

ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERS AS STORYWRITERS: ON ORGANIZING PRACTICES OF REFLEXIVITY

To appear in *The Learning Organization*, paper accepted 18/08/2017

Authors:

Silvia Gherardi, University of Trento and University of Oslo.

Bio:

SILVIA GHERARDI is senior professor of sociology organization at the Department of Sociology and Social Research, (University of Trento, Italy), where she founded the Research Unit on Communication, Organizational Learning, and Aesthetics (www.unitn.it/rucola). She is also professor II at the Faculty of Education (Oslo).

Her research interests include: feminist studies, entrepreneurship, epistemology of practice, and qualitative methodologies in organization studies. She published two books on practice-based studies with Edward Elgar: *How to conduct a practice-based studies* (2012), and *Learning and Knowing in Practice-Based Studies* (2012), co-authored with Antonio Strati.

Michela Cozza, Malardalen University,

Bio:

Michela Cozza, PhD, is Senior Lecturer at the Mälardalen University (Sweden), School of Business, Society and Engineering. She is Book Review Editor of *Gender, Work & Organization*. She is interested in organization theory, science and technology studies, inclusive design, and qualitative methodology.

Barbara Poggio, Università di Trento,

Bio:

Barbara Poggio is Vice-Rector for Equality and Diversity Policies at the University of Trento, where she also coordinates the Centre for Interdisciplinary Gender Studies. She teaches Sociology of Work and Sociology of Organisation at the Department of Sociology and Social Research of the same university. Her research interests mainly deal with social construction of gender in organisations. Since 2014 to 2015 she coordinated the European project GARCIA (Gendering the Academy and Research: combating Career Instability and Asymmetries).

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank the Research Foundation that has made it possible to realize the project and all the volunteer practitioners who accepted to take part in the writing process, sharing their stories. Furthermore, we are grateful to Luigi Maria Sicca for his careful reading of a previous version of the manuscript and his helpful comments and insightful suggestions.

Abstract

Purpose – The article describes how organizational members became storywriters of an important process of organizational change. Writing became a practice designed to create a space, a time, and a methodology with which to author the process of change and create a learning context. The written stories produced both the subjectivity of practical authors and reflexively created the con/text for their reproduction.

Design/methodology/approach – A storywriting workshop inspired by a processual and participatory practice-based approach to learning and knowing was held in a research organization

undergoing privatization. For six months, thirty-one organizational members, divided into two groups, participated in writing one story per week for six weeks. The written story had to refer to a fact that had occurred in the previous week, thus prompting reflection on the ongoing organizational life and giving a situated meaning to the change process.

Findings – Storywriting is first and foremost a social practice of wayfinding, i.e. of knowing as one goes. Writing proved to be an effective practice that involved the authors, their narratives, and the audiences in a shared experience where all these practice elements became connected and through their connection acquired agency.

Originality/value – Narrative knowledge has been studied mainly in storytelling, while storywriting by organizational members has received less attention. This paper explores storywriting both as a situated, relational, and material practice and as the process that produces narratives which can be considered for their content and their style.

Keywords – Organizational learning, practice-based knowing, storywriting, authoring, reflexivity.

Introduction

It may be that the learning organization is “dead”, as Pedler (2013) argued, or perhaps it is still alive but living under different names, as Pedler and Burgoyne (2017) suggested after an informal survey on practitioners. This debate is intriguing, and we aim to contribute to it by discussing one of the features of the learning organization that should receive closer attention. In fact, reflection and time for reflection (Garvin *et al.*, 2008; Örtenblad, 2013) have been acknowledged as ingredients necessary for nurturing a learning context, while how to organize practices for reflection has somewhat disappeared from sight in recent times.

While reflection is usually conceived as a cognitive process – and we acknowledge that people in organizations reflect, both spontaneously and in organized ways – we focus on activities and their reflexivity in producing the context. We shall assume reflexivity in its ethnomethodological definition, subsuming in it the activities of reflecting, and considering both reflection and reflexivity as practice phenomena. Following a “turn to practice” in organization studies (Gherardi, 2009; 2012; Nicolini, 2012) we explore how reflexivity may be designed as an organizational practice that supports learning. Chia (2017, p. 108) proposes the image of “wayfinding” as an alternative practice-based form of organizational learning that entails learning and “knowing as we go”, in contrast to “navigation” which presupposes the existence of pre-established goals and route maps,

and which assumes that we must know “*before we go*” (italics in original). In what follows, we present an initiative in which we designed a space and a time for reflexivity in a research organization undergoing privatization, and we proposed a specific mode for “knowing as one goes” based on narrative knowing and the use of storywriting as a means to achieve it.

