



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Tamara land fractal change management

in between managerialist narrative and polyphonic living stories

Svane, Marita Susanna; Boje, David M.

Published in:

Sc'Moi. Standing Conference for Management and Organizational Inquiry.

Publication date:

2015

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Svane, M. S., & Boje, D. M. (2015). Tamara land fractal change management: in between managerialist narrative and polyphonic living stories. In *Sc'Moi. Standing Conference for Management and Organizational Inquiry*. (2015 ed.).

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Tamara Land Fractal Change Management - in between Managerialist Narrative and Polyphonic Living Stories

Author: Marita Svane and David Boje

Paper presented at Sc.MOI Conference, Las Vegas, 9. – 11. April, 2015

Abstract

Both in literature and in practice, the concepts of management, manage, and manager have been constructed in many ways, each conveying different meanings and assumptions on what management is, who a manager is, and how the manager relates to others. In this paper, we treat two dominant approaches to management; managerialist management and relational polyphonic managing. The short come of managerialism is its monophonic control leaving no room for multivoiced co-creativity in local spaces. In contrast, this is the major contribution offered by polyphonic relational managing. However, taking the view that leadership is understood as a social process, this latter approach is criticized for not offering enough insight into the question of how leadership is distinctive from other organizing processes (Denis, Langley & Sergi 2012). In this paper, we suggest antenarrative fractal change management as a third perspective in an attempt to meet this criticism. Furthermore, we add the criticism that neither of the two major approaches offers sufficient attention to the role that quantum spacetime-mattering plays in organizational development and change. Hence, we offer a quantum storytelling framework in accordance to which we view management as managing the tensed antenarrative interplay between managerialist control narrative and polyphonic, co-creative living stories. Drawing on the work on Henderson and Boje, we relate this third approach to ‘fractal change management’ (Henderson, Boje in press) and inscribes it to the Tamara storytelling organization. As a result, the contribution of the paper is a further conceptual development of Tamara Land fractal change management.

Keywords: fractal change management, antenarrative, quantum, Heidegger, sociomaterial, spacetime-mattering, strategizing, organizing, inquiry, fore-caring, becoming

Introduction

Both in literature and in practice, the concepts of management, manage, and manager have been constructed in many ways, each conveying different meanings and assumptions on what management is, who a manager is, and how the manager relates to others. Especially since the 80’ies, however, the managerialist control approach to management has permeated both the public and private sector leaving less and less space to polyphonic, relational leadership. Performance Management,

New Public Management, New Managerialism and Evidence-Based Management are all concepts and approaches that point into that direction. The managerialist trend often leaves the manager with the paradoxes of simultaneously dealing with control/trust, development/operation, professional quality/economic profitability, stability/change, closeness/distance, and so forth (Rennison 2014b).

Today, the professional strategic manager needs to handle a much wider range of diverging rationales of voices (Rennison 2007: 21) and paradoxes. The multiple, contesting rationales increase the complexity of management and calls for a shift from monophonic control to polyphonic coping (Rennison 2007: 15). The tensions between monophonic control management and polyphonic coping leadership pose a major challenge of contemporary management. Consequently, the semantics of the concept of management still needs scholarly attention.

The challenging question of managing in between managerial, monophonic control and the polyphony of conflicting and competing voices can be addressed from a storytelling perspective, using Boje's quantum triad storytelling model of control narratives, living stories and antenarratives (2014a, 2008). The managerialist control narrative implies fractal rules and patterns that control and govern the way the organizational members think, feel, relate, and behave. The polyphonic living stories co-produce little wow moments of exceptions and novelty that can be considered as fractal ruptures. Tamara-Land is very much about 'antenarrative' processes connecting fractal narratives with fractal story webs (Boje, 2001, 2008, 2011, in press).

In this paper, we reflect upon a semantic, conceptual development of the management concept from a quantum storytelling approach applying and further developing the concept of Fractal Change Management and the quantum Tamara storytelling organization. Central to Fractal Change Management is the tensed interplay between the managerialist fractal control narrative and the polyphonic, co-creative fractal rupturing living stories as part of strategizing and organizing the future of the organization.

The theoretical contribution of the article is to shed more light on quantum fractal change management and organizational development and change. As part of the conceptual development of fractal change management, we suggest that inquiring and caring is a primordial process of fractal change management. Hence, we further develop the 4-B antenarrative model by adding a fifth dimension, 'the Fore-Caring Dimension of Becoming'. Fore-caring inquiry is an inquiry into our mode of 'being-in' in 'being-in-the-world'. Are we in the world as imposed upon us by the fractal narrative patterns or are we in the world in an open and questioning way, fore-caring about the fractal consequences of the sociomaterial becoming of the world? We suggest that this dimension is in the heart of practicing fractal change management.

The paper is structured in the following way. We begin the paper by briefly introducing the semantic roots of the concept of management and management approaches, including managerialism, dialogism and relationalism. From a quantum storytelling perspective, we then proceed to present a criticism of these approaches as regard their contributions but also shortcomings.

Having done so, we unfold the quantum storytelling field as composed by fractal narratives, fractal stories and the fractal transforming antenarrative. We account for the tensed interplay between managerial fractal control narratives and polyphonic living stories of fractal ruptures. We argue that management is about addressing this tensed interplay. Therefore, we draw the attention towards the antenarrative dimension of storytelling, as the antenarrative operates as an interconnection between the fractal narratives and the fractal rupturing stories. Antenarrative management addresses the core of fractal change management in organizing, developing and changing the organization. Continuing the discussion, we add and account for the fore-caring dimension of becoming as a further development of the 4-B antenarrative model.

In the end of the paper, the antenarrative model is discussed in relation to multi-fractal change management and related to the quantum Tamara storytelling organization.

Management Approaches: From Management to Managing

Both in literature and in practice, the concepts of management and manager have been constructed in many ways, each conveying different meanings and assumptions on what management is and who a manager is. Following Cunliffe (2009), these various ways can be conceived as discourses or speech genres (Bakhtin 1986), as they draw on differently organized, ideological, and theoretical forms of talk.

Used in different forms of talk, words author managerial action and identity, and assign to that action and identity authority and power over others (Cunliffe 2009: 10). In that sense, forms of talk, language and discourses on management are performative as they have consequences to managerial actions and practices, to the identity of the manager, and to the way the manager relates to others.

In her literature review of the academic field of management, Cunliffe identifies four managerial approaches (2009: 29). The three of them relates to *management* and managerialism whereas the fourth one implies the shift towards *managing* and relationalism, including critical discourses, dialogue, and storytelling.

Management and Managerialism

Historically, the roots of managerialism can be traced back to the approaches of Classical /Scientific Management and Human Relations. At that time, the concept was associated with 'systematization' and 'legitimization' (Cunliffe 2009: 16) and related to the individual character of a person. By creating a formal body of expertise based on 'scientific' principles and activities and a legitimate tool box of intervention techniques, the aim is to make the manager knowable and more credible and authoritative. Conceived to possess specialised knowledge, the manager can legitimately control people, direct their activities and make changes in order to manage organizations efficiently and effectively. Management is thus a discipline or profession that is different from other professions,

jobs and work activities. The managerial figure is characterized by the elitist and heroic expert who manages and exercises power over other. The relation to others is based upon distance, separation and subordination.

Management Studies appeared in the middle of the 19th century (Cunliffe 2009: 13), including Human Resource Management, Management and Organization Studies, and the growing field of management consultants as well as management gurus. At that time, 'managerialism' and 'professionalism' began to emerge as an institutional, ideological discourse that controls the way of 'doing' and 'being' in organizations (Deetz 1992: 222). Composed by certain ontological worldviews, beliefs, values, ideas, interests, social structures, and social practices, the ideology produces a particular world and particular type of subjects. Hence, the ideology carries performative consequences as it controls and evaluate what is good and true (Deetz 1992, Deetz 1995, Gergen 1995). The ultimate goal of the managerialist ideology is to enhance efficiency, productivity, profit or service for the common good by emphasizing the institutionalised right of the manager to hire, fire, give orders, control and evaluate performance of others (Cunliffe 2009: 17, Deetz 1992: 222).

The ideology of managerialism and professionalism seriously impacts not only the private sector but also the public sector with the performance discourse on New Public Management, also called New Managerialism (Rennison 2014a). Relying on customer-market orientation and the business practices of the private sector, New Public Management focuses on maximizing organizational performance, service and profit by means of cost cutting, reengineering, privatization of services, increased regulation, and evidence-based management as well as performance management (Cunliffe 2009: 18). Evidence-based practice can be viewed as a new managerialist strategy according to which professional practice "should take the form of specifying goals explicitly, selecting strategies for achieving them on the basis of objective evidence about their effectiveness, and then measuring outcomes in order to assess their degree of success" (Hammersley 2001: 3). As decision-making and acting is based upon the use of 'hard facts', the evidence-based practice is closely related to performance management and managerialism.

