

Grounded Anecdotal Evidence: Understanding Organizational Reality Through Archetypes in Organizational Humorous Tales

Dariusz Jemielniak, Paweł Krzyworzeka

Kozminski University

Paper delivered At the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism in Providence, RI (USA), 13-14 April 2012

The traditional, and currently diminishing academic narrative in the social sciences apes the research models of the natural sciences. It relies on formulating and testing hypotheses, preferably by quantitative measures.

Even though qualitative methods have gained some recognition (in particular it is true of grounded theory, which offers the quantitative researchers a sense of familiarity, through structures, coding, and semi-quantitative analysis possibilities), they still usually are expected to relate to “reality” and describe “facts” rather than fiction. Researchers are encouraged to weed out gossip, hearsay, and organizational anecdotes from their “true” findings. In spite of the widely accepted sense-made nature of organizational life (Weick, 1969/1979), scholars are still coerced to try to reach quasi-physical history and facts.

Some researchers (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1998; Czarniawska-Joerges & Guillet de Monthoux, 1994; Czarniawska, 2000) show how studies of fiction can be usefully incorporated into organizational research. Yet, they focus on literature and other published narrations of organizational conceptions.

In our paper we would like to suggest a new focus in qualitative organization studies, which we call grounded anecdotal evidence. Just as the name suggest, we propose that organizational anecdotes, jokes, and short fictional stories should become one of the core objects of management culture analysis, rather than be refuted as unimportant.

We believe that the study of organizational anecdotes and fictional stories shared by the social actors is actually more meaningful and gives more insight into their culture than establishing mere facts. “What really happened” is often incidental, while the stories, which prevail, carry true, or truer, meanings. Just like myths, they can be “‘true’ from the point of view of human experience and consciousness and ‘untrue’ from the point of view of empirical history all at the same time” (Kostera, 2008, p. 3) .

In his seminal works, David Boje (2001, 2008) set the grounds for narrative analysis of organizations. We would like to make a farther step and try to make a case for storytelling studies of anecdotes, as a way to reach organizational archetypes (Kostera, 2007a, 2008), and provide evidence in a way more solid, actually, than the studies of accidental “true” facts.

The novelty of our proposed method relies on making a link between storytelling, organizational archetypes, and humor studies. All three of these approaches are growing in recognition in management science, and yet their combination has not been consistently proposed. It may be useful, though, to offer a single method, justifying the studies of organizational anecdotes as emanations of archetypes, made through storytelling analysis, as it should prove particularly useful for anthropological analysis of workplace culture, from the point of view of the workers themselves, and without the veneer of managerial propaganda.

In this article we briefly emphasize the falsity of factual studies in many of organizational research areas, describe the theoretical backgrounds of our method, coming from humor studies, storytelling, and organizational archetypes analysis, and propose their combination as the new tool for organization students, namely grounded anecdotal evidence research.

Falsity of Factual-Only Studies

Currently, factual research dominates organization studies. By factual we mean studies, which aim at discovering “what really happens” in the sense of historical and physical accuracy. This approach is following the mode of natural sciences, enforcing the paradigm of human agents treated as if they were mainly physical subjects. We do not question the need for such

research projects to exist. It should be noted though that contrarily to natural sciences, management and organizational studies have a much wider scope and aim at explaining reasons, beliefs, and actors' logic, as well as such fragile and elusive concepts as, for instance, organizational memory (Akgün, Keskin, & Byrne, 2012). However, this wide scope is lost when organization scholars try to satisfy the standards set by their natural science colleagues, and focus only on factual accuracy, rather than meanings, conveyed also by fiction.

We do not question that an important part of traditional scientific mode of discovery is reproducibility of results. Yet, human behaviors are very often intricate, and contingent. The drive to make social science research results reproducible forces them to be quantitative and broad, more than meaningful and deep. As it has been shown on many occasions, aping natural sciences in the modes of discovery leads to limiting the scope of knowledge expansion, even in such seemingly quantitative and culturally detached fields as economics (McCloskey, 1990, 2010).

Instead of following the path convenient for natural sciences and focusing on reproducibility of results, we postulate that organization studies need to aim to produce results which are solid, meaningful, insightful and comparable. In order to deepen our understanding of organizational actors' perception of reality (and thus, learning about organizational culture), we need to break with the pretense of factuality. What happens in organizations "in fact" is often just a random, incidental result of meaningless actions, merely a contingent consequence of different trends. On the other hand, what happens in organizations in fiction (in fictional stories shared by organizational actors), is the essence of what people believe in and reflects organizational world much more as it "truly" is, than physically correct observations.