Over the past twenty years, organization scholars have shown considerable interest in narratives and storytelling, especially because they are linked to issues of knowledge, organizational learning, communication, power, and identities (Czarniawska, 1997; Rhodes and Brown, 2005; Gabriel, 2000; Tosey, 2008). The performance of narratives is a key aspect of members’ work lives in “storytelling organizations” (Boje, 1991; Hillon and Boje, 2017), and storytelling intensifies in stressful conditions like organizational change (Brown *et al.*, 2009). We contend that whilst much theoretical knowledge has been produced on storytelling as an oral activity (Vaara *et al.*, 2016), less has been done on the writing of stories by organizations’ members.

Writing may be considered a form of inquiry (Richardson, 1994), and storywriting may be designed as a situated practice for organizing reflexivity within an organization wanting to create a learning context. When organizational members write stories about organizational life, they inquire into the indistinct flux of ongoing experience to introduce order and meaning. They thus produce a sense of accountability of themselves, of others, and of what counts as “events” that they choose to represent. At the same time, the narratives become “texts” that have a life of their own and produce the con/text where they achieve agency and consequentiality. Thus, writing is a reflexive activity that produces: (a) the authoring of organizational experience, and (b) the context where more stories may be written and have an effect on organizational learning.

The article is based on our experimentation with storywriting as a practice intentionally designed to promote organizing reflexivity within a framework of participatory action research (Greenwood *et al.* 1993; Steyaert and Van Looy, 2010) sustaining an organizational change process.¹ It will first introduce storywriting as a method of inquiry, and then present the empirical setting and the research design, before illustrating the narratives that for six months two groups of participants

wrote – in the form of logbooks – about the organizational change process. In the discussion section we focus on how storywriting may be interpreted as a process, as an activity of authoring organizational change, and as a practice in which narratives, authors, audiences, and their materiality achieve agency. The conclusion is devoted to organizing practices of reflexivity targeted on learning contexts.

Storywriting as an ongoing reflexive practice

Interest in writing as a qualitative methodology can be traced back to Richardson (1994, p. 923), who described it as “a method of inquiry, a way of finding out about yourself and your topic [...] a way of “knowing”, a method of discovery and analysis”. What she meant by “a method of inquiry”, instead of a “telling of the world”, was that it offers an opportunity to experience language-in-use, wondering on how we word and re-word the world. Moreover, Richardson (p. 928) notes that we live and work in a postmodernist climate, “a time when a multitude of approaches to knowing and telling exist side by side”. Wayfinding as a metaphor for organizational learning is inscribed in the same epistemology. Moreover, this postmodernist atmosphere is fully expressed by St Pierre (2014, p. 374) when she introduces the concept of collaborative writing as “a different collaboration enabled by a different ontology in post-humanism when writers are neither authors, nor individual, nor present but always already entangled in an assemblage of reading, writing, and the world”. In fact, a posthumanist practice theory makes it possible to see a practice as an *agencement* of elements that achieve agency in their being connected (Gherardi, 2015), and the stories that we tell and write are entangled with activities, artifacts, other human and more-than-human beings, denying centre stage to human beings.

Therefore, storywriting instead of storytelling is a mode of inquiry into the composition of a worded world that is never accurate, precise, captured once and for all, always in becoming and always different. Storywriting is first and foremost a social practice of wayfinding, rather than an isolated

technique individually applied; it is an interactive way to engage with and handle encounters situated in specific organizational contexts.

It should be noted that writing, reflecting, sharing written stories, using arts in organizational research is becoming a consolidated methodology. In the past we have experimented with storywriting in workshops where practitioners wrote stories on gendering leadership practices (Gherardi and Poggio, 2007). Moreover, other studies have experimented with collaborative writing (Gabriel, and Connell, 2010, Gale and Wyatt 2012), sometimes as a participatory methodology with practitioners (Speedy and Wyatt, 2014); and the writing of collaborative biographies (Davies and Gannon, 2006) has been developed as a feminist methodology.