Both in the public and private sector, the managerialist approach still draws on analytical, scientific management techniques and evidence-based methods, and continues to systematize and professionalize management through training and by centring on techniques, systems and processes required to increase performance. The managerial figure is viewed as professional and skilled and the role of the manager as institutionalised and legitimized.

The relation to others is based upon power located in the routine practices of everyday life (Deetz 2003: 29-30). Following Foucault (1988), power and control is located in the discursive and non-discursive practices, in language and in social norms. Hence, power is omnipresent as it is produced and reproduced everywhere at each moment and in each relation. What makes the disciplinary power so powerful is the subtle ways in which the organizational members begin to take on the language and the forms of talk of the dominant discourses as their own (Deetz 2003: 30) as the natural way of talking about the organizational reality, relations and identities.

The managerialist approaches can be criticized for its assumptions of organizational coherency, order and consent and belief in monophonic control. Both the public and the private sector contemporary managers face a wide range of diverging and contesting multivoiced ideologies and rationales. This complexity calls for a shift to polyphonic coping (Rennison 2007: 15) and more relational oriented approaches to management.

Managing and Relationalism

In opposition to managerialism, critical, relational and social construction oriented approaches to leadership emerge in the 1980'ies and onwards. The relational approach splits into several branches aiming at destabilizing the ideologies of managerialism and new managerialism. One of these branches is critical theory and the discourse field, including the critical positions of Deetz and Foucault as well as Alvesson and Fairhurst. This branch views the manager as discursive and fragmented subjectivities. The various and different discourses create competing pressures on the manager leading to the formation of multiple, fragmented subjectivities. The managers' identities are thus sites of negotiation and contestation (Alison Pullen according to Cunliffe 2009: 40).

Another branch is the social construction approach arguing that social realities, identities and knowledge as well as 'facts' are socially-constructed and emerge in ongoing interactions and dialogues. This branch implies a shift from *management* to *managing* in order to emphasize that managing is "*a way of being and relating*, rather than the conventional view of *management* as a series of disembodied activities or roles within an already existing reality" (Cunliffe 2009: 43). Leadership is thus viewed as a collective activity rather than as the doings of formal, individual leaders (Crevani, Lindgren & Packendorff 2010: 78). Rather than control and authority, leadership is about participation and collectively creating a sense of direction. With a focus on mutuality understood as group members leading each other within a closed interacting group, leadership is fundamentally in the plural as followers and leaders are essentially the same person. Thus leadership is conceived as a social process, emerging in the interactions and dialogues. The approach thus proposes a relational conceptualization of leadership. (Denis, Langley & Sergi 2012). Viewed through the lenses of Cunliffe and Eriksen (2011: 1433), relational leadership is fundamentally a way of being-in-the-world and a way of working out meaning with others through dialogue. The dialogue is defined as "the great dialogue" (Bakhtin 1984: 71), meaning that all voices participates in the polyphonic dialogue with equal rights.

One of the ways in which the social construction approach conceives of the manager is as a practical author (Shotter, Cunliffe 2002, Cunliffe 2001, Shotter 2008). Managers are authors and together with other organizational members they co-author their organization's social realities. Through heteroglossic, multivoiced dialogues (Bakhtin 1984, 1981), managers and followers are continually trying to make sense of various impressions and experiences of the organizational everyday life and through language and dialogue to create meaning of new possibilities for moving forward and for

coordinating actions (Cunliffe 2009: 42). Practical authorship thus emphasizes linguistic and dialogical practices as part of managing an organization.

Due to its strong emphasis on dialogue as an ideal of organizational communicative practices, the relational approach can be criticized for turning dialogue into a discursive ideology. Hence, dialogicalism or relationalism emerge as new concepts. Relational leadership is subsequently associated with a particular form of talk and language characterized by the prefix of 'co-', such as co-construction, co-production, co-authoring, co-participation, and so forth.

Romanticizing dialogue, the social construction approach can be criticized for paying too little attention to the role of power in producing leadership, organizational realities, and identities (Denis, Langley & Sergi 2012: 267, 269). Following this line of thinking, plural leadership is criticised for assuming mutual convergence around common goals and directions, and for diluting the distinctiveness of leadership. If leadership is understood as a social process, then how to distinguish leadership from other organizing processes? (Denis, Langley & Sergi 2012: 267, 269).

Furthermore, from our point of view, the social construction approaches to managing as well as the classical approaches to management and managerialism overlook the significant role, materiality plays in managing the processes of organizing and strategizing the becoming of the organization. This criticism is to be unfolded in the next part of the paper and discussed in relation to the criticism put forward by Denis, Langley and Sergi. We suggest that the quantum storytelling approach to management provides an alternative between the two positions. Our ambition is to suggest a theoretical and methodological framework that adds more insight into the phenomenon of 'management' and 'managing'.

Quantum Storytelling Approach to Management

As part of this semantic, conceptual development of the concept of management, the discourses, forms of talk and languages about management have expanded over time, and have become one of the major challenges of contemporary management. In this paper, however, we suffice to refer to these different branches as either control management or as relational managing. Each of the two discourses carries different and contesting ideologies for managing the organization towards its future and for relating to others. Simultaneously existing, they create tensions, complexity, crossfire and paradoxes. Caught in the middle of these tensions, the public as well as the private sector manager has to deal simultaneously with the paradoxes of control/trust, operation/development, stability/change, professional quality/economic profitability, closeness/distance, and so forth (Rennison 2014b).

Consequently, the semantics of the management concept still needs scholarly attention. Each of the two approaches to management carries different weaknesses and contributions. Whereas managerialism is based upon reproductive monologic communication, relational leadership enhances a polyphonic, productive and co-creative communication. The centrifugal forces of the polyphonic dialogue may lead in a multitude of different directions, decentralize the organization, and create or-

ganizational disorder, whereas the centripetal forces of the monologue lead to organizational centralization, coherency and order. Overstating this, the one extreme relates to an organization that is already organized and in place, fossilized, reified and dead, whereas the other extreme relates to an organization dissolving into plurivocal chaos.

In this paper, we suggest to look into antenarrative management as a storytelling approach to management. We suggest that antenarrative management is about managing, organizing, and strategizing in between these two extreme poles of control management and relational managing. Neither one of the three approaches or dimensions (as we prefer to call them) can be singled out and isolated from the others. At the contrary, we suggest to view them as part of an integrated conceptual framework for understanding contemporary management of complexities, paradoxes, and tensions. We argue that viewing management through the antenarrative lenses calls forth the distinctiveness of leadership that Dennis, Langley, and Sergi (2012) are in search for. In the remaining part of the paper, we unfold and further develop a storytelling approach to these three dimensions of management.

Furthermore, we adopt a quantum approach to storytelling management in order to answer the call in academia for more focus on the active role of materiality in organizational development and change. In recent years, the social construction approaches to strategy, organization, culture, management and learning have increasingly been criticized for ignoring the active role of the materiality of the social world (Barad 2007, Ingold 2012, Nicolini 2012, Taguchi 2009). The social construction approaches have been criticized for not sufficiently taking into account the materials and the sociomaterial practices of organizational life (Barad 2007, Nicolini 2012). Hence, in the recent years, the new material research agenda has gained an increasing interest in the fields of organizing (e.g. Carlile, Langley 2013, Shotter 2011), management (e.g. Jarzabkowski, Pinch 2013), storytelling (e.g. Boje 2014a, Strand 2012), learning (e.g. Taguchi 2009), and culture (e.g. Ingold 2012).

In this paper, our ontological and epistemological approach to quantum storytelling draws inspiration in particular from Heidegger (2008, 1975), Barad (2007, 2003), Shotter (2011), Bakhtin (1990, 2010), Deleuze (1987), and Ingold (2007, 2012). Based upon these approaches, we view human beings, non-human beings, and things as beings-in-the-world that engage with the world in a practical, embodied, emotional, material, dialogical and discursive manner. We advocate that this engagement occurs at a pre-reflective and pre-reflexive level which is more primordial than cognition and interpretation. It involves the active role of spacetime-mattering and of sociomateriality.

Spacetime-mattering is the inseparability of spatializing, temporalizing, and mattering in the ontological situation. In her use of the word 'matter' / 'mattering', Barad plays with two semantic meanings. The one semantic meaning refers to the matter of the world out of which materials, human beings, and non-human organisms, the whole nature and universe are constituted. The other semantic meaning of matter refers to meaning, that is, what comes to matter in the constitution of the world-in-its-process-of-becoming. Subsequently, mattering is the entanglement of meaning and materiality and is referred to as material-discursive practices by Barad. Thereby, Barad emphasis

how discursive power is part of determining what comes to matter in the ontological constitution of the world. Other quantum researchers refer to the entanglement of meaning and materiality by using the concept of sociomateriality in order to research the entanglement between social and material practices.