Thus, it is only natural that studies of narratives and stories, including the fictional ones, should have a place in organization studies.

Narrative and Storytelling Studies

Sharing stories is a natural way of organizing human experience, just as exchanging narratives is the most common form of social interaction (Bruner, 1991). In fact, the very process of the social construction of reality (Berger & Luckman, 1967) is fundamentally discursive (Phillips, Lawrence, & Hardy, 2004). As some authors point out, collective storytelling is actually a useful metaphor of organizing (Boje, 1994): the very essence of interactions and negotiating social constructs relies on creating coherent, plausible stories. Organizations abound in “narratives with simple but resonant plots and characters, involving narrative skill, entailing risk, and aiming to entertain, persuade, and win over” (Gabriel, 2000, p. 22).

Also, as Barbara Czarniawska points out, the dividing line between scientific and narrative knowledge is often blurred (Czarniawska, 1997). Ethnographic studies in particular are, inescapably, walks in the fictional woods, which may deprive them of validity in the traditional sense (Clifford Geertz, 1988). They may claim authority by assuming realistic expression (Wolf, 1992), but they still remain subjectively constructed narratives of cultural encounters. The myth of scientific discovery forces ethnographers, as well as other social scientists, to hide behind pretenses of objectivity. Yet, “sociological studies and novels, ethnographies and journalistic articles are all stories” and simply “varieties of the same thing” (Watson, 2000, p. 502). As a matter of fact, it is the lack of recognition of the unavoidable fiction element in any academic inquiry that makes it less, rather than more valid. As Carl Rhodes and Andrew D. Brown put it, “to label one’s writing ‘factual’ is to claim an equivalence between one’s representations and an externally located ‘reality’ that not only sidelines the need for reflexivity, but also denies the author’s responsibility for his/her writing”, and “the claim that research represents reality unproblematically is irresponsible” (Rhodes & Brown, 2005, p. 476). Perhaps the recognition of this fact, as well as the growing interest in narrative knowledge and narrative forms of academic discovery (Sköldbberg, 1994) have lead to increased interest in studies of fictional narratives.

Clearly, analyzing fiction (e. g. books) may be quite useful in better understanding management and organizations, since it helps in combining the traditional academic rational accounts with the more subjective and emotional study of characters, and roles imposed on them (Czarniawska-Joerges & Guillet de Monthoux, 1994). Analyzing powerful narratives may, for instance, help in shedding new light of the issues of identity, power relations, or

inequality in management studies (Knights & Willmott, 1999). This is true not only of literary classics, but also of popular culture and cartoons.

Similarly, analyzing local, organizational stories, common to organizational actors, is of utter importance for management and organizational science. Through them, shared meanings and values are negotiated (Smircich, 1983). It is the process of enacting narratives, and constant re-mythologizing the main storylines, that constitutes organizing (Boyce, 1996). In fact, management itself relies on creating powerful narratives. In the case of authoritarian and “greedy” institutions (Coser, 1974) it leads to monophony of stories imposed on organizational actors (Boje, 1995): management of narratives and conscious storytelling are important elements of normative control (Kunda, 1992).

Yet, the enforcement of organizational propaganda and stories unavoidably leads to countercultural movements (Martin & Siehl, 1983). Organizational actors react with their own stories and narratives, to oppose the dominant discourse. These stories are perhaps an even more important element of organizing, since they are unmanageable, deeply hidden for an external observer, but also often perceived by organizational actors as closer to reality than the official discourse. Thus studying them is of utter importance for organization studies. One of the most interesting elements of anti-managerial storytelling is organizational humor.

Humor Studies

“Humor appears when people resolve two conflicting images in ways that make sense within distorted systems of logic. The processes by which organization members set up such puzzles for others to solve (...) say much about the ways organization members work and play together” (Kahn, 1989, p. 46). The analysis of playful behaviors at work (Hunter, Jemielniak, & Postuła, 2010) as well as of organizational humor (Romero & Pescosolido, 2008) have steadily grown into popularity in organization studies over the last years.

Organizational humor is often depicted as a tool of power struggle between the workers and the management (Fleming & Spicer, 2007). Many totalitarian organizations and states recognize jokes and humor as a serious threat (Oring, 2004). This is so for at least two

reasons: irony serves as a tool for deconstructing and defusing the official organizational propaganda, and also it helps people in distancing themselves from their roles (Kunda, 1992).