In addressing the question of how to design practices of reflection (and how reflexivity is performed by reflecting), we define reflexivity “as situated, engaged, relational, material-discursive *practices*” (emphasis in original) (Keevers and Treleaven, 2011, p. 506). The aim of reflexivity is to achieve a close interweaving among symbols, languages and actions, and their connections with the context, so that the world is comprehensible to oneself and to the other members of a collectivity. Reflexivity is therefore a characteristic of all order-producing social activities, storywriting included, since it is used to create a sense of orderliness for action but reflexively creates that self-same context for action.

While reflection and reflection-in-action have been widely studied in the management learning literature (Cunliffe, 2003; Cunliffe and Easterby-Smith, 2004; Reynolds and Vince, 2009; Jordan *et al.*, 2009) as types of “inquiry characterized by engaging in comparison, pondering alternatives, taking diverse perspectives and drawing inferences” (Jordan, 2010, p. 393), less attention has been paid to organizing situated practices for reflexivity. In fact, while reflection looks back at the past in order to alter the future, reflexivity is anchored in present practice, in identification of the assumptions and priorities that shape our interpersonal relations. Reflexivity consists in the practices of accountability, observability, and reportability of social action (Garfinkel, 1967), and

we can inquire as to how accountability, observability, and reportability are “done” in practice when organizational members engage in a situated practice of collective writing.

In storywriting – as a practice for organizing reflexivity in the context of organizational change – it is particularly important that organizational members become “practical authors” (Cunliffe 2003, Schotter 1993; 2010; Schotter and Cunliffe, 2003). Organizational members become practical authors of their own work when they can play an active role in the production, reproduction, and transformation of their working practices (Gorli *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, enhancing the possibilities for practical authorship relies on the conditions to engage in the ongoing organizational power game and appropriate it. Organization studies increasingly analyse reflexive practices in order to understand how individuals deploy them in order to avoid or engage with a call to change either themselves or the social context (Antonacopoulou, 2004; Hibbert *et al.*, 2010; 2017).

In the following sections, we illustrate how the practical authors of narratives about change engage in a process of wording and *worlding* their everyday lives and how they, their stories, and their audiences achieve agency within a writing practice.

Organizing a practice of reflexivity: research design

We conducted an experiment in storywriting in the context of the transition of an Italian public research institute (454 employees) to a private research foundation (henceforth: Foundation). In the public discourse, this privatization was presented as intended to improve the performance, flexibility, and the autonomy of the institute, which was already recognized for its scientific excellence, as well as its economic and social impact. In this context, we proposed storywriting as a methodology for engaging organizational members in a collaborative practice of rewording and appropriating the ongoing change, which was generating controversial reactions. This tense atmosphere motivated managers to support the design of a temporary practice designed to promote organizational learning in a “protected” environment.

The storywriting workshop consisted in asking participants to reflect on the events of the past week and write – each week, for six weeks – a short narrativeⁱⁱ either related to what they considered as a “key event” that had occurred in the past week or a personal reflection related to organizational life. Contrary to other approaches, we did not ask the participants to use a grid to write their stories – as Ripamonti *et al.* (2016) did – nor we did we direct their attention to “arresting moments”, as Greig *et al.* (2013) did on using a phenomenological approach. The rationale of our methodology was that participants should create a logbook in which they expressed a collective and unfolding experience, choosing what to voice and what to silence, what to include in a plot and what to leave out.

The writers had to upload their texts to an online platform, which was password-protected and accessible only to researchers and participants. We involved thirty-one volunteers: managers did not participate because their presence might have affected the interaction. Two groups were created and each chose a name: “Voltaire” was the name of the first group, while the second decided to call itself “Mentalworkers”. We would stress that the groups’ names expressed a different imagery and a different positioning within the organizational change: the former name was more elitarian and individual, since Voltaire was an Enlightenment thinker and a satirical polemicist, while the latter name was more proletarian and collective, suggesting an analogy between metalworkers and mentalworkers, i.e. the transformation of work from manual to cognitive. Symbolically, the transition from the first group, whose narratives were written in the immediacy of the organizational change, to the second group, whose narratives came at a later stage, marked a switch in the subjectivation of “the worker” in the Foundation.

Covering six months of the ongoing organizational change, the groups worked in two consecutive periods. The first group comprised thirteen people, involved from January until March. The second group consisted of eighteen people, involved from June until July. Each group was also involved in a first workshop to familiarize it with the methodology before the storywriting began, and in a second one held at the end of the six weeks to de-brief the narratives and reflect collectively on the ongoing process of organizational change.