Emphasizing spacetime mattering and the sociomaterial / material-discursive practices, the quantum approach grants more constitutional power to materiality than the social construction approach does. Hence, the quantum turn draws on the practice turn and conceive of matter as an active agential constituent part in the configuration of the world. According to Barad, matter is a ‘doing’, and not to be conceived as stable things or stable entities (2007: 151). In our quantum storytelling approach, we follow this practice orientation as storytelling is not only about oral or written performances but also about sociomaterial ‘doings’ and ‘practices’.

Despite the criticism of the social construction approaches as regard the under-appreciation of the active role of materiality, our quantum approach acknowledges and draws on the important contributions on language, discourse, and meaning made by the social construction and critical theory approaches.

Similarly, we appreciate the Heideggerian trace that relational management is being-in-the-world since this makes management a way of being-in in being-in-the-world. This implies that strategizing and organizing the organizational world-in-its-becoming is inseparable entangled with the coming-into-being-of-the-person/-manager. As Ingold phrases it: “Since the person is a being-in-the-world, the coming-into-being of the person is part and parcel of the process of coming-into-being of the world” (Ingold 2000: 168).

We conceive of the entanglement between the coming-into-being of the world and of the person/manager as a sociomaterial spiraling process of becoming in spacetime mattering. In this spiraling process of becoming of the world and the person, the social and the material entangle with each other in various ways, at different scales, ranging from the individual to the organizational level.



Figure 1. Antennarrative Spiral of Social and Material Entanglement along the Line of Becoming

Drawed by Boje and Svane. Modified version of the original drawing (Boje 2014c)

As a contribution to the semantic understanding of how management and managing of strategizing and organizing practices can be conceived, we aim at unfolding this entanglement from the perspective of quantum storytelling in this paper.

The ‘quantum storytelling field’ theory has been worked out in several books (Boje, 2014; Boje & Henderson, 2014; Henderson & Boje, 2015) and articles (Boje & Haley, 2014; Boje, Rosile, Saylor, and Saylor 2015; Boje, Haley, & Saylor, 2015; Boje, Svane, Henderson & Strevel in press, Svane in press), and is the topic of the annual Quantum Storytelling Conference (<http://quantumstorytelling.org>). As illustrated in the triad storytelling model below, the quantum storytelling field is defined here as relation of grand narratives and living story webs, with antennarrative lines playing important pre-reflexive and pre-reflective transformative relationships in spacetime-mattering.




Figure 2: The Quantum Storytelling Field

Designed by David Boje, drawn by Marita Svane

In our view, the entanglement between coming-into-being of the world and of the person/manager, is part of the tensed interplay between closed dominant (counter) narratives and open living story webs. The closed dominant narratives produce particular discursive organizational worlds and sub-

jectivities, whereas the polyphonic living story web fosters a horizon of endless possibilities of becoming for both the organizational world and the person/manager. The antenarrative line interconnects and transforms the narrative and the living story poles out of which interplay the world and the person/manager emerges.

As an integrated and important part of the entanglement between the sociomaterial process of becoming of the world and the person, we furthermore introduce the quantum concept of ‘fractals’ in line with what Henderson and Boje refer to as ‘fractal change management’ (Henderson, Boje in press).

Fractal is a concept that originates from Benoit Mandelbrot’s work in fractal geometry in 1970s (1977). The concept has been adopted and further developed in the storytelling field (Boje, Henderson 2014, Boje 2015, in press, Duarte 2014). "A fractal is defined here as a recurrence of self-similar and/or instability processes across scales: individual, unit, inter-unit, organization, inter-organization, regional, international, global” (Boje, 2015: 10, bold and italics in original). Hence, self-similar fractal patterns (re)occur in the sociomaterial process of coming-into-being of both the world and the person (manager).

Fractal change management is about grasping, becoming aware of, and changing these fractal patterns as they are formed, practiced and changed in the sociomaterial process of becoming. Hence, we argue that strategizing and organizing is a process of managing fractal changes at both the organizational and at the personal level due to the entanglement between these two levels. Hence, “fractals form in fractal narratives, fractal story webs, and are interconnected by transformative antenarrative fractal processes” (Boje 2014c: 2). These antenarrative fractal processes give rise to ‘fractal change management’ (Henderson, Boje in press).

In the following, we will unfold this quantum storytelling ontology and its implications to fractal change management.

Multi-Fractal Clusters of Control Narratives – Counternarratives

In this next section of the paper, we first define what quantum fractal narratives and counternarratives are in relation to organization and management. Then we proceed to explain how fractal control narratives and counternarratives impact on organizational development and change as well as on the formation of the subject.

Fractal Narratives and Counter-Narratives

“Fractal narrative” is defined as “a narrative that finds its best accomplished form in the Web” in hyperlink networks (Duarte 2014: 284, Boje 2015, in press). The Web need not be the Internet, rather it can be constituted by a web of communicative praxis in discourse and in ritual relationships.

The fractal control narrative follows the Greek philosopher Aristotle's definition of a storytelling. "By such a definition, narratively *"proper"* stories must be: (a) linear plot sequence, (b) whole coherence of beginning, middle, and ending, and (c) recited by a solitary narrator" (Boje 2007: 1454). Hence, the fractal control narrative is a structured and repeated story of plotted events. The fractal is the repeated story of the heroic character in a complex plot within plots, patterns within patterns, that are repeated over and over again from one telling to the next (Boje 2015, in press, Boje 2014c: 3).

The fractal control narrative is a managerialist narrative where managers are narrating the organizational reality for others. Fractal rules and patterns emerge through this narrative discourse. As the only dialogue allowed is a managerial one, the fractal narrative turns into a managerialist fractal hegemony. All others must imitate and follow the fractal pattern and rule or pay the consequences of their resistance. The fractal control narrative works as a centripetal monologue that closes down the living story process in the attempt to only tell one story (Boje 2014a). In that sense, the one story of the fractal narrative system exercises social control.

As a result, the organization may be exposed to the risk of passive or even active polarized resistance that emerges as fractal counter-narratives / counter-powers against the dominant fractal narrative. A counternarrative is "a cluster of histories, anecdotes, and other fragments woven together to disrupt stories of domination, 'a story [or narrative] that resists an oppressive identity and attempts to replace it with one that commands respect'" (Nelson, Lindemann 2001: 6, bracketed additions ours). All together, the cluster of narrative and counter narratives constitute a tensed multi-fractal pattern.

Consequently, differences, deviations and exceptions are suppressed to fit into the grand narrative system of abstraction, generalization, homogeneity, coherence and order. The system-order and system-wholeness ontology then constitutes a fractal system pattern that regulates and socializes human behavior. In producing and maintaining particular ways of doing, practices, thinking, and relating, the repeated discursive narrative lead to institutionalized habits, routines and legitimated customized practices, to institutionalized and a taken for granted expectations, to ritualized relations, to traditional and unquestioned everyday ways of thinking, living and practicing the organizational life. As such, the fractal control narrative is driving not only by the managerial decisions and action but also by the autopoietic forces of self-organization, self-optimization, self-maintenance, and self-replication of the grand system.

As the fractal narrative tends to universalize, homogenize, and essentialize, it simplifies the complexity of the organization at the level of system abstractions. Hence, in the fractal control narrative, the sociomaterial organization is already designed, structured, coherent, and 'in place'. The fractal controls the agency of the constituent parts, including language, meaning, discourses, and materiality.

This system-ontology of a system-wholeness, system-order, and system-boundaries is, however, challenged by complexity theory and process-ontology. Hence, following the ‘becoming’ perspective of the process-ontology (Tsoukas, Chia 2002: 295, Nayak, Chia 2011, Ingold 2000, Chia, Holt 2009), organizations are conceived as always in the process of becoming, unfinalized and unfinished, with fragmented and changing, dynamical relations. This is what Boje calls systemicity (Boje 2014a). An organization is an ongoing “world-making” phenomenon (Nayak, Chia 2011: 282).

Multi-Fractal Branching Organizational Development and Change

The fractal narrative pattern is not a stable pattern but changes across time and space either as a linear, designed new system-wholeness or as an organic and adaptive new open-system-wholeness. The fractal pattern may develop as a branching multi-fractal splitting into more and more narratives or counternarratives as illustrated in the below figure. Furthermore, as the branching fractal encompasses both dominating narratives and counter-narratives, the fractal pattern is a multi-fractal pattern of sociomaterial discursive practices that overlap, interweave, cohere, conflict, diverge, scatter and enable as well constrain each other. Still, as the dominating narrative and counter-narratives are relational and as such interactive and interconnected, they are part of the same linear, hierarchical structural development. They form a cluster of multi-fractal narrative-counternarratives.