The larger the power imbalance between people and the organization is, the more humor is used as a weapon of the weak: examples go far beyond internal organizational power play or counter-totalitarian opposition (Benton, 1988), and include e.g. customer-corporation relations (observable e.g. in the prominence of jokes about Microsoft, see: Shifman & Blondheim, 2010), or anti-racism movements (Weaver, 2010).

Everyday humor helps in sensemaking the professional roles of workers and in resisting managerial control (Lynch, 2009). In a way, organizational rhetoric, used to reinforce the expected behaviors and hierarchical authority, is challenged by deconstructing ambivalence of spontaneous worker opposition (Höpfl, 1995), also in humoristic form. All this makes workplace humor, as well as organizational anecdotes a natural target for any studies attempting to understand organizational culture and management, not only through the perspective of the managers, but also the workers. Workplace anecdotes are perhaps the most interesting, and yet still the most underestimated genre of organizational narratives.

This kind of organizational stories and behaviors are carnivalesque in sense described by Mikhail Bakhtin (1984). Bakhtin in his seminal works on medieval carnivals shows vividly how important role the non-official playful behavior played in maintaining social reality by giving temporarily realize from dominant norms and offering suppressed people means to talk back to power: “As opposed to the official feast, one might say that carnival celebrated temporary liberation from the prevailing truth and from the established order; it marked the suspension of all hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions. Carnival was the true feast of time , the feast of becoming, change, and renewal” (Bakhtin, 1984, p. 10).

Humor stories in organizations similarly to traditional carnival are a realm of temporal liberation from the dominant discourse and established formal hierarchies. In these stories important comments on organizational life are hidden, messages encrypted in jokes convey information that are not controlled by formal hierarchy and may inform us about future trends

and probable developments. Hence, organizational humor is of special relevance for those whose research topics concerns organizational change, innovations and future trends. However, using traditional research instruments that focus on observing real behaviors, looking for true stories and validating it, researchers would not be able to access this part of truth about organizational reality.

Also, it is worth noting, that learning from ironic accounts serves as a very good way for understanding the workplace reality from an angle which is different than usual, in particular in case of knowledge-intensive professions (Jemielniak & Kostera, 2010). It also allows to delve better into the nuances of work as a separate phenomenon, particularly worth of bringing back into the interest of management science (Barley & Kunda, 2001).

Organizational anecdotes are important cultural artifacts, playing a role both in sustaining the managerial system, as well as deconstructing it. They show what organizational actors consider as incongruous, and well underline the organizational power play (Dwyer, 1991). Yet, we believe that an even further argument is justified: organizational anecdotes (and, in particular, humorous stories retold or created by organizational actors) are also major carriers of organizational archetypes, and as such should be one of the central foci of organizational culture analysis.

Archetypes and Myths Studies

In organization world, archetypes are emanations of organizational interpretive schemes (Oliver, 1992). Archetypes are the primary organizational deep roles, commonly used for making sense of organizing, for ordering interactions, as well as for enacting organizational purpose (Moxnes, 1999). They are what the symbols and myths are built from (Kostera, 2007a). They permeate our understanding of the world, and, according to Jung (1968), serve as the carriers of narratives and images. Myths (through which archetypes are expressed) are primal to stories, and they can take the form of a narrative, when put into words. The power of archetypes, emanated through myths, made the human language, symbolic interaction and

perceptions, and the world of thought possible (Bowles, 1993; Campbell, 1972; Jemielniak, 2009).

In organization studies archetypes have been growing in popularity over the last 10 years, and have been used for expanding our knowledge of e.g. experience economy (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2010), feminine aspects of organizing (Höpfl, 2002), or leadership (Hatch, Kostera, & Kozminski, 2005). Similarly, analyzing myths in organizational world, as well as retelling the mythical stories and using them for interpreting contemporary organizations, prove useful for management studies (Gabriel, 2004). Delving into the archetypes shared by organizational actors allows to understand their perception of the world they operate in. They are a skeleton for the social construction of reality (Berger & Luckman, 1967), after all. Therefore myths and archetypes analysis has become an important part of organizational symbolism studies (Alvesson & Berg, 1992), and already seems to differentiate into different approaches.