Overall, the participants wrote 135 narratives: the first group wrote 62 texts out of 78 expected, while the second one wrote 73 texts out of 114 expectedⁱⁱⁱ. Each author was asked to give a title to guide the reader by giving a quick clue as to the subject of the story.

We did not analyse the narratives according to their content, since the aim of our intervention was not to collect them, but rather to promote a participatory methodology for reflecting via writing, and sustain the reflexivity of the written stories. The process of writing proved to have a reflexive effect since the first narratives influenced and created the context for the following ones.

In the next two sections, we draw on a selection of narratives that illustrate how everyday life in the Foundation metabolized the initial impact of the change process. They are prime examples of how, when writing their stories, the participants developed an authorial subjectivity linked to their appropriation of the ongoing process of change, and how the written stories performed its authoring.

Soon after the Big Bang: Voltaire's narratives

The narratives of the first group were focused on identifying the changes characterizing the organizational life of the Foundation. A recurrent expression like “It is the first time that ...” marked temporal discontinuity and signposted a reference to something “new”. Indeed, the Voltaire group wrote many “stories of change” linked to key events considered turning points in the history of the organization.

Two events attracted the almost unanimous attention of the Voltaire group, respectively during the first and the second week of storywriting: the Retreat – a day devoted to discussing research at the Foundation – and the appointment of a new Secretary-General. Both were events that embodied and symbolized the organizational change as a kind of primordial Big Bang materialized in specific events. In writing about them, the authors made a choice about what was observable and reportable and what should left in the background.

In their storywriting, the Voltaire authors reflected upon and took a stance on the big organizational change instead of being passive spectators. By anchoring the organizational transformation in

particular events, the storywriters made the overall change more tangible, giving it a voice and the appropriate words.

Story 1: “Retreat 2009. The future of scientific and technological research” (English in original)

This has been the week of Retreat 2009. A great event for research: leading researchers and scientists in the international field of Information Technology and Microelectronics. For the first time the Foundation has provided a new service: the live video-audio streaming of the event. For the days of the Retreat, everyone could connect from around the world to the webpage to follow the rapporteurs live. A new service useful for both Foundation researchers and outsiders.

In Story 1 the important change is worded as a new service, i.e. the streaming of events to both the Foundation researchers and external interested people. This aspect connects with the aim of improving the visibility of the new Foundation and its research excellence, and progressively eradicate the legacy of the past. The symbolic value of this story is not only the new openness towards an external audience but also the call to participate implicit in the availability of the streaming. The narratives that referred to this event constructed it as a moment of organizational reflection on the discontinuity introduced into everyday life.

At the same time, “jammed mechanisms” and “entrenched situations” cohabited with a new organizational set-up centered on a new Secretary-General. This co-existence of old and new, past and present, caused mixed feelings: storywriters were aware that change takes time and, as in Story 2, they described change as a “crossroads” that can either deteriorate or improve the situation.

Story 2: “At a crossroad”

Today we have a Secretary-General. We also have a Grant Officer to attract non-European funds. The organization has found a structure that will be completed with appointment of the new Director of the Centre XX. Now is the time to work to ensure that the machine’s jammed and encrusted mechanisms inherited from the old system find the fluidity that allows them to operate smoothly and keep pace with the times. But will

we be willing to work without walls? Will it really be possible to harmonize Administration and Research? I say, why not? (...) This occasion of reorganization and change is simply a great opportunity. Change in itself is neither positive nor negative: it is an opportunity, a crossroads that allows one to go in both directions, for better or worse.

This comparison between past and present continued in the following week's narratives, which now stressed the introduction of new practices such as those minimizing the bureaucracy. As the author of Story 3 says, the past is analogic and slow, while the future is digital and rapid, meaning that a successful change relies on an increase in autonomy and flexibility, on empowering the workers and enhancing organizational efficiency.