Figure 2 –Two dimensional and three dimensional branching fractals
(Designed and drawn by David Boje, Used by Permission).

Drawing on Deleuze & Guattari (1987), this fractal patterning can be conceived as a botanical tree metaphor for organizational development and change. The tree metaphor conveys a hierarchical structure that branches and splits into a multidimensional directions. As conveyed by the tree metaphor, however, the organization can only grow and develop in a linear, hierarchical structure. The hierarchical linear structure is the dominating fractal narrative pattern. The branching patterning continues across time and space, and, at some point, the founding narrative is morphed in some new directionality and dissolubility of new facets (Heidegger, 1962) due to their improved efficacy. This is illustrated in the right part of the above figure.

Fractal Theyness

The fractal control narrative does not only bring forth particular organizational realities but also particular types of subjectivities as products of the fractal narrative discourse. In order to improve organizational performance in a branching organization, the fractal discourse defines how to think, behave and relate in the hierarchical, branching structure. Organizational members are thus turned into institutionalized and reified system objects that are instrumentally used for deliberate strategic and economic purposes.

Through the socialization into the dominant discourses, the subjects begin to adopt the forms of life and talk of the discourse as their own natural way of talking about the organizational reality, relations and identities. They develop what Heidegger calls the they-self. The they-self refers to the absorption of self into the world where the “they” prescribes the way of interpreting the world by articulating the referential context of significance (Heidegger 2008: 167). As such, theyness is a fractal narrative of social, cultural norms, values, assumptions and expectations.

As the fragmented storytelling organization may be split into competing dominant narratives and counter-narratives, organizational reality is contested by the various discursive voices of theyness. As a result, communicative practices are exchanged in stereotyping, monologic communication between discursive counter-positions at the expense of heteroglossic dialogue. Consequently, these discursive communicative practices enhance estrangement and detachment as their meetings are reduced to stereotyping categories that belong to the abstract, general fractal patterns detached from existential, real life storytelling.

Already in 1936, Walter Benjamin wrote about the coming to the end of the art of storytelling: “It is as if something that seemed inalienable to us, the securest among our possessions, were taken from us: the ability to exchange experiences” (2006: 362). Not only seems the ability of exchanging experience to be lost but also the storytelling community of listeners: “With this the gift for listening is lost and the community of listeners disappears” (2006:367).

Polyphonic Fractal Rupturing Living Story Web

Similarly to the section on fractal control narrative, we begin this section by defining the concept ‘fractal stories’ in relation to polyphonic storytelling organization and management. Then we proceed to apply the concept ‘fractal stories’ on organizational development and change as well as on the coming-into-being-of-the-person.

Fractal Stories

In opposition to control narrative management that tends to reduce and deskill the story listeners to ‘static story consumers’ (Boje August 28 2006: 5), polyphonic management would strive for pre-

serving storytelling communities in the Benjaminian sense of the word. The storytelling community is what we call the organizational living story web. The living story web constitutes the dynamical storytelling arena of multiple voices as new storytellers access and others leave it (Boje 2014b: 13).

In polyphonic storytelling organizations, living stories are exchanged between a storyteller and a listener in spacetime-mattering. Telling stories is: “the ability to exchange experiences” (Benjamin 2006: 1) of life. The very gift of the storyteller, is the: “... ability to relate his life; his distinction, to be able to tell his entire life” (Benjamin 2006: 378) as this life is stretched along between birth and death.

Living stories are ontological life world stories of being-in-the-world (Heidegger 2008) as they are told in the here and now moment of living life and are stories about things, self, others, events and the world (Boje 2014a). Told in the here and now moment implies that the living stories occur at the concrete ontological micro level of actual happenings in spacetime-mattering. As such, they contrast the abstract level of the coherent narrative.

In the Benjaminian storytelling community, the relation between the storyteller and the story listener is one of dialogue as Bakhtin defines the dialogue as an ontological existential of human life: “Life by its very nature is dialogic” (1984: 293). The dialogue is conceived as an inherently responsive interaction. The centrifugal forces of the dialogue thus allow diversity, dissensus, heterogeneity and polyphonic truth to come into play in “the great dialogue” (Bakhtin 1984: 71) which makes the dialogue rich in reference to other voices and their discourses, alternative worldviews, questions, doubts, criticism, counter-arguments, and different interpretations (Bakhtin 1984: 71).

Hence, new ways of doing, practicing, talking, thinking, relating and behaving may emerge as little wow moments of new sociomaterial practices and arrangements. The little wow moments are exceptions that break with the expectations of the fractal pattern and produce differences and changes in the sociomateriality of the organization. They are living story fractal ruptures, preparing the ground for new fractal patterns to emerge. Boje (2015, in press: 38) defines a ‘fractal story’ as a web of fluid ‘living story’ interrelationships between urban-chaos and fractal-cyber-order that is centrifugal, veering away from order, toward anarchism, discontinuity, and the erratic, violent urbanism.”

A fractal living story is thus different from the fractal narrative. Whereas the fractal (counter) narrative is characterized by coherency, order, and consensus, the fractal story is characterized by disorder and dissensus. The fractal story is an unfinalized and unfinished patterning, a living patterning that emerges, scatters, and transforms through the polyphonic dialogue in the living story web. The shift from fractal narrative to fractal story is subsequently a shift from fractal patterns to fractal patterning, from fractal self-similarity to fractal non-self-similarity, from regularity to irregularity. Following Boje (2014c: 9), fractal living stories do not exhibit the regular fractal-self-sameness imputed to grand narrative iterations. At the contrary, fractal living stories can lead to irregular non-self-similar fractal storytelling in random processes.

Rhizomatic Random Organizational Development and Change

The development of fractal story patterns differs from the development of fractal narrative patterns. In order to explain this difference in relation to organizational development and change, we draw once more on the work of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), and shift from the botanic metaphor of the tree to that of the rhizome. The rhizome exhibits how organizing occurs in local, 'non-fractal random processes' (Boje 2014c: 10) through the polyphonic living story web. Hence, we conceive ontological organizational becoming to occur 'in the middle' (illustrated in the figure below) and in the 'here- and nowness' of the ontological micro-situation.



Figure 2: Assemblage Rhizome

(Designed by A.M.C. Strand and produced by N.T.F. Topp.
Material Storytelling Lab. 2014. Aalborg University)

In a rhizome, the development and changes do not form a linear structure from beginning to end, from point to point, from position to position, but it grows between, in the middle, along the lines of becoming (Deleuze, Guattari 1987, Ingold 2011). The rhizome develops thus in a random process.

The rhizome works by variation, expansion, conquest and offshoots; thus, the rhizome is made up by reterritorializing and deterritorializing lines of flight (Deleuze, Guattari 1987). Finding its way, muddling through, coping and escaping obstacles emerging on its way, the lines of flight change and grow in a world of unlimited possibilities.

The fractal control narrative attempts, however, to be monologic, to achieve generality and universality by ignoring, neglecting, silencing, and erasing its living stories (Boje 2011: 3) and to collapse them into one legitimate, institutionalized story. Thereby, the fractal control narrative tries to marginalize sociomaterial events and characters as if they do not matter to the organizing and strategizing processes and outcomes (Boje 2014c: 10). The tensed interplay between the fractal control nar-

rative and the polyphonic fractal living story web is thus a struggle of mattering, of what is included in or excluded from mattering when strategizing and organizing.

Ownness

The richness, novelty and creativity of rhizomatic organizational development and change emerge out of the polyphonic fractal living story web grounded in co-creative polyphonic dialogue. The coming-into-being-of-the-organizational-world cannot be separated from the coming-into-being of the person.

As a result of this entanglement, we need to address the tensed interplay between fractal control (counter) narratives and fractal living story web not only at the organizational level but at the personal level. We refer to the tensed interplay at this level as the struggle of self. As an outcome of the struggle, we may fall into self-forgetfulness by (un)consciously submitting ourselves to the patterns of fractal control narrative.

The emergence of selfhood occurs continuously in the living story that stretches along between birth and death. As such, the living story composes a connectedness of life, a historicizing of both having-been and being futural (Heidegger 2008: 427, 437) towards death. The telling of living stories is an act performed in Being; a once-occurrent event of Being as part of life-in-process-of-becoming (Bakhtin 2010: 12-13). The historicizing process stretched along between birth and death provides some kind of fractal continuity in the emergent self.

