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ABSTRACT

This chapter highlights the manner by which matter came to matter in an organizational restorying process. It reports on the important findings of an action-research project using and developing an organizational-rewriting apparatus coined as Material Storytelling (Strand, 2010). Within the contemporary management literature, the low-practical aspects of organizational life, development, and change are commonly disregarded as unimportant. In return, this chapter highlights how matter matters as part of the field of possibility for action. More specifically, this chapter is the story about how I, together with 10 participants at a Danish care institution, the ‘Youth-home’ at the Deaf-blindness Centre in Aalborg (DBC hereafter), came to acknowledge the importance of the arrangement of our physical surroundings in our workplaces in regard to the practices that are actually being conducted (and not). These surroundings do not so much (passively) mirror what is important and not important. Rather, they co-constitute, on a daily basis, which material-discursive practices (and voices) are allowed to matter, and which, in effect, are excluded from mattering through the congealed agency of these materialized physical surroundings. It became evident that if you want to rid the everyday work-practices from certain habitual patterns of behavior – and, in effect, change these priorities or hegemonies – you must be willing to change some vital physical and material conditions of the workplace. However, the rebuild in itself was not the solution. Rather, it was an important aspect of reworking the complex relationality of people, practices, and surroundings and in accomplishing a more balanced relationship between the discursive and the material in reworking the organization. The chapter proposes, through concrete examples, an Apparatus of Material Storytelling as the methodology through which imbalances can be resituated; a manner of ‘enacting the between’ that suggests a different take on the relationality of power, discourse, and materiality, which includes a discussion about respons(dis)ability just as much as responsibility, due to silenced, excluded, or impaired voices.
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“Language matters. Discourse matters. Culture matters. There is an important sense in which the only thing that does not seem to matter anymore is matter” (Barad, 2007, p. 132).

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter highlights the manner by which matter matters in organizational restorying processes. In doing so, the chapter proposes Material Storytelling as an apparatus for intra-active organizational development, change, and inquiry. It emphasizes that organizational changes are accomplished through a changed relationality of people, practices, and surroundings (including structural layout and artifacts). This sheds a different light on the dynamic relationality of power, discourse, and materiality. The chapter thereby builds on the theoretical account of the Apparatus of Material Storytelling laid out in the previous chapter (Jørgensen & Strand, 2014) and builds evidentiary support for the (Baradian) elaboration of the ‘dispositif’ and ‘artisan storytelling’ from Chapter 2 (Jørgensen & Klee, 2014). Furthermore, it supplements Chapter 10 (Thomassen, Jørgensen & Klee, 2014) in highlighting the benefits and implications of using Material Storytelling practices as a motor of organisational development processes.

Following Barad’s (2007) posthuman take on matter and Boje’s (2008) take on story as living story, organizations are seen as dis/continuous becomings of intra-actions of complex living stories that include ‘stories of spaces’, ‘stories of artifacts’, and ‘stories of bodies’ that, as a common trait, are performative, multimodal ‘showing in action’ rather than ‘telling (merely) in words’. The chapter re-enacts experiences from using (and developing) an Apparatus of Material Storytelling for generating organizational change in an action research project among the staff at a public Danish Care institution in a six months period across 2008-2009 (Strand, 2010 & 2012).

Understanding that process as an organizational storytelling process of a complex nature, it shows how the staff’s story performances are reconfigured – through workshop-based supervisions enacted through material storytelling modalities – side by side with the situated, materialised practices of their work being reconfigured literally through a complete re-built of the organizational material surround. The chapter argues that a rebuild in itself is not enough. It is the reworking of the complex relationality of people, practices, and surroundings (including structural layout and artifacts) that enables change.

Both in the daily practices and in the literature, the enacted relationality favors discourse over matter, culture over nature, talking over bodily actions, and explicit (reflected) forms of knowing over implicit, tacit (and affective) forms of knowing (e.g., Shotter, 2009 and Staunæs, Juelskjær & Rathner, 2013). The chapter proposes, through concrete examples, the Apparatus of Material Storytelling – with associated three material story modes – as the methodology through which these imbalances can be resituated; a manner of ‘enacting the between’ that suggests a different take on the dynamic relationality of power, discourse, and
materiality, which includes a discussion about respons(dis)ability and not only responsibility, due to silenced, excluded, or impaired voices.

The chapter aims to resituate language and matter in organisational storytelling by making explicit the constitutive entanglement (Barad, 2007) of the relationality of people, practices, and surroundings at DBC1. The chapter is organized in a complex manner entailing different layers of text where concepts, quotes, short-stories, photos, transcripts from video-recordings, various models, and so forth, are enacted through three different ‘scenarios’ that function as techno-scientific, productive machines (e.g., Juelskjær, 2009, Strand, 2012 & 2014a and b) for accommodating ‘other ways of knowing’ (e.g., Heron & Reason, 2006) in the (intra-)act of reading the chapter.

The first scenario introduces and defines the concrete Material Storytelling apparatus and its associated three story modes. This includes analyses of short stories and delineates how they can and have been enacted in organizational development and change processes as so-called Material Story Labs. It takes up the key concept of ‘apparatus’ from Chapter 4.

The second scenario inquires into the vital subterranean subtleties of the intra-active processes that are generated through such material storytelling practices. This includes a discussion of notions such as ‘touching-responsiveness’ as well as founding differences of Agential Realism comprised as two paradigmatic moves one needs to make in order to follow the intra-active approach. Extracts of transcripts are analyzed to exemplify the general points.

The third scenario draws out some of the implications for working with organizational development and change in this radical manner. Two implications are highlighted: The first is ‘getting your hands dirty’, and is depicted through examples from the rebuild of the main room at DBC. The second is one of an impaired ability; a respons(dis)ability needs to be considered as part of the call for an ethics of responsibility or an ethics of mattering.

**SCENARIO 1: INTRODUCING MATERIAL STORYTELLING**

*What Are Material Storytelling Practices?*

The performative move of my PhD study (Strand, 2012 Book 1 & 2) was the coining and posing of the notion of ‘Material Storytelling’ as a research based methodology for enacting organizational change. One implication of practicing Material Storytelling proved to be a changed relationality of commonly enacted hegemonies among modalities: mind-body, language-materiality, culture-nature, and explicit-implicit forms of knowing, and so forth. In line with these findings, Material Storytelling practices are defined as follows.

**Working Definition**

Material Storytelling practices are material-discursive reconfigurations of congealed hegemonic story performances. A reconfiguration that is folded through an intra-act of a

---

1 Now CHD; Centre for Deaf-blindness and Hearing-Impairedness.
multimodal complex of a ‘between’ of co-constituted, co-constituents; an Apparatus of Material Storytelling.