Story 3: "Travelling on one's own"

The novelty of this week has been that for the first time I've used the computer mask which since the beginning of the year has allowed the direct and personal compilation of expenses request forms for missions. Surprisingly, everything went smoothly ... Besides the obvious fact that you avoid wasting time on information transfer and that the secretarial work is simplified, the main psychological advantage of direct compilation of the expenses request form is that, by organizing the transfer details yourself, you have a greater sense of efficiency and, I would say, empowerment. After all, what is more natural for a researcher than to plan a work mission, quickly submit the idea to the head of his/her unit, draw up the budget, and receive the administration's okay by immediate return of post? In the transition from Research Institute to Foundation, one of the most alluring (and for the time being most frustrating) promises for those working there was that decision-making within the organization would be streamlined and simplified, with greater investment in trust and responsabilization of the individual researcher to the detriment of the traditional bureaucratic control mechanisms typical of public administrations. (...) It may seem strange, but compiling a document online has given me a greater sense of ongoing change than many other more highfalutin initiatives

The narratives written immediately after the Big Bang were focused on notable “events” and they created the context for the writing of later narratives pinpointing “minor changes” that give meaning to daily life. The uncertain future is mastered by the words, which take the place of an empty scenario, as well as by the narratives embodying observations and reflections in a tangible (i.e. the uploaded text) and reportable plot. The sense of accountability inscribed in these narratives paved the way for the following ones.

The sun after the storm: the narratives by *Mentalworkers*

In the *Mentalworkers* group, there were neither typical narratives nor key events, nor a comparison between past and present. This absence was due to the passage of time, together with the effect of the ongoing reflexivity of storywriting. Indeed, events like the Retreat and the appointment of the new Secretary-General had already occurred, and were no longer so relevant for those writing three months later. Moreover, the *Mentalworkers* started writing just before summertime and vacations, a period that generally affects the rhythm of organizational life overall.

In the second period of the storywriting workshop, both the emotional tone and the focus of the narratives changed. For the first group, the main subject matter was the organizational change, while work in itself was in the background. Conversely, the meaning of work was the main topic in the second group of narratives. We argue that the mode of constructing accountability, observability, and repeatability had changed.

Language use also changed, and in *Mentalworkers* narratives it marked membership of a collectivity. There was frequent use of possessives, as in “our [research] center”, “our [or “my”] group”, “my research unit”, “our research group”, “our office”. By contrast, the *Voltaire* authors referred to the Foundation as external to them by using expressions like “the Foundation staff”, “the science center and the human science center [of the Foundation]”, “the researchers and technologists of the Foundation”, “those working in a scientific environment”, “a group”, “the

research staff”, “the offices located in Via...”, “the organization”, “a center”, the “Big Brother” (referring to the decision-makers).

Noteworthy is the presence of ethical/aesthetic judgements like “the good and the bad of this work” (i.e. research work). Storywriters associated “the good” with the possibility to apply specific individual competencies (for example, a personal skill in photography that can be valuable also in one’s work) or creativity (for example, take the lead of a paper when it comes to design). “The good” was also when one had time to complete constantly interrupted tasks. The pleasure, and through the pleasure the attachment to work, is well represented in the following story.

Story 4: “So long”

What was the significant event of the week just past? If I think for a moment and look at my diary for the past few days ... it’s curiously empty. And then I realize that this week I’ve worked more than I’ve done for a long while: I’ve written a lot, and managed to start on that article that was waiting for so long... After a period crammed with meetings, group work sessions, board meetings that have overlapped for a series of reasons (primarily, the transition to Foundation), this week has been quiet! ... It may be the imminent summer, but I have taken advantage of this calm and my research has certainly benefited from it.

Story 5 introduces also “the bad”, which was linked to an increased number of meetings to consolidate the new set-up. As in Voltaire Story 2, the *Mentalworkers* Story 5 reveals the ambiguity of change: the recurrent meetings were sources of information and clarification, on the one hand, and time-consuming events on the other.

Story 5: “Meetings, meetings and meetings again!”

I’ve spent most of the week in meetings. Organizational meetings, catch-up meetings, meetings to plan future work ... However, when meetings multiply and, most importantly, concentrate together, there’s little time left for work, not to mention that you usually come out of meetings with an additional workload. So

now my ideas are certainly clearer, with an updated work schedule and, above all, with an increased workload. My state of mind is similar to what you have when you're close to a deadline.

In the writing, what counted as “organizational change” underwent a significant shift. While the first group of narratives described an “organization” outside its members’ activities, the latter group of narratives dealt with “organizing” as a process which the members own through their work. Reflections on the changed working conditions recurred also in Story 6, which referred to an ethical concern about an increased influence of business interests on decisions concerning research.