Along this temporal stretch, selfhood emerges through the dialogical exchange of performed acts. According to Bakhtin, self and other are thus temporally and relationally constructed in the dialogue as selfhood is a dialogical transformation of "how an individual becomes other than what he was" (1981:115). This process, however, presupposes the investment of self as an active participant in the dialogue: "In this dialogue a person participates wholly and throughout his whole life: with his eyes, lips, hands, soul, spirit, with his whole body and deeds. He invests his entire self in discourse, and this discourse enters into the dialogic fabric of human life, into the world symposium" (Bakhtin 1984: 293). The self of which Bakhtin is speaking is the unique self.

The difference between the unique self and the self-forgetful story-teller and story-listener can be unfolded by drawing on Heidegger's (2008) distinction between the 'authentic self' and the 'they-self'. As a contrast to the absorption into the they-self, the unique, authentic self does not uncritically repeat the usual fractal sociomaterial doings despite its cultural familiarity. In order to avoid becoming depersonalized, the authentic self struggles to actualize own uniqueness. This struggles in an ongoing process of becoming an authentic self that is distinct from the cultural and institutionalized fractal theyness. Self-forgetfulness is thus a challenge to be faced by the fractal change management.

Fractal Transforming Antenarrative

In order to understand the process and practices of managing these tensions and struggles and their consequences to organizational development and change, we shift our focus to the antenarrative dimension of the quantum storytelling field.

The antenarrative targets the interconnection between fractal control narratives and fractal living story web. The antenarrative thus addresses the transformative work with the tensions and struggles. The antenarrative offers a conceptual and methodological framework for analyzing the processes of changing of narratives, stories, selfhood and world in strategizing and organizing. Thereby, the antenarrative framework provides insight into the managing of sociomaterial organizing and strategizing practices; that is, fractal change management.

Originally, Boje defined the ante-narrative in only two ways: the “ante-as-‘before’-narrative” and the “ante-as-‘bet’-predicting [fore-telling]-the-future” (Boje 2012: 253, 258). Due to the quantum turn, the two B model developed into the four B model, as the beneath of fore-conception and the between of fore-structuring were added by Boje as two new antenarrative patterns.

In this paper, we further develop the antenarrative model by adding fore-caring as the dimension of becoming. This dimension addresses a fore-caring, inquiring, and ethical mode of being-in-the-world. The ethical perspective is important to ontological transforming world-making due to its real, consequential effects. Hence, there is a need for an ethical answerability that cares about the different consequential effects of different material discourses in spacetime-mattering. Therefore Barad emphasizes an “ethico-onto-epistem-ology” (2007: 185): “Particular possibilities for acting exist at every moment, and these changing possibilities entail a responsibility to intervene in the world’s becoming, to contest and rework what matters and what is excluded from mattering” (Barad 2003: 827). Hence, we add the becoming antenarrative dimension to encompass an ethical answerability of caring, drawing on Bakhtin’s ‘answerability’ and Heidegger’s ‘caring’.

The five B’s dimensions are interrelated and entangled with one another, and, as such, each dimension is transactive to the others. We need all five antenarrative dimensions in order to study and generate insight into the managing of sociomaterial organizing and strategizing processes as these occur in the tensed interplay between fractal control (counter) narratives and fractal rupturing living stories.




Figure 3: Five B Antenarrative Model

The antenarrative five B's are worked out in relation to Heideggerian being-in-the-world ontology in his 'fore' notions. The five antenarrative practices and processes happen in the pre-reflexive fabric of communicative practices out of which lived story and grander fractal narratives-counter-narratives are constructed. The five B dimensions are shortly presented below and thereafter applied on the case story.

- **Antenarrative-Before**
 The mode of being before narrative coherence (fore-having); "Any assertion requires a fore-having of whatever has been disclosed; and this is what it points out by way of giving something a definite character" (Heidegger, 1962: #157).
- **Antenarrative-Beneath**
 The antenarrative processes are beneath narrative and living story web (fore-conception); "Anything understood which is held in our fore-having and towards which we set our sights 'fore-sightedly', becomes conceptualizable through the interpretation... it is grounded in *something the grasp in advance---*in a *fore-conception*" (Heidegger, 1962: #150).
- **Antenarrative-Bets**
 Bets on the future potentialities that are a multiplicity of paths to choose among (fore-telling); Fore-seeing can be short-sighted (#316) or far-sighted in "the existential meaning of the herme-

neutical/situation of a primordial analytic of Dasein" and once again "the authenticity of potentiality-for-Being-one's-Self" and the "*meaning of the Being of care*" *Care and Selfhood* ... (#316).

- **Antenarrative-Between**

Between narrative and living story (fore-structure); "All interpretation operates in the fore-structure, which we have already characterized" (Heidegger, 1962: #152).

- **Antenarrative-Becoming**

Care (& uncare) in the storytelling field itself (fore-care); the care-structure includes the phenomenon of Selfhood as "*the Ontological Meaning of Care*" (#323).

Fore-Having Organizational Future

The fore-having of antenarrative 'beforeness' is a way of sociomaterially fore-having the future in its-process-of-becoming. Fore-having the future occurs when we enact bets on possible futures through our sociomaterial actions. As our actions are inseparable entangled with materiality, our actions and doings are co-constitutive parts of producing and materializing ontological organizational worlds. The temporality of fore-having is the past. This is indicated by the expressions 'having-been', 'before' and 'already' enhanced by Heidegger (2008: 376).

By birth, we are thrown into a specific world as being-in in being-in-the-world. As being-in we do have a 'being-in-space' of our own. However, this being-in-space cannot be separated from the basis of being-in-the-world in general since being-in-the-world is an essential structure of our existence. Hence, Heidegger speaks of our existential spatiality. By being thrown, we are submitted to a definite, fractal, cultural world of theyness and embodied, habituated everydayness. The incorporation of everydayness and theyness is an incorporation of fractal practices, as "*practice is the routinized activity of the body*" (Nicolini 2012: 4). Embodied practices involve skills, abilities, knowledge, learning, and practical understanding (Schatzki, Knorr-Cetina & von Savigny 2001: 18).

Falling away from ourselves in self-forgetfulness, we are delimited and determined by the fractal patterns and rules of everydayness and theyness. When, the fractal living story rupture, ruin, breakdown, and disturb everyday life, non-meaningfulness and non-relatedness occur and calls for the hermeneutical situation (further explained in fore-caring). In the hermeneutical situation, our fractal narrative understanding of everyday organizational life is questioned

The uncanniness questions the fractal, usual entanglement of meaning and matter, of the social and the material. In our view, the uncanniness manifests in two sociomaterial ways. Either as uncanny little wow moments of exceptions from the fractal habitual expectations. As such, little wow moments are sociomaterial manifestations of new possible ways of entangling matter-meaning, the material and the social, in organizing and strategizing. Or as an uncanny alarming signals of unat-

tractive consequences of already existing fractal patterns that may continue in the future if unchanged.

Through sociomaterializing actions, we can enact the possible attractive futures of the little wow moments, make their arrival more potential and in the end, actualize them in the here and now, paving the way for their arrival. Alternatively, we may also be able to impede less attractive futures from arriving by being sentient and alert to their alarming signals. This may happen as a conscious, deliberate choice and action, but at a pre-reflective and pre-reflexive level, it may also happen as part of our emotional attunement and spontaneous, immediate response towards the different futures of organizational becoming.

Fore-Conception of Organizational Future

The fore-conception of antenarrative beneathness reaches into the subtle, pre-reflective and pre-reflexive antenarrative practices that go beyond the institutionalized languages of the fractal narrative-counter-narratives and instead fosters the emergence of new real life languages and meanings.

Heidegger makes a distinction between conception and fore-conception and between theoretical knowledge and practical knowing. The fractal narrative consists of pre-defined concepts and already interpreted, thematic and scientific knowledge at an aggregated, generalized, and abstract level of the organization. According to Heidegger, however, the most primordial kind of knowing is the one grounded in our actions and not in our cognition. Taking action on possibilities is not rooted in a conscious move where we analyze and take cognizance of the situation (Heidegger 2008: 347); instead actions are already part of the situation as being-in-the-world. Anything understood in fore-having and seen foresightedly becomes conceptualizable through interpretation (Heidegger 2008: 191). Hence, conceptualization of real life meanings occurs in interpretation as a reflected understanding of meanings.

Bakhtin emphasizes how the theoretical language leads to a depersonalized and theoretical, clichéd textbook language use. According to Bakhtin, the formally correct use of language impedes creativity as the creative potential to a great extent depends on the bold and rich language of actual, real life: *“After all, language has a powerful effect on the thought processes of the person who generates it. Creative, original, exploratory thought that is in contact with the richness and complexity of life cannot develop on a substrate consisting of the forms of depersonalized, clichéd, abstract, bookish language.”* (Bakhtin 2004, s. 24).