Material Storytelling practices involve a variety of story performances of temporal, spatial, and meaning-matter reconfigurative modalities. There are three different intra-playing modes of Material Storytelling: (1) the physical, spatial, material surrounds of the organization in question (also framed as ‘spatial discourse’ and ‘stories of space’); (2) the physical, multimodal presence of the human participants in question (also framed as ‘mattering bodies’ and ‘stories of bodies’); and (3) various material objects, such as small figures placed in a sandbox, large posters with models, self-made clay objects, and so forth (also framed as ‘mattering bodies’ and ‘stories of artifacts’).

This threefold notion is linked to three specific inspirational sources for developing the three story modes of Material Storytelling in the action research project conducted by me at DBC. Here I performed the role of supervisor in a series of workshop-based supervision sessions for a six months period in 2008-2009. Those inspirational sources were the Feng-shui method of Taoism, the body-based pedagogy of Bodynamic, and the Sandplay method.

**Material Story Lab**

Material Storytelling practices comprise complex entanglements of stories of spaces, stories of bodies, and stories of artifacts. All in all, the three material story modes are understood as flexible and multilayered memory-devices, and thus as multimodal storytelling apparatuses.

The following model comprises the three material story modes of enacting the between, which in turn comprises the concept of a Material Story Lab:\(^2\):

Figure 5.1. Model of the three material story modes.

\(^2\) Material Story Lab is physically build and located at Aalborg University Nordkraft. Room 10.16, 10.17 & 10.18 and New Mexico State University (NMSU) is currently in the process of building one inspired by Strand, 2012. Also two Danish consultancy companies (Act2Learn in Aalborg and Old Friends Industries in Copenhagen) are using Material Story Lab as part of their palette of tools for organizational development, leadership development. For further info see www.materialstorylab.hum.aau.dk.
The three material story modes are understood as intra-playing constituent modalities of meaning-matter entanglements. The notion of entanglement follows Barad (2007) in implying that the three material story modes are only distinct in a relational sense as “agencies are only distinct in relation to their mutual entanglement; they don’t exist as individual elements”, (Barad, 2007: 33).

You could argue that it is strange to name the above constitutive agencies as ‘stories of x’ as it implies them having an independent existence, and story-outcomes, which is not the case according to Barad. They are all intra-active material-discursive practices (see Jørgensen & Strand, 2014). However, the three material story modes are reconfiguring agencies that produce a specific foci and motor for intra-play in the workshop setting of the Material Story Lab.

At one level, they are all active as an unavoidable aspect of every action. At another level, one of them is foregrounded as the focus of attention in having been chosen as the mode of enactment (of the between) of the particular event; as the specific (affective) site of engagement (see the section called Scenario 2 below).

The workshop setting of the Material Story Lab could be (and was always) configured as three rooms-in-the-room, that literally/physically render room for the material-discursive practices of each of the three story modes. The model below explicates the orchestrated workshop setting of the workshop-based supervisions of the action research project at DBC.

Figure 5.2. The enacted structural layout of the workshop-setting as three rooms-in-the-room.

Barad in turn draws on quantum entanglement, which was first coined as part of ‘Bell’s theorem’ also named as ‘the entanglement theory’. 
Area A is/was used for opening and closing the intra-active supervision. Typically, the problematic to be dealt with here emerges during the first twenty minutes of talk. Area B structurally laid out the material-discursive field of possibility for enacting ‘stories of bodies’ as a mode of enactment of story performances. Area C structurally laid out the material-discursive field of possibility for specifically enacting the ‘stories of artifacts’ method called ‘Object theatre’. These fields of possibilities are understood as apparatuses through which material storytelling practices are enacted. The term ‘apparatus’ is therefore central and will be explained next.

Localized Practices as Enactments of Knowing, Being and Becoming

Things, actions, or living beings are, according to Barad, a doing, a performative enactment of in/exclusions (Shotter, 2011) and are thus always-already a material-discursive practice. A chair, for instance, is never a physical thing alone (Strand, 2014a). It is the congealing of the action of sitting. It is even the congealing of the agency of ‘inviting’ or ‘collecting’ (Haraway, 2008) the material-discursive practice of sitting to be enacted. The action of holding a meeting is not just the gathering of people in a furnished room with an agenda to follow. It is the performative re-enactment of a material-discursive practice that is part of the ongoing becoming of the world(s) organization(s) and materialization where in/exclusions matters. Who were invited? Which topics were excluded from the agenda? And so forth.

Furthermore, any such material-discursive practice is formative of and formed through multiple scales of space, time, and matter as these modalities are active constituents that are themselves constituted through the moment of action. They are both configurative for and configured as this particular space (and not some other), as this particular time (and not some “other”), and as this particular meaning-matter (and not some “other”).

In short, localized material-discursive practices are agential realizations of in/exclusions that matter for other practices, times, spaces, and meaning-matters that could have been. Barad’s agential realism thereby encapsulates both the performative enactment of congealed agencies through which the world differentially becomes enfolded and the process of the congealing of these agencies through the performative enactment of in/exclusions. Knowing, being, and becoming, knowledge-making, meaning-making, and world-making are, in that respect, three sides of the same process.

---

4 A method inspired heavily by the therapeutic method of Sandplay in which I have taken yearlong-study training. Sandplay includes a sandbox approximately 60x80x12 cm with 7-8 cm of finely grained sand, as well as eight categories of artifacts; nature (plants, rock, etc.), human beings (various nationalities and ages), animals, miscellaneous (also broken stuff), means of transportation, buildings, religious figures (of all kinds) and transition figures (butterflies, etc.). Object theatre uses these basic elements, however Object theatre differs from Sandplay in being focused on the meaning-making and world-making of the here-now work or project-related practices. The completed sandbox configuration is coined as a ‘terrain-board’. Object theatre is currently used as a mode of design, and learning-processes at Aalborg University, Institute of Communication & Psychology (See Poulsen & Strand, 2014), as well as on the Master of Public Governance and Master of Organizational Learning at Institute of Learning & Philosophy, Aalborg University.
Apparatus as Configurative Enactments of Spacetime-matter Manifolds

The concept of ‘apparatus’ (see also Jørgensen & Strand, 2014, this volume) is central for a Baradian inspired take when it comes to grasping (analytically, conceptually) the becoming of these ongoing processes of knowledge-practices, meaning-making practices, or world-making practices. The concept of ‘apparatus’ affords the necessary complexity of the range of in/excluded constituent modalities across the space-time-matter manifold through which any material-discursive practice becomes and takes part in the becoming of other such practices.

Apparatuses are themselves to be regarded as material-discursive practices, doings, and enactments of in/exclusions, and they are formative of meaning and matter as the phenomena of the world are enacted through them. They are productive of and part of the phenomena they produce, and they are continuously reconstituted as part of the ongoing intra-activity of the world’s materialization. Following Quantum physicist Niels Bohr, Barad (2007, p. 333) describes this as “the larger phenomenon” where the apparatus depicts the formative, productive part of the phenomenon’s constitution. When employed, the phenomenon and the apparatus therefore always go hand-in-hand – we can never have one without the other (Soerensen & Strand, 2014). In addition, when a space-time-matter co-constituent of the phenomenon changes, the apparatus changes and vice versa.