Story 6: “In-between two private partners”

Supervising a PhD dissertation, we came across a technology that could be developed to solve a technological problem in the LPG-fuel car market. The PhD is sponsored by an industrial partner A, which wants to keep control over dissemination of the thesis results. The same technology suggested in the thesis had previously been proposed by another industrial partner B, who only asked us to try to make devices with this technology in our microelectronics laboratory. To proceed with the dissertation, it is necessary to verify the compatibility of the new technology with the system in which it is to be incorporated. Essential for this is the contribution of partner B, but that means at least partly revealing the industrial intentions of partner A. I found myself having to decide what information to give to B so that that it could work informally. I had to answer a simple question: Can I use this thing in that system to get this measurement? Well, to do this without exposing the PhD student to partner A’s ire I had to do a number of checks to safeguard relationships with both private partners. To gain credibility in the eyes of industry, researchers often endeavour to imitate its confidentiality standards, which induce a rigidity which may even halt or slow down the progress of work.

The plot of this story proves how an individual researcher is in the front line in actualizing the ethical stance of the organization.

Communicating by the narratives what was “good” and “beautiful” (as well as “boring” in Story 5) of research work was a means for the negotiation and comparison of subjective opinions about

working at the Foundation. At the same time these texts, through their materiality, are detached from their authors' intentions and carry with them the ethic of work at the new Foundation. Overall, the reflexivity expressed through the categories of "good" and "bad" marks the new rhythm of the Foundation and exemplifies how accountability, observability, and reportability are done in a practice of reflexivity and how this reflexivity creates the context that the narratives describe. These narratives share a moral according to which – metaphorically speaking – the sun always comes back after a big change, and it sheds light on new priorities as well as on new challenges to face as a collective and more powerful subject.

Storywriting was a process of wording a moment of change in organizational life and *worlding* the organization in which the authors dwelt.

Discussion

What happens in storywriting as an organizational practice? Its illustration through the narratives selected enables its interpretation as a process, an activity, and an *agencement* of all practice elements.

As a process, we may refer to the transition in the narratives from the Voltaire group to the *Mentalworkers*. We named this transition as "from Big Bang" to "the sun after the storm", and in reading the stories one can note how the narratives just after the change were constructed around facts originating from outside the writers and presented as "events" symbolizing the Foundation's change process (narratives 1-2-3), while the later narratives were plotted around both everyday work and the meaning of working in the Foundation according to aesthetic and ethical judgments (narratives 4-5-6). Writing stories was a process in which the narratives were used to create a sense of orderliness in organizational life, but reflexively they created the self-same context that made some narratives possible while others became less plausible, or implausible. This interpretation refers to one aspect of reflexivity – i.e. inscribing accountability, observability, and reportability.

Now we can discuss the other aspect of reflexivity by posing the question of what narratives “do” in being written.

When we interpret storywriting as an activity, we focus on how observability, accountability, and reportability are accomplished within the plot of a story. In other words, we discuss how storywriting is a form of inquiry, a wayfinding form of “knowing as we go” (Chia, 2017). We may consider as an example the transition in the narratives from the first one – in which the Retreat was the observed “fact” accounting for an organizational change and referred to visibility and participation – to the last one in which the meaning of “privatization” was exemplified via a moral dilemma within a network of actions and actors. This transition may be interpreted as a situated activity of authoring the change process and thus of appropriating it and participating in the organizational power game. In fact, while the locus of control inscribed in the narratives was initially external to the storywriters, in storywriting and through a process of authoring the change, the locus of control was positioned in the storywriters’ hands and expressed through the plotting of narratives that made the world comprehensible to themselves and negotiable with the other members of the Foundation.

Finally, we consider storywriting as an *agencement* of practice elements, and we wonder what the narratives “make do” in their circuit of reproduction, i.e. as a situated practice aimed at reflexivity. When we interpret storywriting as a practice we are pointing at how in the process of practising all the elements are connected together to acquire agency. In fact, once the human being as author has been decentered in favour of a relational epistemology, then agency is distributed among all the elements: the narratives, their authors, their audiences, and their material embeddedness. Reflexivity is thus interpreted as the *agencement* of the elements contributing to storywriting as a situated practice. Narratives circulate and act as common ground for communication and knowledge sharing (Bechky, 2003). They have a life of their own independently from the intentions of their authors, and they become organizational artifacts, or boundary objects that act “as common

information spaces that enable interaction and coordination without consensus or shared goals” (Bartel and Garud, 2003, p. 333).