Relating real life language to the creative exchange of living stories of lifeworlds is supported by Shotter and Katz’ concept of living moments: *“... it is in such living moments between people, in practice, that utterly new possibilities can be created, and people “live out” solutions to their problems they cannot hope to ‘find’ in theory, solely in intellectual reflection on them”* (Shotter & Katz 1999, s. 81).

This performative practice oriented view on language and discourses is reflected in Wittgenstein's work on language games and forms of life according to which meanings of words are woven into the activities of their forms of life: "the meaning of a word is its use in the language" (Wittgenstein 2010 § 43). In our perspective, the language of the fractal control narrative is made up by the instituted rules of the language game as used in discursive forms of life and talk. The language of the fractal rupturing living stories is an emerging real life language as language and meaning develops in the ontological real life micro situation.

As Barad points out, language, discourse, and meaning are performative, agential co-constitutive parts in organizational and strategy world-making.

Fore-Telling Organizational Future

The fore-telling of antenarrative bets relates to the futural and directional mode of being as Being-towards-possibilities (Heidegger 2008: 188, 261-264) and to the mode of being in the moment of vision for 'its time' (Heidegger 2008: 437). Being-open in an inquiring, caring way may disclose a horizon of endless possibilities of the world-in-its-becoming. The horizon of possibilities emerges through the rhizomatic living story web of polyphonic co-creative voices in spacetimemattering. Fore-telling is related to the horizon of possibilities, whereas betting addresses which of the possible futures is more likely or potential to arrive than others; as a potentiality-for-being. In contrast to the horizon of possibilities produced by the fractal rupturing living story web, the fractal control narrative collapses the possible futures into just one future. This is due to the fact that the future of the organization is already predefined by the fractal pattern assumed to reoccur in the future.

Betting on the future may be an outcome of a reflexive, reflective, and hence conscious and cognitive choice but it may also occur as an embodied, sentient, and spontaneous response to novelties in our circumstances and signals of arriving futures at a pre-reflexive and pre-reflective level. Through various state-of-minds, we are already attuned towards the signals of futural possibilities in different ways, as being alert to, turning away from, or being attracted towards them. These signals of possible arriving futures are related to the uncanny little wow moments and alarming signals of unattractive and unexpected consequences. In the moment of vision for its time, new future possibilities emerges as the signals are projected onto the future of the organization.

The sociomaterial enactment of the futural possibilities occurs through the material-discursive practices. Hence, in line with Barad's notion of agential cuts (2013, 2007, 2003), some rhizomatic possibilities are cut off, excluded from mattering, whereas others are included and further cultivated in the sociomaterial enactment. In our terminology, the agential cuts are enacted bets on possibilities

Fore-Structuring Organizational Future

The fore-structure of the antenarrative ‘between’ refers to being ‘between’ birth and death along which living life is stretched. Furthermore, the antenarrative operates as a bridge ‘between’ fractal living story and fractal narrative-counternarrative. In our quantum storytelling view, fore-structuring refers to the organizing of matter-meaning in spacetime-mattering as stretched along between birth and death.

In the fractal narrative structure, the world is already an organized cultural world of institutionalized and materialized meaning structures. Meanings are identified, organized and structured. It is through these processes of organizing meanings in terms of similarities and differences that we develop our worldview and construct relations, cultural boundaries and identities such as: I, me, you, them, and us or paper, pen, ink (Svane 2014). As actants, actors, and events are already defined in relation to each other, the organization is already accomplishing and performing tasks through these pre-defined structures and practices. The fractal narrative structure resembles thus Barad’s *relata* (predefined boundaries and properties of entities) and inter-action (Barad 2007, Barad 2003). The narrative meaningfulness and relatedness is already in place.

In the antenarrative process, structures are, however, viewed as fore-structures. The fore-structures are always open to and subject to changes in their intra-active becoming. Maintaining that all interpretations operate in the fore-structure, Heidegger emphasizes that, by nature, interpretation is always open towards changes. The antenarrative mode is thus a mode of being-open in being-with in the encounter with other beings. In intra-action, matter, meaning, discourse, language, time, and space are participating, agential parts of the intra-active (re)configuring of the world. The possibilities of the world for becoming are remade in each meeting, in each intra-action (Barad 2007: x).

Fore-Caring Inquiry into Organizational Future

The fore-caring of antenarrative becoming refers to the mode of being ‘ahead-of-itself’ grounded in the future (Heidegger 2008: 375) in a fore-caring of what is to become. Fore-caring is related to being anterior in time and space between birth and death. Fore-caring is a caring and concern for the future ahead of ourselves, of others, of relationships, of the world and of destiny. According to Heidegger (2008), caring is an existential of being. Being is caring. This caring dimension offers an ethical perspective on the becoming of the world and beings.

Care and concern implies an existential ontological inquiry into the relationship between being-in in being-in-the-world. Being-in-the-world is a being in a cultural, familiar and known world. That is to say that being-in-the-world is a referential context of significance for understanding and interpreting life experiences and events. If fossilized, this referential context begins to operate as a cultural container that turns the hermeneutical spiral of understanding into what Heidegger calls a ‘*circulus vitiosus*’ (2008: 194). As the legitimate and generally accepted pre-defined understanding, it is ground-

ed in the general everydayness and theyness. Repeated over and over again, it operates as a fractal pattern that turns the hermeneutical spiral into a self-repeating, closed circle.

As a contrast to the closed hermeneutical fractal circle, fore-caring refers to the open hermeneutical spiral. This implies a shift away from conceiving the referential context of significance as a container to view context as something dynamically changing in spacetime-mattering. Consequently, we need to inquire into the relationship between being-in and being-in-the-world. This relationship addresses the entanglement between the coming-into-being-of-the-person and the coming-into-being-of-world in spacetime-mattering.

Hence, fore-caring of future is a mode of being-in in being-in-the-world in an inquiring, sentient and caring way. This inquiry occurs in the hermeneutical situation and is initiated by the uncanniness arising from the little wow moments and the warning signals. Hence, the disturbing, uncanny events make us inquire and search for a new meaning of what is becoming, the narrative and all of its explanations and fractal patterns of relatedness being thrown into question.

Inquiring into and caring about the relation between being-in and being-in-the-world enables an open and disclosing hermeneutical spiral that may lead to the emerging of the authentic self as distinguished from the cultural fractal theyself. This is referred to as the spiral of selfhood authenticity (Anton 2001). This inquiry may enable the disclosing and transcending spiral of understanding and interpretation.

One of the most authentic modes of caring is in anticipatory resoluteness. Anticipation is a form of being-towards; of looking forward to a possible way to be. Resoluteness is related to authentically taking ownership of own life in one of the possible (rhizomatic) ways that occurs in the world of events. Resoluteness is “taking action” (Heidegger 2008: 358). Taking ownership of one’s life relates to the authentic self (self which take hold in its own way) as distinguished from the they-self (the absorption of self into theyness) (Heidegger 2008: 167). An authentic self does not uncritically repeat the usual doings despite its cultural familiarity but exhibits ethical answerability towards alarming signals and little wow moments as these emerges in the futural becoming of the world and beings. (Svane 2014)

Ethical answerability is based upon Bakhtin according to whom the speaker can expect answerability: “the speaker does not expect passive understanding that, so to speak, only duplicates his or her own idea in someone else’s mind [...]. Rather, the speaker talks with an expectation of a response, agreement, sympathy, objection, execution, and so forth...” (Bakhtin 1986: 69). In this active response, one is answerable for both the intent of the actor and for the actual content of the act committed according to Bakhtin (2010). As Henderson and Boje (in press) point out, the answerability of intentions should be extended to include the ownership of unintended consequences in the context of chaotic and turbulent environments. As such, the two-sided ethics of Bakhtin is expanded to become three-sided.

Caring is furthermore related to moods and attunement as moods and attunement matters to the way we engage our being-in in being-in-the-world. All our moods manifest in how we are and how we are faring and may even make us turn away (Heidegger 2008: 173), thereby not taking ownership of our lives. We are in the world by moods prior to cognition, and we are attending to the world from this inner state-of-mind. We find “events happening to us and within us – as a movement of feeling that comes [...] – that we ourselves have not initiated” (Shotter 2011: 4). Thus, the internal processes of our body entangle with the processes of the material world in an inseparable structure of interactions. The movement of feelings arises as part of what Shotter expresses as “our outgoing exploratory activities and their incoming results” (2011: 10). (Svane 2014).