As such, apparatuses are considered to be material configurations that reconfigure spatiality and temporality as well as mattering (Barad, 2007, p. 146). Therefore, Material Storytelling apparatuses have the possibility of resituating hegemonies. In Barad’s words apparatuses “enact a local cut that produces “objects” of particular knowledge practices” (Barad, 2007, p. 147). These ‘objects’ are onto-semantic constructs, which, according to Barad (who follows Bohr), are the smallest unit of reference we can ever address (Barad, 2007, p. 333).

Barad is inspired by her colleague Donna Haraway in using (re)configuration instead of construction to emphasize the entangled figuration of phenomena as material-discursive practices of space-time-matter manifolds. She thereby pays tribute to the double sense of the word matter; meaning and materiality; a tribute articulated also in the title of her book Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Meaning and Matter.

Donna Haraway (2008, p. 4) notes that “figures collect the people through their invitation to inhabit the corporeal story told in their lineaments”. Just above this quote, she notes how she as a little girl she loved to inhabit the miniature worlds and how she loved the play of scales of time and space that toys and stories made patent for her (see also Jørgensen & Strand, 2014, in this volume).

The apparatuses of the material-discursive practices of the three material story modes work as such material-discursive apparatuses for enacting the between field of possibility, whether it is the use of the sandbox, small figures, and so forth, as figurative modes of enactment of the between (stories of artifacts), the structural and artifactual figuration of rooms (stories of spaces), or the enactments of human body figurations through body-based-pedagogy exercises (stories of bodies). Any of these enacted phenomena are story configurations of a complex organizational reworking Apparatus of Material Storytelling that includes the case organization as part of the between.

The three material storytelling modes of performances are particular meaning-making, world-making practices configured through and co-configuring for the complex material-
discursive apparatuses that make up the case-organization in the here-and-now moment of enactment. Such an apparatus ‘collects’ and ‘invites’ the enactment of particular stories to be performatively enacted and, as such, contains a field of possibility for performances.

Haraway further holds (2008, p. 4) that figures are at the same time creatures of imagined possibility and of fierce and ordinary reality (see also Jørgensen & Strand, 2014, in this volume). In other words, the material-discursive configuration of phenomena are brought about through the double sense of imagined possibilities (the ‘there then’) and of ordinary reality (the ‘here now’). The particular material-discursive configurations are material-semiotic nodes or knots of intra-active co-shaping of bodies, materiality, and meaning or, stated otherwise, the constitutive entanglement of people, practices, and surroundings.

The material storytelling apparatus is, therefore, not a representation or an illustration of something else. Nor is it only a support, referent, or source of sustainability of a particular discourse (e.g., Barad, 2007, p. 151). Nor are the configurations that are enacted through the apparatus merely (passively) mirrors of what is important and what is not important (the hierarchy of priorities). Rather, the apparatus co-constitute, on a daily basis, the probabilities of which material-discursive practices (phenomena) are allowed to matter and which, in effect, are excluded from mattering through the congealed agency of these materialized configurations.

Therefore, the (organizational and/or the reworking) apparatus enacts particular story performances, but the complexity that it holds through the field of possibility for action is not a deterministic relationship in the usual sense of causality, where certain story performances become inevitable.

Precisely because an unforeseeable multiplex of time, space, and matter constituents are always part of the enacted localized folding of the spacetimematter manifold, there is open-endedness to the complex ‘betweens’ that apparatuses hold.

The outcome, therefore, can never be predicted. However, the apparatus enables and constrains what story performances are enacted since the apparatus, as a between field of possibility, holds specific inclinations for story performance embedded in the material-discursive configuration of the apparatus due to the in/exclusions of constituents. For example, little room was left for doing other activities when the activity room at DBC was furnished wall-to-wall with sofa-TV-sets.

The apparatus therefore enacts moment-to-moment different opportunities and limitations for performances; to stimulate, make easy or difficult, to enhance or delimit, to make more or less probable, and so forth, various practices. We shall see an example of this in the following short story, where we encounter DBC understood as an apparatus of a complex field of possibility with a tendency towards some material-discursive practices to the exclusions of others.

**Short Story 1: Encountering DBC Fall 2008**

When I first came to the Centre for Deaf-Blindness (DBC) in the fall of 2008, I encountered a group of staff that was practicing extensive caretaking of the residents more so than of themselves.

---

5 The ‘what could be/was’ of the nonlocal anticipated future, recollected past spaces, times and meaning-mattering
No breaks were being held during an eight-hour shift; unless sitting on the tip of a stool counts as such. The extensive caretaking was due both to a lack of staffing and a multi-complex of disabilities among the so-called (only) deaf-blind residents. You could say that the bodily disabilities constituted an apparatus with a field of possibility for actions that required an extensive amount of time on common daily practices such as showering, getting dressed, and eating, as well as an substantial amount of help. This field of possibility was leaving very little time for other activities to be undertaken.

In addition, the physical interior of the ‘youth-home’ was, as part of the apparatus of the whole situation, a constituent in the matter. It was not very well suited for the multi-complex of disabled youngsters to manage on their own. The relationality of resident and youth-home were resituated during the process - to the benefit of both staff and residents - in terms of liberating both time and space for less caretaking and for more pedagogical development hours.

The latter was a practice that the staff referred to as ‘oasis’ hours, since they were functioning as breathing-spaces for rendering energy to deal with the caretaking and general practical aspect of the work-practices at the youth-home.

I came to think of the staff as multitasking ‘mummies’. The photo below shows the 3pm staff-shift that collided with the young residents coming home from their school activities. This meant that a chaotic atmosphere was enacted, where practices of serving/eating afternoon snack, exchanging information among departing, and arriving staff, as well as planning the afternoon and evening activities, were all attempted to be accomplished in the same time and space: the kitchen table.

This collision was reworked during the project (by changing time-schedules 15 minutes respectively for the arrival of the staff for the next shift and the residents). The poster presented below re-enacts the manner by which this enslaving pattern of the multi-tasking and rather exhausted ‘mummies’ became configured at the 2nd Group workshop supervision as a scale over-weighted to one side, which was one way to articulate the hegemony:
Figure 5.4. Photo of posters from 2nd workshop-supervision.

The various dilemmas of hegemonies of various material-discursive practices in the fall of 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Real and good enough</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Ideal and perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Standing steady and being faithful to own knowing</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Slipping and being compliant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Taking time off with a good conscience</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Having one finger on the pulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Doing pedagogical development with the residents</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Doing practical nursing help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Being calm and slow moving</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Disturbed waters and fast moving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.5. List of current dilemmas from 2nd workshop-supervision.

The staff coined their change wish as ‘an increased professional presence’, meaning an increased balance between the practices of caretaking, practical stuff in general, and pedagogical development. As the above list reveals, this also included an increased balance between being compliant to the demands of others (management, resident’s parents, various professional practitioners (physiotherapists, etc.), other colleagues, and so forth, and having their own sense of knowing and experience and needs.