Conclusion

To design learning environments in organizations, it is necessary to organize spaces, times, and practices where members can activate and develop shared reflexive practices. We have presented and discussed an organizational intervention where efforts were made to create conditions to support a learning context, in an organization undergoing an important process of change. This came about through an activity of collective storywriting whereby the members of the organization were stimulated to engage in a collaborative practice of rewording and appropriating the ongoing change. In so doing, we made possible an activity of reflexivity that went beyond a cognitive process through which individuals “recapture their experience, think about it, mull over it and evaluate it” (Boud *et al.*, 1985, p. 19) but is characterized as a situated, engaged and relational practice based on accountability, observability, and reportability of social action.

By combining processes of authoring and agencement, collective storywriting makes it possible to translate the flow of experience into words making sense of the change and, in a sense, “taming” it by generating widespread responsibility for change within the organization.

References

- Antonacopoulou, E.P. (2004), “The dynamics of reflexive practice: The relationship between learning and changing”, in Reynolds, M. and Vince, R. (Eds), *Organizing Reflection*, Ashgate, Aldershot, UK, pp. 47-64.
- Bartel, C.A. and Garud, R. (2003), “The Role of narratives in sustaining organizational innovation”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 107-111.
- Bechky, B.A. (2003), “Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of knowledge on a production floor”, *Organization Science*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 312-330.

- Boje, D. (1991), "The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 36 No. 1, pp. 106-126.
- Brown, A., Gabriel, Y. and Gherardi, S. (2009), "Storytelling and change: An unfolding story", *Organization*, Vol. 16 No.3, pp. 323-333.
- Chia, R. (2017), "A Process-philosophical Understanding of Organizational Learning as "Wayfinding"", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 107-118.
- Cunliffe, A. L. (2003) "Reflexive inquiry in organizational research: Questions and possibilities", *Human Relations*, Vol. 56 No. 8, pp. 983-1003.
- Cunliffe, A. and Easterby-Smith, M. (2004), "From reflection to practical reflexivity: experiential learning as lived experience", in Reynolds, M, and Vince, R (Eds), *Organizing Reflection*, Ashgate, Hampshire, pp. 30–46.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997), *Narrating the organization*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Davies, B. and Gannon, S. (2006), *Doing collective biography: Investigating the production of subjectivity*, Open University Press, Berkshire.
- Gabriel, Y. (2000), *Storytelling in organizations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gabriel, Y., & Connell, N. A. D. (2010). Co-creating stories: Collaborative experiments in storytelling. *Management Learning*, Vol. 41 No.5, pp. 507-523.
- Gale, K. and Wyatt, J. (2012), "Back to futures: Diffractions and becomings of collaborative writing", *International Review of Qualitative Research*, Vol. 5 No.4, pp. 467-477.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967), *Studies in ethnomethodology*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Garvin, D.A., Edmondson, A.C. and Gino, F. (2008), "Is yours a learning organization?", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 86 No. 3, pp. 109-116.
- Gherardi S. (2009), "Knowing and learning in practice-based studies: An introduction", *The Learning Organization*, Vol 16 No. 5, pp. 352-359.

- Gherardi S. (2012), *How to conduct a practice-based study: Problems and methods*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Gherardi, S. (2015), "How the turn to practice may contribute to working life studies", *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 13-25.
- Gherardi, S. and Poggio, B. (2007), "Tales of ordinary leadership: A feminist approach to experiential learning", in Reynolds M., Vince, R. (Eds), *The Handbook of Experiential Learning and Management Education*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 155-168.
- Gorli, M., Nicolini, D. and Scaratti, G. (2015), "Reflexivity in practice: Tools and conditions for developing organizational authorship", *Human Relations*, Vol. 68 No. 8, pp. 1347-1375.
- Greig, G., Gilmore, C., Patrick, H. and Beech, N. (2013), "Arresting moments in engaged management research", *Management Learning*, Vol. 44, pp. 267-285.
- Greenwood, D. J., Whyte, W. F. and Harkavy, I. (1993), Participatory action research as a process and as a goal", *Human Relations*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 175-192.
- Hibbert, P., Coupland, C. and MacIntosh, R. (2010), "Reflexivity: Recursion and relationality in organizational research processes", *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 5, pp. 47-62.
- Hillon, Y.C. and Boje, D.M. (2017), "The dialectical development of "storytelling" learning organizations: a case study of a public research university", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 4, <https://doi.org/10.1108/TLO-02-2017-0010>.
- Nicolini, D. (2012), *Practice theory, work, and organization*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hibbert, P., Callagher, L., Siedlok, F., Windahl, C. and Kim, H.S. (2017), "(Engaging or avoiding) change through reflexive practices", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, online first DOI: 10.1177/1056492617718089
- Rhodes, C. and and Brown, A.D. (2005), "Narrative, organizations and research", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol 7 No. 3, pp. 167-188.