Attunement and moods matter to how we act to make potential futures manifest whether we are alarmed by them, turning away from them, or attracted to them. Understanding the movement of feelings as part of our primordial material engagement with the world relates to Heidegger’s Being-attuned (Heidegger 2008: 172) and is essential to understanding our relationship with being-in-the-world. As Heidegger states: “...Dasein can, should, and must, through knowledge and will, become master of its moods” (2008: 175). By being more aware of and managing the moods of our feelings, we may attune in new ways towards choices and actions and become more open and authentic selves in our approach to the manifold of future pathways (Svane 2014).

Caring, authenticity in anticipatory resoluteness, and attunement are all embodied, emotional practices in the engagement with the world. As such, the body is foregrounded in the quantum antenarrative practices of caring.

Theoretical Implications of Fractal Change Management

The theoretical work on the interplay between the fractal control narrative and the fractal rupturing living stories has given rise to theoretical reflections of fractal change management. These reflections are summarized in this section of the paper. The below figure is a way of illustrating the conceptual framework encompassing these reflections.




Figure 4: Fractal Management

Source: Developed by Svane & Boje 2015.

The model illustrates the antenarrative interconnection between fractal control narrative and fractal rupturing living stories. Fractal change management stretches out between these two poles of the quantum storytelling field.

Fractal change management implies zooming out at the fractal narrative patterns occurring at the institutionalized abstract, macro level where fractal expectations control thinking, feeling, relating and behaving, produces the familiar everydayness, and result in the absorption of the theyness. If not challenged, the institutionalization fossilizes the sociomaterial structures and practices and produces a rigidity that harms its creative responsiveness to novelty emerging in the interior and exterior of the organization.

The fractal patterns of self-sameness occur across different scalabilities ranging from the micro to the macro level. Whereas the fractal control narrative scales only a few events and characters, living story webs encompass the particularities of the local storytelling-eventness. Subsequently, the scaling of eventness is different in the institutionalized, grand narratives and living story web. The living story web is about sociomaterial relationality, localities, and dynamics in the ongoing (re)organizing of the organization. It encompasses the rich complexities and flows of lived socio-

material events. The control narrative instead becomes grander and more general as simplicity and coherency increase. (Boje 2014c: 10)

Furthermore the fractal patterns are ranging from the local to the global including the six surrounding institutional dimensions of the political/ideological, economic/market, social/cultural, technological/knowledge, natural/physical, and legal/judicial. The various institutional dimensions are sources of multi-fractal and multi-discursive patterns that maintain or contest each other in branching clusters of fractal (counter) narratives. Thus fractal change management is highly complex.

Fractal change management also implies zooming in at the ontological micro-situations occurring in the rhizomatic living story web. In these situations, exceptions, ruptures, and breakdowns of the institutionalized and legitimized everydayness and theyness emerge and disrupt the sense of familiarity, meaningfulness and relatedness. The uncanniness manifests in embodied, materialized and felt little wow moments of new ways of organizing and practicing the social and the material (meaning and matter) sending the organization down a new path. The uncanniness may also manifest as alarming signals of unexpected consequences of the existing sociomaterial structures and practices.

Not only does fractal change management look into the spatial scalability of sociomaterial sense-shaping, but also into the temporality of past, present, and future. The fractal narrative is conceived to reproduce the self-similar patterns in a temporal movement from past to present to future. In this retrospective reproduction, the little wow moments of ruptures tend to be silenced, ignored or remain unnoticed. This temporal pathway of retrospective, reproductive sensemaking is the linear and cyclic antenarratives that reproduce the past by predicting its reoccurrence in the future. Unlike this, the rhizomatic and spiral antenarratives take a different temporal pathway as they move from the future to the present to the past. This temporal pathway is the antenarrative, prospective sense-shaping of the future in an open-ended process of becoming.

In this open-ended process of becoming, fractal change management relate to the pre-reflexive level of embodied, emotional, and sentient beings alert to and responding at the vague signs of little wow moments indicating changes, novelty, and new directions. Hence, antenarrative fractal change management manages the entangled processes of spatializing across scales, temporizing, and mattering (the sociomateriality; the entangled processes of meaning and matter) in the quantum storytelling field. Antenarrative managing is managing spacetime mattering in the ontological situation.

Fractal change management is about becoming aware of the tensed interplay between these two levels. It is about preventing fractal control narratives to overshadow the little wow moments and the alarming signals and about keeping the organizational movement open and spiraling in its ongoing process of becoming. Simultaneously, fractal change management is also about organizing and strategizing the manifold of future pathways unfolding and emerging in the rhizomatic living story web.

Uncanniness is a central key to achieve this awareness as uncanniness initiate the fore-caring inquiry into the hermeneutical spiral. Another central key is the feelings and moods that arise from

our embodied, practical engagement and from being sentient being. These feelings and moods are signals of how we are faring as being-in in being-in-the-world. Drawing on Heidegger, fractal change management is about mastering moods, feelings and attunement. We don't conceive of this in an instrumental way but in a hermeneutical and inquiring way.

Fractal change management thus operates at the more primordial level of pre-reflection and pre-reflexivity. As embodied, sentient, authentic, and dialogical inquiring beings, we become alert and respond to the vague signs of changes, novelty, directions. We become aware of the little wow moments as they are disclosed to us through the inquiry transcending the fractal habituated narrative veil. Similarly, we become aware of the warning signals of unattractive futures that are approaching or already have arrived, since the fractal narratives reproduce themselves in future reoccurrence.

In short, antenarrative fractal change management manages the entangled processes of spatializing across scales, temporizing, and mattering (the sociomateriality; the entangled processes of meaning and matter) in the quantum storytelling field (Svane, Boje 2015). Antenarrative managing is managing spacetime mattering in the ontological micro situation.

From a quantum storytelling organizational perspective, antenarrative fractal change management inscribe into the quantum storytelling universe of the Tamara storytelling organization (Boje 1995, Boje et al. in press). "*Tamara organizing* is defined as the plurality of simultaneous, performative story spaces and the networking of co-producers in complex organizations" (Boje 2005: 2, Boje 1995). The Tamara metaphor addresses the relationship between the pluralities of storytelling voices. Drawing on Bakhtin, the relationship can vary from the domination of centripetal monologic discourses, marginalized voices and excluded stories to the centrifugal, heteroglossic dialogue between equal voices and included stories.

The Quantum Tamara organization is a fragmented, multivoiced and multispaced storytelling organization of story-disorder and struggling stories in spacetime mattering. Tamara organizational storytelling is an open, unfinalized, and unending process without beginning, middle, and end. However, the Tamara organization constitutes an arena of power practices where stories struggle to influence and control mattering (the entangling and organizing of the social and the material). Retrospectively looking backward and prospectively looking forward, past and future as well as spaces are restoried in spacetime mattering.

Final Remarks

Based upon the theoretical work, we suggest that the quantum storytelling field offers a promising framework for analyzing and understanding contemporary management in its tensed and paradoxical interplay between the fractal control narrative of managerialism and the polyphonic co-creative living stories rupturing the fractal patterns. The antenarrative is a process of organizing and strategizing in this interconnecting line. Hence, antenarrative management is conceived of as an ongoing process of managing the tensions.

The tensed interplay is a balance between the domination of the fractal patterns of the narrative and the fractal ruptures caused by little wow moments and alarming signals emerging in the living story web. By being embodied, sentient, inquiring, and responsive, we may become aware of the moods and feelings entangled with the little wow moments and alarming signals. Through fore-caring inquiry, we may transcend the habituated narrative veil of everydayness and theyness incorporated into our way of thinking, feeling, relating, and behaving through the work of the fractal control narrative.

The hermeneutical fore-caring inquiry of antenarrative management concerns the coming-into-being of the person / manager and the world as simultaneous spiralling processes in spacetime-mattering. Antenarrative fractal change management is not a discipline exercised by the manager at the distance of the world. At the contrary, fractal change management is a process of changing fractals in the relationship between being-in and being-in-the-world; that is to say, of transcending the everydayness and the theyness in order to enter into the process of selfhood authenticity and ethical answerability. The fractal change manager is part and parcel of this fractal change process emerging from within the phenomenon.

In our perspective, antenarrative managing is to facilitate and practice a fore-caring inquiry into the moods and feelings prevalent in the organization as these indicate how the organizational members are faring in the process of becoming. Antenarrative managing is about mastering these moods and feelings. Mastering the moods and feelings is related to the fore-telling of how we are attuned towards the future possibilities that emerge in the rhizomatic living story web as regard their potential attractiveness. In fore-structuring, they are organized into which possibilities come to matter and which are excluded from mattering, as well as language practices are developed in order to articulate the new organizing of meanings. By taking actions upon the little wow moments and alarming signals, antenarrative managing aims at preventing less attractive futures from happening and at paving the way for more attractive futures as a way of fore-having of future.