Correspondingly, the temporal aspect of allowing oneself to slow down and taking the time to consider or actual time off (breaks) were part of the wish for increased professional presence as they experienced their workdays as being in ‘disturbing waters’ and ‘slipping’.

---

6 The notion of ‘Professional presence’ is developed by Marianne Kristiansen (1993) and was introduced to them by me.
Being able to do this with a good conscience mattered; as we shall see below in the transcript from one of the workshop-based supervisions (Short story 2).

The series of photos below shows how the enslaving patterns of these imbalances were resituated through rebuilding the physical surroundings of the organization. Two previously ‘silenced’ or excluded material-discursive practices were enacted: (1) a staff-room, where staff could withdraw for undisturbed space and time whenever needed for various task related to the planning and the management of the shift, and (2) a room for taking ‘restituting’ breaks on shifts.

Figure 5.6. Photos of the established Staff-room.

Figure 5.7. Photos of the established room for taking breaks.
Changes = changes actions:
- No longer doing preparations from home, or showing up earlier at work (to do them)
- Saying ‘no’ with a good conscience – it’s ok!
- Demarking; it is not mine to deal with or – ‘not now’, maybe later
- Teamwork torch passed on – undisturbed, more calmness
- It only needs to be ‘good enough’ not perfect
- Stop – it is properly good enough already
- We are taking breaks, sending each other off on breaks, more difficult to leave your self
- No longer running after the phone
- We do tasks-division on the evening shifts
- Have become better at leaving piles behind
- Have become better at prioritizing pedagogical development and presence

Other types of changes:
- Manner of speaking has changed:
  o more ‘I messages’ than ‘we-messages’
  o telling each other more of what used to be unsaid
- Using other symbols to express your self; ex. Goal of becoming Tarzan into goal of becoming a dolphin
- You are rebuilding your house to make room for the new behaviour: multiroom - staffroom
- Clearer markings of your (different) professions

Figure 5.8. List of changes accomplished throughout the six months development process.

The list of changes accomplished during the six-month development process at DBC, seen below, articulates the very low-practical aspect of the reworked story performance that was needed and treasured since they made a big difference to their workday.

Scenario 3 discusses the implications of having to deal with these kinds of low-practical aspects of development and change processes.

**Short Story 2: The Crucial Moment**

The following short story enacts a crucial part of the meaning-mattering, world-making configuration at DBC. It is extracted from a transcript of a video-recording of one of the workshop-based restorying action that was a crucial part of the reconfiguring of the enslaving material-discursive practices at DBC. The mode of enactment used for the Apparatus of Material Storytelling was ‘stories of artifacts’, also known as ‘Object theatre’, and the clues for practicing this mode of enactment of the between are as follows.
Six clues for Object theatre

1. *Let your mind ‘off’ and allow the artifacts to collect and invite you by letting your hand/eyes choose...be silent...*
2. *The same goes for the placing of the artifacts in the sandbox...be silent...*
3. *Avoid also - initially - analyzing the meaning*
4. *When analyzing notice ‘the corporal story told in the lineaments of the figures’ by using the grammar of material storytelling...*
5. *Progress slowly, slow down, linger, inquire into the figuration by asking ‘what could it be?’...*
6. *Listen to your gut feeling, it tells you when the sandbox-story-configuration is ‘done’...*

Figure 5.9. The six clues for Object theatre.

The grammar of material storytelling is as follows:

The Grammar of Material Storytelling

Notice the:

- **categories/categorizations?** (the cutting together/apart of phenomena)
- **opposites/contrasts?** (in color, materials, size)
- **directions/relations – barriers, roads, connections?** How are the artifacts turned (front/back), how close are they standing? Central/peripheral?
- **start by noticing on the very concrete, material, format level**

For further reference:

- **draw ongoing notes of the configuration + verbal cues on** for example a A2 story map, take photos or make video-rec. of the process

Figure 5.10. The Grammar of Material Storytelling.
The typical phases of the Objects theatre process are as follows:

**The Object theatre process**

*Phase 1:* establish the sandbox and the selection of artifacts suitably for the purpose...

*Phase 2:* choose artifacts – according to an agreed problematic – take your time...

*Phase 3:* begin the placing of the artifacts in the sandbox, by for example one of these intra-action orders:

A) everyone places silently ‘their’ chosen artifacts in the sandbox among everyone else

B) one person starts, and completes the sandbox silently, the others adds/changes

C) everyone takes turns in making their own sandbox configuration

*Phase 4:* The meaning-making of the sandbox is configured using the clues of the visual, material format of the configuration

*Phase 5:* The sandbox story configuration – (the terrain-board) is now done

Figure 5.11. The phases of the Object theatre process.

The transcript below shows how the enslaving pattern of the hegemony of the two material-discursive practices of caretaking (including various practical work) and pedagogical development mattered and were crushed as a means of having it ‘go away a bit’ in order for them to get the ‘oasis’; developmental hours with a good conscience (See Strand, 2012, Book 2, Analysis Part, 1, 3 and 4 for a thorough analysis).

The actions took place on 10th December 2008, which was midways into the development project at DBC. The human participants were two staff members (pedagogues), Lone and Pernille, and myself as supervisor. While Lone did the sandbox configuration, Pernille acted the role as collegial witness. The articulated problematic to be dealt with emerged during the introductory talk in Area A: ‘How to create an oasis with a good conscience’.

The sandbox configuration, pictured above, includes seven artifacts. A palm tree depicting the ‘Oasis’, which is the metaphor used for the development hours and the restituting breaks that the staff are seeking. A small pink house depicting the workplace the ‘youth-home’ at DBC, ‘where such oasis should be’. A white sink and a phone depicting ‘disturbing elements’. A small gold-plated picture frame with a photo of a women from the late 19th century depicting ‘old habits and routines’. And a hammer placed on top of the picture frame depicting that the old habits ‘need to be crushed’. Notice the circular format with the oasis in the middle. This references a prior sandbox-configuration, given the title ‘The eye of the hurricane’ as a place where calmness and quietness were found. Here this eye is reconfigured as the oasis, which is an example of how the story mode enables the spanning across space-timescales.

---

7 A metaphor, which was developed during in the first month of the project through an event outside the supervision practices of the action research project.