- Jordan, S. (2010), "Learning to be surprised: How to foster reflective practice in a high-reliability context", *Management Learning*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 391–413.
- Jordan, S., Messner, M. and Becker, A. (2009), "Reflection and mindfulness in organizations: Rationales and possibilities for integration", *Management Learning*, Vol 40 No. 4, pp. 465–473.
- Keevers, L. and Treleaven, L. (2011), "Organizing practices of reflection: A practice-based study", *Management Learning*, Vol. 42 No. 5, pp. 505-520.
- Örtenblad, A. (2013), "Who is the learning organization for? A stakeholder contingency approach to contextualizing managerial panaceas", in Örtenblad, A. (Ed), *Handbook of Research on the Learning Organization: Adaptation and Context*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, pp. 289-305.
- Pedler, M.J. (2013), "Is the learning organisation still alive?", Unpublished Report of a survey of practitioners, available at: mikepedler@hotmail.co.uk
- Pedler, M. and Burgoyne, J.G. (2017) "Is the learning organisation still alive?", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp.119-126.
- Reynolds M. and Vince, R. (2009), "Reflection, reflective practice and organizing reflection", in Armstrong, S.J. and Fukami, C.V. (Eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Management Learning, Education and Development*, Sage, London, pp. 89-103.
- Rhodes, C. and Brown, A.D. (2005), "Narrative, organizations and research", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol 7 No. 3, pp. 167-188.
- Richardson, L. (1994), "Writing: A method of inquiry", in Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (1st Edition), Sage, London, pp. 923-948.
- Ripamonti, S., Galuppo, L., Gorli, M., Scaratti, G. and Cunliffe, A. L. (2016), "Pushing action research toward reflexive practice", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol. 25, pp. 55-68.
- Shotter, J. (1993), *Conversational realities: Constructing life through language*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Shotter, J. (2010), “Situated dialogic action research disclosing “beginnings” for innovative change in organizations”, *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 268-285.

Shotter, J. and Cunliffe, A.L. (2003), “Managers as practical authors: Everyday conversations for action”, in Holman, D. and Thorpe, R. (Eds), *Management and language: The manager as a practical author*, Sage, London, pp. 15–37.

Speedy, J. and Wyatt, J. (2014), *Creative practitioner inquiry in the helping professions*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam.

Steyaert, C. and Van Looy, B. (2010), “Relational practices, participative organizing”, in Steyaert, C. and Van Looy, B. (Eds), *Relational practices, participative organizing (Advanced Series in Management, Vol 7.)*, Emerald Group, Bingley, UK, pp 1-17.

St. Pierre, E.A. (2014), “An always already absent collaboration”, *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies*, Vol.14 No.4, pp. 374-379.

Tosey, P. (2008), “One upon a time ... tales of organisational learning”, *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 454-462.

Vaara, E., Sonenshein, S. and Boje, D. (2016), “Narratives as sources of stability and change in organizations: Approaches and directions for future research”, *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 495-560.

Zanutto, A. (Ed), (2010), *Trasformazioni*, FBK Press, Trento.

ⁱ ‘Participatory action research is a form of action research in which professional social researchers operate as full collaborators with members of organizations in studying and transforming those organizations. It is an ongoing organizational learning process, a research approach that emphasizes co-learning, participation, and organizational transformation’. (Greenwood *et al.*, 1993 p.177).

ⁱⁱ The terms “story” and “narrative” are often used interchangeably; however; some differences can be identified. While a “story” usually refers to a sequence of events, “narrative” refers to the way the events are recounted and connected into a coherent whole.

ⁱⁱⁱ The original texts are in Italian. Some participants did not upload a story every week: this is why the total number of stories differs from the expected one.