Antenarrative fractal change management is thus about managing the organizing and strategizing process through the five B antenarrative model. The Tamara land storytelling organization adds to the perspective that spacetime-mattering is entangled with power as regard what is included in and excluded from mattering through material-discursive practices.

In short, antenarrative fractal change management operates at the primordial level of pre-reflection and pre-reflexivity in spacetime-mattering

As regard future research, the conceptualization of this framework calls for empirical studies and practical as well as theoretical implications to managing as regard the linkages between narrative and human agency in the creation and spreading of fractal narrative patterns, and the use of power.

Bibliography

- Anton, C. 2001, *Selfhood and authenticity*, State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Bakhtin, M. 1990, *Art and answerability: Early philosophical essays*, University of Texas Press, Austin, Texas.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1981, *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 2010, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1984, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 2004, "Dialogic Origin and Dialogic Pedagogy of Grammar", *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, vol. 42, no. 6, pp. 12-49.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1986, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Third paperback printing, 1990 edn, University of Texas, Austin, USA.
- Barad, K. 2013, "Cutting Together-Apart1", *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies*, vol. 3, pp. 16.
- Barad, K. 2007, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Duke University Press.
- Barad, K. 2003, "Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter", *Signs*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 801-831.
- Benjamin, W. 2006, "The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov" in *The Novel: An Anthology of Criticism and Theory 1900-2000*, ed. D.J. Hale, Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishing, New York, pp. 361-378.
- Boje, D. 2014a, *Storytelling Organizational Practices. Managing in the Quantum Age*, Routledge, New York.
- Boje, D. 2014b, , *What is living story?*. Available: <http://peaceaware.com/Boje/> [2014, 4/4/2014].
- Boje, D.M. August 28 2006, *655 Day One*.
- Boje, D.M. 2012, "Reflections: What does quantum physics of storytelling mean for change management?", *Journal of Change Management*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 253-271.
- Boje, D.M. 2011, "Introduction to agential antenarratives that shape the future of organizations", *Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antennarrative Handbook*. New York: Routledge, , pp. 1-19.
- Boje, D.M. 2008, *Storytelling organizations*, Sage.
- Boje, D.M. 2005, "Storytelling in management research", *Sage Dictionary*, .

- Boje, D.M. 1995, "Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as "Tamara-Land"", *Academy of Management journal*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 997-1035.
- Boje, D.M. 2015, in press, *Change Solutions to the Chaos of Standards and norms Overwhelming Organizations: Four Wings of Tetranormalizing*. Routledge, London/NY.
- Boje, D.M. 2014c, , *What is Fractal Change Management - Wakekfield and Boje*. Available: <http://peaceaware.com/fractal/> [2015, 4/3/2015].
- Boje, D.M. 2007, "Storytelling" in *International encyclopedia of organization studies*, eds. S. Clegg & J.R. Bailey, Vol 4 edn, Sage Publications, , pp. 1454-1458.
- Boje, D.M., Svane, M., Henderson, T.L. & Strevel, H.B. in press, "Critical Corporate Social Responsibility in Tamara-Land: The Role of Tetranormalizing Fractals" in , ed. R. Ocler,.
- Boje, D.M. & Henderson, T.L. (eds) 2014, *Being Quantum: Ontological Storytelling in the Age of Antenarrative*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Carlile, P.R. & Langley, A. 2013, *How Matter Matters: Objects, Artifacts, and Materiality in Organization Studies*, Oxford University Press.
- Chia, R.C. & Holt, R. 2009, *Strategy without design: The silent efficacy of indirect action*, Cambridge University Press.
- Crevani, L., Lindgren, M. & Packendorff, J. 2010, "Leadership, not leaders: On the study of leadership as practices and interactions", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 77-86.
- Cunliffe, A.L. 2009, *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book About Management*. SAGE Publications, London, UK.
- Cunliffe, A.L. 2001, "Managers as Practical Authors: Reconstructing our Understanding of Management Practice", *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 351-371.
- Cunliffe, A.L. & Eriksen, M. 2011, "Relational leadership", *Human Relations*, vol. 64, no. 11, pp. 1425-1449.
- Deetz, S. 2003, "Disciplinary power, conflict suppression and human resource management", *Studying management critically*, , pp. 23-45.
- Deetz, S. 1995, "Character, corporate responsibility and the dialogic in the postmodern context: A commentary on Mangham", *Organization*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 217-225.
- Deetz, S. 1992, *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*, SUNY Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. 1987, "A thousand plateaus", *Capitalism and schizophrenia*, vol. 11.
- Denis, J., Langley, A. & Sergi, V. 2012, "Leadership in the plural", *The Academy of Management Annals*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 211-283.

- Duarte, G.A. 2014, *Fractal Narrative: About the Relationship Between Geometries and Technology and Its Impact on Narrative Spaces*, transcript Verlag.
- Foucault, M. 1988, *The history of sexuality. Vol 1. An introduction*. Vintage Books, a division of Random House, New York.
- Gergen, K.J. 1995, "Relational theory and the discourses of power" in *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism*, eds. D.M. Hosking, H.P. Dachler & K. and Gergen, Aldershot: Avebury, , pp. 29-51.
- Hammersley, M. 2001, "Some questions about evidence-based practice in education", *Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Leeds, England*.
- Heidegger, M. 2008, *Being and time*, HarperCollins, New York.
- Heidegger, M. 1975, *Poetry, Language, Thought*, First Harper Colophon edition edn, Harper & Row, New York.
- Henderson, T.L. & Boje, D.M. in press, *Managing Fractal Organizing Processes*, Routledge, NY/London.
- Ingold, T. 2012, "Toward an Ecology of Materials", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 41, pp. 427-442.
- Ingold, T. 2011, *Being alive: Essays on movement, knowledge and description*, Taylor & Francis.
- Ingold, T. 2007, "Materials against materiality", *Archaeological dialogues*, vol. 14, no. 01, pp. 1-16.
- Ingold, T. 2000, *The perception of the environment: essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*, Psychology Press.
- Jarzabkowski, P. & Pinch, T. 2013, "Sociomateriality is 'the New Black': accomplishing repurposing, reinscripting and repairing in context", *M@ n@ gement*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 579-592.
- Mandelbrot, B.B. 1977, *Fractals: form, chance, and dimension*, Freeman, New York.
- Nayak, A. & Chia, R. 2011, "Thinking becoming and emergence: process philosophy and organization studies", *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, vol. 32, pp. 281-309.
- Nelson, H.L. & Lindemann, H. 2001, *Damaged identities, narrative repair*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Nicolini, D. 2012, *Practice theory, work, and organization: An introduction*, Oxford University Press.
- Rennison, B.W. 2014a, "Performativt lederskab i en diskursiv (u)orden - når sprog skaber subjekt og subjekt sprog", *Erhvervspsykologi*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 8-21.
- Rennison, B.W. 2014b, "Polyfont lederskab - fra monofoniens kontrol til polyfoniens coping" in *Sprækker for fornyelse. Nye perspektiver på offentlig styring og ledelse*, ed. K. Majgaard, Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag, Copenhagen, Denmark, pp. 145-170.

- Rennison, B.W. 2007, "Historical discourses of public management in Denmark Past emergence and present challenge", *Management & Organizational History*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 5-26.
- Schatzki, T.R., Knorr-Cetina, K. & von Savigny, E. 2001, *The practice turn in contemporary theory*, Psychology Press.
- Shotter, J. 2011, , *Reflections on sociomateriality and dialogicality in organization studies: from "inter-" to "intra-thinking" in performing practices*. Available: <http://www.johnshotter.com/mypapers/Intra-thinking.pdf> [2014, April].
- Shotter, J. 2008, *Conversational realities revisited*, London: Sage Publications.
- Shotter, J. & Cunliffe, A.L. 2002, "Managers as practical autho", *Management and language: The manager as a practical author*, , pp. 15.
- Strand, A.M.C. 2012, *Enacting the between. On dis/continuous intra-active becoming of/through an apparatus of material storytelling*, The Faculty of Humanities, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.
- Svane, M. 2014, "Quantum Organizational World-Making - Through Material Embodied Storytelling Practices", *Quantum Storytelling Conference*.
- Svane, M. & Boje, D. 2015, "Tamara Land Fractal Change Management - In Between Managerialist Narrative and Polyphonic Living Stories", *Sc'Moi, Standing Conference for Management and Organizational Inquiry*.
- Taguchi, H.L. 2009, *Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early childhood education: Introducing an intra-active pedagogy*, Routledge.
- Tsoukas, H. & Chia, R. 2002, "On Organizational Becoming: Rethinking Organizational Change", *Organization Science*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 567-582.
- Wittgenstein, L. 2010, *Philosophical investigations*, John Wiley & Sons.