8 During the workshop-based supervision held Nov. 21st. Also with Lone and Pernille.
Extract 1: Summing up the Plot

1. Lone: so so [Lone is looking down into the sandbox, moving both hands with spread out fingers in a synchronised order with the two words ‘so’ ‘so’ in front of the Palm tree in the centre of the sandbox]

2. Lone: that here must go away a bit with the practical tasks the telephone. [She makes 5 synchronised movements with both hands in rhythm with the stressing of the words]

3. Lone: And the old habits [She lowers her right arm and makes an outward sweeping movement with her left arm over the hammer and the picture-frame with the old-fashioned woman]

4. Lone: so we can get this here oasis (3) [She moves her right hand over the palm tree and moving it in two small downward steps up and down in concert with the stressing of the words. On ‘oasis’ she looks up at Supervisor]

5. Sup: uhmn [Supervisor nods and places her right hand on her cheek and chin, and Lone moves her hand back on to the edge of the sandbox fumbling the sand of her fingers]

6. (1)

7. Sup: Yeah [nodding]

8. Lone: with a good conscience [still looking at supervisor]

9. Lone: So we they should not be: important [She moves her right hand palm out across the phone and the sink in concert with the stressing of the words]

Summing up, Lone says that the practical tasks (the white sink) and the phoning (the phone) ‘must go away a bit’ in order to reach the target, the oasis (developmental hours). A
bit earlier she has shown how the old habits (picture frame) needed to be crushed by the hammer in order to manage to ‘better get in’ to the oasis (the palm tree). There seems to be three parts in her story: (1) to acknowledge the disturbing elements as something that needs to ‘go away’, (2) to commit the crucial act: crushing the old habits, and (3) to get the reward, the oasis.

She had previously referred to these two material objects (sink and phone) as ‘disturbing elements’, which explains her idea of having them ‘go away’. It is noteworthy how she emphasizes this idea of ‘going away’ bodily by using both her hands to imaginatively ‘wipe away’ those disturbing elements from the practices of the ‘youth-home’ (the pink dog house) by imaginatively removing it from the scenery of the sandbox. These enactments are afforded in the complex intra-action of sand(box), material artifacts, hand-movements, and words.

As we shall see below in Scenario 2, there is a bit more to it when it comes to having them ‘go away a bit’ and no longer be important.

**Scenario 2: Deep Inquiry of the Subtleties of Intra-Action**

How are we to understand the importance of the two practices: practical tasks and phoning; the agency through which these practices come to have importance; and the way conscience is an entangled part of this. This section deals with both the multimodality and in the constitutive subtleties of the intra-active dynamic of the agency through which imbalanced practices becomes (reconfigured). We now turn to the next step of the reconfiguring that takes place during the crucial moment at DBC in order to grasp the discursive reconfiguring of the hegemony. Scenario 2 enquires into the vital subterranean subtleties of the intra-active processes that are generated through the material storytelling practices, and how such practices can be analyzed. This includes a discussion of notions as ‘touching-responsiveness’ and the founding differences of agential realism; the two paradigmatic moves.

**Extract 2: The Founding Differences of the Enslaving Pattern**

This part follows directly after Lone had summed up the plot (see above). The multimodal constitutive apparatus invites a contemplation – a deep inquiry – which articulates the founding difference (in/exclusion) that matters for the spacetimematter manifold of the hegemony of material-discursive practices of caretaking and practical tasks verses oasis hours. An analysis is thus undertaken of the agential cutting together/apart to reconfigure a different difference for a reworked material-discursive practice at DBC.

10. Sup: So the conscience (2) could you say it this way that conscience has something to do with: (.)

11. Sup: how big importance you subscribe to [slowly leaning forward and while looking down into the sandbox her hand is removed from the chin and reached out into the sandbox and Lone moving her eyesight from Sup to the sandbox]
12. **Sup:** *this eehh and (1) that [moving the hand over the area of sink and the phone on the verbal stressing of ‘this’ and afterwards over the area of the palm tree and the house on the verbal stressing of that]*

13. **Lone:** *yes [still looking down into the sandbox]*

14. **Sup:** *(1) well ri::ght now it seems as if as if that there has greater [holding the hand over the area of the sink and phone on ‘there’]*

15. **Sup:** *Importance [looking up at Lone]*

16. **Sup:** *than [this and that] (.) [holding the hand over the palm tree and the pink house on the stressing of the words]*

17. **Sup:** *is that correctly understood [making a slight down movement with her right hand on the stressing of ‘cor’ and ‘under’ and Lone looking up at Sup]*

18. **Lone:** *yes (1) it is allowed to: yes*

19. **Sup:** *It is [allowed] to (.) yes [(parallel with the verbal stressing sup is making two marks with her hand)]*

20. **Lone:** *Hmmm*

21. **Sup:** *But that is only [looking at Lone and making a circular movement in the air with her right hand]*

22. **Sup:** *an illusion or what (.) it doesn’t have to be so [still looking at Lone holding her right hand by her mouth/chin]*

23. **Lone:** *(6) I don’t know eehhm (2) well they must still be taken care of (1) [looking straight out in the air]*

24. **Lone:** *It’s not that [turning to look at Sup again]*

25. **Sup:** *No [looking at Lone and holding her right hand by her mouth]*

26. **Lone:** *But the question is how high a priority it should have [looking at supervisor]*

27. **Sup:** *Yearhh: [still looking at Lone, nodding and is holding her hand on her lips]*

28. **Lone:** *(1) really [looking at sup]*

29. **Sup:** *Yes [looking at Lone]*

The manner of my hand movements in the sandbox (line 12), literally links ‘conscience’ and ‘importance’ to the two materially displayed areas of ‘disturbing elements’ (phone and sink) and ‘oasis’ (palm tree and house). The small pause (1) before stating ‘that’ and the moving of the hand to the next category highlights the need to attend to the opposition.

A changed relationality of the material story agencies of the artefacts and the categories they enacted are thus re-storied and re-configured. Only the category of ‘disturbing elements’ had been storied explicitly earlier. A subtle but very important re-storying of the category of ‘the oasis’ is enacted here, by placing the hand over the palm tree and the house at the same time (line 12). Therefore, by including the pink house as an item belonging to the category, the hand agentially cuts this category differently.

In verbally going through the material story agents one at a time, Lone had mentioned earlier the house – referring to DBC – as a home ‘that should contain these oases’. However, in line 4 Lone had emphasised with her hand-movement the category ‘oases’ distinctly as only including the palm tree by the manner in which she addressed the palm tree with her
closed hand. This is reconfigured in line 16 by creating the necessary link that Lone did not make. My hand is showing in action together with (emphasized) verbal framing and gaze that ‘oases and house’ go together and are opposed to ‘the disturbing elements’ of the sink and the phone. Two categories are cut. Oasis is now part of the ‘youth-home’.

Thus, while ‘anchoring’ it to the displayed memory-devices in the sandbox with the hand, two conflicting forces are storied as the centre of attention. The story here moves away from the simple storyline of a three sequential plot into elaborating the nuances of the necessary reconfiguration; that oases and the current conduct of the house must be ‘fused’ as a practice within that house in order for them (the staff) to ‘better get in’. This calls for a changed relationality; a reconfiguring of material-discursive practices of the house. Lone continues with specifically dealing with the enslaving pattern of the material-discursive practice of phoning.

**Extract 3: The Enslaving (of the) Phoning Practice**

30. Lone: And say well isn’t it also just okay (.) that the phone is ringing five times [still looking at sup]
31. Sup: Yeahh [still having her hand in front of her mouth and looking at Lone]
32. Lone: and there is nobody who runs after it (.) [still looking at Sup]
33. Sup: Yeah, [nodding, still looking at Lone]

This brief extract shows the story performances through which the agential cutting together/apart of a changed relationality of staff/phoning is emerging. Asking the question is perhaps now allowed?

