz *et al.* 2014; Seidel and O'Mahony 2014; van Laer 2014; Burnett *et al.* 2015; Gilliam and Flaherty 2015; Maclean *et al.* 2015; McCabe 2015; Rapp *et al.* 2015; Rippin 2015; Sayers and Fachira 2015; Schedlitzki *et al.* 2015; Schwarz 2015; Śliwa *et al.* 2015; Steyaert 2015; Tye-Williams and Krone 2015.