**Analyzing Constitutive Entanglements**

The altering of the languaging (Steffensen, 2009), understood as a different material-discursive intra-action or intraplay of communicative modalities of hand gestures, prosody, proxemics, and story-figures, afford here a multimodal re-storying of the problematic that are dealt with. The intra-play of an altered hand gesture and the placing of story-figures in a sandbox configures a different categorization (boundary-making) of the elements of the problematic dealt with, including the hierarchy of importance, the hegemony of two material-discursive practices, where one was not presently sufficiently part of the house (the youth-home).

With a Baradian take on becoming, we need to grasp the resituating of hegemonies (at DBC) through the constitutive entanglement of a plurality of space, time, and mattering modalities through which the relationality of the hegemony has become and can be changed. This alters the understanding of power (and) dynamics.

In order to clarify that argument further, we need to turn to the two paradigmatic moves or founding differences through which the notion of constitutive entanglement is enacted.
Two paradigmatic moves

1st move) agential realism reframes the notion of individual existence as something that pre-exists interaction

Barad moves away from individual (distinct) entities with clear-cut boundaries and attributes that are placed in or above the physical world and poses instead entanglement (thus intra-action) and of-ness as that ‘fundament’ from where being and becoming emerges. We are ‘of’ the flux of the world, and existence is not an individual affair ‘in’ a container-like world. Distinctness of phenomena are agentially made real and emerges out of agential ontological relations. Hence a pre-individual or pre-entity level of intra-action rather than inter-action is emphasized; the entangled state

2nd move) agential realism reframes the notion of agency and its presumed localization within individuals

Barad subsequently moves away from agency as an attribute someone (or something) has and poses agency as a dynamic with various forms of human and nonhuman agencies bringing about the world. Materiality, space and time is recognized as equally, and mutually constituent forces to that of human agency and claims all phenomena to be always already material-discursively constituted. Phenomena are thus always ontologically entangled, human and non-human agencies, and as such phenomena which emerges out of ‘the between’ flux of time, space, body, artifacts, discourse, language and so on as the interdependent mixture of co-constituent forces, a ‘complex mixture’ that is then elaborated by the notion of ‘apparatus’.

Figure 5.13. Overview of the two paradigmatic moves of Agential Realism, (Strand, 2014b).

The two moves fundamentally change how we are to understand agency. When individual existence is no longer the name of the game (1st move), neither are individual characteristics (2nd move). The entangled state is the ‘between’ apparatus of co-constituted, co-constituents, that depicts the constitutive entanglement through which any phenomenon becomes.

Following Barad, power (and) dynamics are thereby reconfigured as the intra-active, diffractive interferences of complex agencies across multiple scales of space, time, and matter. The agential multimodal cutting together/apart of bodies of knowledge (categories) are enactments of in/exclusions that matters, and the manner by which phenomena comes to exist, and with phenomena comes relationalities with inherent power-dynamics understood as dynamics of agency.

The multimodal material-discursive configuration of the apparatus matters for the story performances enacted. As stated above, inclinations are embedded in the material-discursive configuration of an apparatus and the actualized here-and-now story performance is constituted through these. In terms of analysis of this constitution, it calls for a different approach.

Jørgensen and Strand (2014, this volume) argue for the “detailed exploration of crucial now-moments in organizations” (p.xx). Barad herself argues for a diffractive mode (see Jørgensen and Strand, 2014, this volume, for an elaboration of diffraction) of analysis where we learn to tune our analytical instruments (the diffraction apparatus as she calls it) in a way that is sufficiently attentive to the details of the phenomenon we want to understand (Barad, 2007, p. 73).

In relation to organizational story reconfiguration, this calls for detailed explorations of those moments in which crucial or important reconfiguration takes place, because it is the only way we can get a sense of the constitutive entanglements of human and non-human forces that (re)configure story performances as spacetimematter configurations. The model of
the Apparatus of Material Storytelling, presented below, is a manner of operationalizing this Baradian take on the relationality of power, discourse, and materiality as performatively enacted (agentially cut) manifolds of spacetimematter with constitutive in/exclusions that matter:

Figure 5.14. The Model of the Apparatus of Material Storytelling.

The phrase ‘the between affective site of engagement’ depicts the site of engagement of story performances as one where the subtleties of these multimodal, complex story-enfoldings of in/exclusions becomes vital intra-actions from the ‘touching responsiveness’ (Strand, 2012) of the intra-active dynamic in the moment of becoming. In other words ‘touching responsiveness’ depicts the multimodal constitutive entanglement of - a mutual touch of - for example, story performances and material figurations, as we saw above with the palm-tree, the house, and the hand gestures, verbal framings and gaze, and the wiping away of the disturbing elements.

**Extract 4: The Bells in the Corridor**

As we shall see in the transcript below, it is very meaningful that Lone held that it required ‘crushing’ as in a physical breaking down and rebuilding. The enslaving pattern of always answering the phone is a story performance enacted through the agency of the relationality of exaggerated phone-ringings through extra phone bells. The touching responsiveness the human apparatus and the material configuration matters. Matter matters in the iterative enactment of practices that the field of possibility of the apparatus of the larger
material arrangement allows; answering the phone, as well as the practices it does not allow; undisturbed space. Thereby an answer is given to the question Lone poses:

34. Lone: Because why is it really that we should always answer it [on ‘really’ she swings out her right hand arm to the side]
35. Sup: Yes yes yeah [still holding her mouth looking at Lone]
36. Lone: People can just call back really [on ‘call back’ she shrugs her shoulders]
37. Sup: Yaer yaer [still looking at Lone and nodding]
38. (2)
39. Lone: But it dis turbs^[momentarily looking down in the sandbox while making a hand movement 2 times with her right hand into the sandbox over the phone with the stressing of ‘dis’ ‘turbs’]
40. Sup: Ye:ar, it dis turbes^[nodding and also looking down in the sandbox momentarily]
41. Lone: One gets torn out of it and thinks oh is it now that I should run (.) or no is it now that I should run [on stating ‘thinks’ she flips both her hands out to the sides while looking straight out in front of her. Her voicing in stating ‘is it now that I should run (.) or no is it now that I should run’ is slightly altered with a higher pitch than she normally speaks with]
42. Sup: Yes. [nodding and looking at Lone while holding her chin]
43. Lone: also because it rings all through the whole corridor so [moving her right arm vertically in front of the left side of her chest on ‘all through’ and then in a straight line out to the right side of her while stating ‘the whole corridor’]
44. Sup: Yes yes yes
45. Lone: no matter where you are (.) you can hear it [swings both arms out to the sides]
46. Sup: Really? (.) so there are these extra bells or what? [pointing in the air with her right hand while stating ‘these extra bells’]
47. Lone: Yea ahr [nodding with marked head movement up and down synchronized with the stressing of ‘yea’ and ‘ahr’]

The apparatus of the enslaving pattern of running after the phone on dispense of undisturbed developmental hours, clearly also entails the spatial range of how far the phoning agency can reach (line 43 and 45). Enveloped in this spatial range is, of course, the time range of having to run after it to answer it as well as leaving the current practice behind while running after it; in effect excluding the continuity of that practice in the moment of acting towards answering the phone. On a very concrete and practical level, this shows how ‘it is allowed’ and how ‘allowance’ is a material-discursive practice of in/exclusions and materialized practices of dis/continuity.

The ‘touching responsiveness’ of the staff and the phone ringing in the extract is a very good example of the power dynamic of the constitutive entanglement. It is not so much that one individual existing entity (the phone) has agency over the other (the staff member). In this case, the spacetimemattering of ‘allowance’ is a dynamic of mutuality.
Scenario 3 articulates some of the implications of (actively) making space, time, and matter matter as mutually constitutive parties of ongoing processes of becoming through the Apparatus of Material Storytelling; (1) the implication of having to get your hand dirty by including various low-practical and concrete aspects of organizational life, and (2) the implication that an impaired ability, a respons(dis)ability, needs to be considered as part of the call for an ethics of responsibility, as part of an ethics of mattering while hegemonies are still part of everyday organizational practices.

These implications are diffraacted through the example of the rebuilding of the main activity room at DBC as this rebuild, as an affective site of engagement (Strand, 2012), is a suitable memory-device for grasping these implications.

A series of photos of the rebuilding of the main room is inserted below. First, though, is inserted – as a story board – a copy of the blueprint of the reconfiguration of the main (activity) room of the ‘youth-home’. As we can see, the main room was reconfigured as three rooms in the room; an open space area for..., a sensory area for..., and a hang-out area for.... In addition, in the right-side corner of the blueprint below, you see the included Staff room. Before the rebuild, each of the three areas was fitted with sofa-TV sets, small tables, and cupboards along the walls providing a homey atmosphere.

Figure 5.15. Blueprint of the rebuild of (the enactments of) the material-discursive practices of the reconfigured main room at DBC.
Below we see a variety of photographs of the three rooms-in-the-room:

Figure 5.16. Photographs of various parts of (enactment of) the material-discursive practices of the open-space area of the main room.

Besides these changes in the main activity room, staffing was expanded with two extra people, and a staff room (as mentioned). Further, a room for taking breaks was included. In addition, procedures for taking breaks, conducting the afternoon shift, task-division during the evening shift, for effective meetings, and so forth, were developed. These were followed by a practice designating a certain amount of monthly working hours as pedagogical development - so-called ‘green-hours’, which are reenacting the congealing of the material-discursive practices of the ‘oasis’.

The rebuild was the enactment of the changed relationality of the people (residents and the staff), the practices afforded (included), and the physical surroundings. This changed the relationality of staff/residents as the enslaving pattern was resituated to accommodate the multiplex of disabilities of the residents, which, in effect, helped to constitute them as less disabled and thus less dependent on the staff to enable their actions. This in turn afforded the staff both space, time, and matter (the field of possibility) to do other activities; taking breaks, conducting a developmental hour with one or two of the residents in the undisturbed manner, and the like.

**Implication 1: Getting Your Hands Dirty**

Such processes of reconfiguring organizations ‘credit’ space-time-matter as constituents since they were considered and reworked in the rebuild process; neither time, nor space, nor matter were the same after the shift. As such, the process offers an understanding of change that is rather different from conventional understandings.
Figure 5.17. Photographs of the various parts of (the enactments of) the material-discursive practices of the sensory-area – notice the discovery wall with small doors to be opened and the content discovered with your hands. Notice also the intra-active play devices for sound, light, and vibration.

Figure 5.18. Photographs of the various parts of (the enactments of) the material-discursive practices of the hang-out area – notice the wheels on the sofa to make for a more flexible use as part of both the hang-out area and the open-space area.
Here, the question of organizational change is reversed and posed as a question of how stasis is made possible. The answer is through the congealed agency of people, practices, and surroundings.

In the process of mattering, matter plays a vital role in enabling stasis understood as the reproduction moment-to-moment, day-to-day of the (more or less) same material-discursive practice. Matter, here, is not a thing, but a doing; a (process of a) congealing of agency of a material-discursive practice.

As the recapturing on the changes accomplished above draws out, there are various levels that you get your hand in as a participant. These accomplishments are performed stories of the development process as they are congealed agencies of the process. It reveals that you deal with the entire range of ‘material-discursive’ practices when participating in ‘enacting the between’ through the Material Storytelling apparatus.

In addition, it reveals that you therefore need to be willing to get your hand dirty, both literally and metaphorically, as you are involved in many parts of the reconfiguration of in/exclusions that takes place on many levels; architectural blueprints, rebuild plans, daily procedures, tasks divisions, schedules, and so forth.

The following highlights summarize the approach.

### Changing Organizational practices through material storytelling

Enact a radically different approach to change by asking:

- **Which practices are presently materialized in our physical surroundings (incl. structural layout and artifacts) that we no longer wish to reproduce?** (Stories of space, Stories of artifacts)
- **Which practices are we reproducing on a daily basis through our bodily enacted story performances – that we no longer wish to be part of our work?** (Stories of bodies)

Figure 5.19a. Highlights for a Material Storytelling approach to Organizational development and change.
Changing Organizational practices through material storytelling

A radically different approach to consultancy:

- Don’t intervene - Enact the between...from within the ‘entangled state’ of which you are part...
- You need to tolerate to get your hands dirty...
- You must be able to read the grammar of material storytelling...
- You must work on the concrete level with removing the old for/and rebuilding the new

Figure 5.19b. Highlights for a Material Storytelling approach to Organizational development and change.

A Material Storytelling approach to Organizational development and change draws on the Baradian take on the entanglements of mattering and meaning. It challenges both the research on the subject as well as the development practices conducted. ‘Enacting the between’ – as a difference to intervening – is one of those challenges, as you yourself are part of the complex between apparatus through which the reconfigurations are enacted. You are not an outside observer.

According to agential realism, knowing, thinking, measuring, theorizing, and observing are material practices of intra-acting within and as part of-the-world. What do we learn by engaging in such practices? We do not uncover pre-existing facts about independently existing things as they exist frozen in time like little statues positioned in the world. The point is not simply to put the observer back in the world (as if the world were a container and we needed merely to acknowledge our situatedness in it) but to understand and take account of the fact that we too are part of the world’s “differential becoming” (Barad, 2007: 91).

Apparatuses of Material Storytelling are not a neutral ‘reveler’ of ‘what is’. It is a mode of enactment of in/exclusions that matters for rebalancing hegemonies. A Material Story Lab takes the intra-active nature of knowing, being, and becoming seriously; it enables and fosters the intra-action of diverse learning styles in the development process where Western monomodal approaches are counterbalanced with emphasis on analogue modes of storytelling and bodily practices of tactile engagements with human and non-human agencies.

It includes the facilitator as participant. There is no acting at a distance or attempt to do so from outside the organizational apparatus. There is just being part of the (apparatus of) process of becoming with an eye to the in/exclusions you help enact, and through which you are yourself enacted in the process. What is required, then, is the accounting of this partaking as part of analytical accounting of the multimodal constituent processes of the story
performances (the phenomena) that are enacted through the Material Storytelling Apparatus (the three material story modes as material-discursive practices) (See Strand, 2012, Book 2, Section 3.1 and 3.2).

**Implication 2: Respons(dis)ability?**

Haraway (2008), as well as Barad, lethally wounds the primary narcissism of the self-centered, self-referential human subject, by reconfiguring us as ‘just’ an ordinary mortal critter of the world with relational heritages from always already being of an entangled ‘between’ state. The dethroning of ‘The Great Divide’ (Haraway, 2008) accomplished with Barad’s theorizing is a dethroning of singularity accomplished by reworking relationalities of presently enacted hegemonies of discourse/matter, culture/nature, language/body, explicit/implicit forms of knowing, and so on.

As Bennett (2010) notes, the human seems to be put back in the seat or on the throne ‘in the end’ as on very vital constituent. While this does seem to be the case, it is importantly in a reconfigured state, where ‘the apparatus’ runs the enfolding, and the human being can only strive ‘to be a student of the movement of the moment’ in a ‘touching responsibility’ towards the agential cutting that they co-enact, while acknowledging themselves as being enfolded in the process as well.

However, this leads to a relevant question. Are the humans just ordinary critters (as Haraway, 2008 states), which are controlled and restrained just as much as we control and restrain? How can we meaningfully talk about responsibility when the ability to respond from a standpoint of reflective humans being in control seems impaired, illusory, and perhaps unreliable? I argue that hegemonies enact disabilities for responding accurately. The ability to respond means – within an ethics of mattering – to enact agential cuts, that co-constitutes worthwhile world-practices.

“In my agential realist account intelligibility is a matter of differential responsiveness, as performatively articulated and accountable, to what matters” (Barad, 2007, p.335).

However, when the relationality of people, practices, and surroundings – as enactments of a between field of possibility, where founding differences excludes, for example, biological needs for taking breaks during the eight hour shift – vital voices (of the body in this case) are excluded from mattering. Silenced over time, in the sense that it becomes habitual practice not to respond to the sensed needs, to the ‘voice’ calling for the practice of ‘taking a break’. Further, if there is no suitable place to take the break – there is no affective site of engagement to ‘invite’ or ‘collect’ the practice. The touching responsiveness of human/surroundings is thereby impaired in regard to enact ‘taking a break’.

I argue that this impairs the necessary intelligibility for the differential responsiveness that Barad talks about, and requires us to performatively articulate and be accountable for what matters. It performs a kind of dis-ability – a respon-dis-ability – with profound impact on the practices of organizational life and becoming, that calls out the need to pay attention to the strikingly absent, the excluded practices, as part of the materialized practices, (cp. Figure 18a and 18b above).
Jørgensen & Klee (2014, this volume) call for artisan storytelling as a means of bringing back the human in recognition of the decline of genuine storytelling and as a counter-storying to prevailing management theories and practices. Perhaps the artisan storyteller is the respond-able, and the Material Story Lab, with its three entangled material story modes, are then perhaps an example of a diffractive apparatus for enacting these respond-able artisans?

Stories of artifacts, stories of spaces, and stories of bodies are performative practices. The extracts of the video-recordings discussed above explicate these full-body performances of expression and creativity intra-playing across human/non-human modalities. The artisan storyteller would be a material storyteller when he or she deals with the practical matters of the world and does not hesitate to get their hand dirty and partake in rebuilding practices and low practical re-arrangements of schedules and procedures.

To acknowledge oneself as part of an apparatus, brings the human right back in the seat as an agential partaker of ‘the between’ dynamic, and therefore both a responsive, and ethical responsible – a response-able agent for the enacted cuts on a daily basis of each encounter. Matter matters in these encounters. As Haraway points out, we are ‘gatherings’ of what we pick up from ‘our’ encounters. ‘We’ are ‘inherited relations’, as stated by Barad.

To become responsible for organizational reworking practices enacted through an Apparatus of Material Storytelling is to become responsible – response-able – by reworking imbalances that causes response-dis-ability. To participate in such practices is to be collected and invited. In collecting and inviting, one comes to assume response-ability in practices of Material Storytelling.

CONCLUSION

I conclude that ongoing processes of becoming in organizational living and change (as well as teaching and research) are material-discursive (re)configuring actions where matter, space, and time matter as co-constituents. Through these actions, it is possible to enact different in/exclusions that change present hegemonies. In these reconfiguring actions, the matter of mattering of the apparatus has to do with (the material-discursive intra-active dynamic of): (1) spacetime matter’s structuring force as congealed agency, (2) its maneuverable character, and (3) its ability to invoke affect(able) memory across timescales.

The interior decor plays a role in the emergent actions by directing attention and governing actions among co-authoring human participants in a certain way; for instance, the extra bells in the corridor extending the range of the phone ringing, which in turn directs the staffing to answer the phone ‘no matter what’. When the interior decoration is reworked (the replacing of furniture, activity artifacts and so on) in an organizational setting, the everyday actions change. Here space is not a neutral container in which action takes place, but an active co-constituent that is reworked. Furthermore, the maneuverable character of matter provides for a change of scenery in a manner that enhances the re-storying of organizational practices as reworked material-discursive practices; for instance, using a small hammer to enact a crushing the enslaving old habits and routines depicted by a photo in a picture frame. Mattering is affect-able as a figurative memory-device that, in the appeal of the present, is a co-constituent in (re)configuring story performances and thus enables each event to span flexibly across multiple times and spaces.
That matter matters does not imply that material changes are enough to produce the re-working of organizational practices. In the case of DBC, it was the accomplishment through the changed relationality of the human and nonhuman co-constituents and partakers afforded by the sandbox-based material storytelling in work-shop-based supervision sessions and the intra-related rebuild of the material surround of the organization. The changes here were storied and enacted in the intra-play of human and non-human participants.

Lone enacted her part of the crushing of the enslaving pattern with the act of a small wooden hammer. The previous day, construction workers had literally begun breaking down the main room. This is perhaps another example of the unpredictable relationality of people, practices, and surroundings that seems to work ‘behind our back’ and enact story performances through the touching responsiveness of the affective sites of engagement.

In that regard, humans are just ordinary critters (Haraway, 2008) being part of mundane, everyday, vital subterranean subtleties of intra-active story performances accomplished through a complex apparatus of human/non-human modalities.

“The noble art of loosing face, may one day save the human race, and turn into eternal merit, what weaker minds would call disgrace”, Piet Hein
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