In our focus on organizational archetypes we distance ourselves from the neo-institutional archetype theory in organizational change studies (Cooper, Hinings, Greenwood, & Brown, 1996; Greenwood & Hinings, 1993, 1996). We recognize its limitations (Kirkpatrick & Ackroyd, 2003), as well as want to make a narrower focus on organizational actors' perceptions and culture, rather than processes on the more abstract organizational change level. Our background is anthropological (Kostera, 2007b) and we place our method in the wider field of ethnography of organizations (Schwartzman, 1993).

We believe that studying organizational archetypes can be achieved best through qualitative, grounded analysis of organizational narratives and stories. Moreover, we insist that the stories (both fictional and with claims to factual accuracy), which are particularly interesting from the point of view of organizational archetypes are anecdotes and jokes shared by organizational actors, since they touch significant topics (only such are chosen for humor), and also serve as the safety valve of anti-managerial counterculture. Thus, we propose a new method of organizational inquiry, the grounded anecdotal evidence study.

New Methodology: Grounded Anecdotal Evidence

Our study shows emergent methodological trends in organizational theory that deal with phenomena like storytelling, narrations, humor, and archetypes. Studies in these trends acknowledge usefulness and insightfulness of fiction in studies of organizational life and shift their focus from the “facts” to the fiction. As we have explained, fictional stories and narratives play an important part in the very enacting of organizing, and carry meanings deeply shared by organizational actors. Anecdotes and humorous accounts form an extremely important category of these narratives, since they are manifestations of contention, counter-mainstream rhetoric, and power play. Also, they offer a rare opportunity to approach the topic of organizational archetypes, clearly an interesting and meaningful way to look at organizational cultures.

Recently developed studies of organizational fiction, especially in the last decade, derive their findings from evidences that could be called anecdotal. In the literature on qualitative research methods the anecdotal evidence term is used as the opposition to scientific one, the kind of evidence that could be characterized as methodologically rigorous (Silverman, 2006). Randomness of analyzed empirical material and lack of validity is the main threat for qualitative study and all methodological handbooks instruct how to avoid it.

Studies of fictions that we have referred to were not based on anecdotal evidences in this unfavorable meaning. In most cases findings and theoretical propositions were well-grounded in proper empirical material. Methodological triangulation is one of the main strategies that researchers are using (for example comparing collected narrations with historical data). Another anti-anecdotal strategy would be using appropriate tabulation of qualitative data to allow readers to “see” the material and draw their own opinions and interoperations based on it (Silverman, 2006). This kind of studies produce likelihood rather than certainty (Polkinghorne, 1988, p. 175) and strength of arguments and conclusions is evaluated by its resistance to counter interpretations not by statistical validity.

Anecdotes – stories which are non-real, or non-serious, or neither – traditionally are not acknowledged as a reliable source of knowledge about social life because of the specific status of fiction in academia and due to methodological reasons. Studies that constitute the

new trend challenge these barriers and create a fundament for a new approach to organization studies that we called the grounded anecdotal evidence method: a method consistently combining the three emerging streams of organizational studies, by applying the approach of narrative and storytelling studies to the analysis of organizational humor and anecdotes, and aiming at understanding through them organizational archetypes. All three of these streams of analysis are gaining prominence, but they are rarely combined. Thus, we would like to encourage and validate it as not only justifiable, but also academically useful method.

This new method is grounded in a sense similar to grounded theory is (Glaser & Strauss, 1967): through seeking common patterns and iterations of ironic storylines and archetypes. The method relies on analyzing two types of organizational anecdotes: the ones collected through non-participant or participant observation, as well as the ones collected through requesting organizational actors to write anecdotes specifically for the purpose of our research (by the use of the method of "the narrative collage", see more in: Kostera, 2006). Since the narratives collection methods have been abundantly discussed in literature, we are not going to describe the process here. Our purpose is different: by proposing the grounded anecdotal evidence as a new method of organization study we want to draw the academic attention to the intersection of organizational storytelling, humor, and archetypes, as the yet relatively unexplored, and extremely promising area of study.

For instance, Jemielniak (2008) studied the archetypes of computer users shared in anecdotal stories among IT specialists, on the *slashdot.org* forum. In hundreds of narratives of misunderstandings, slips, and failures, IT support experts described a number of archetypical figures in encounters of "favorite support story" forum thread. These stories showed that IT specialists construct the role of a user asking for help almost universally as of an idiot. Also, the representations described in the stories, apart from their incredible humorous potential, allowed another observation: PC users, by performing the role of the Fool (as depicted in Tarot arcana), experienced and enjoyed a liminal freedom from other organizational roles. In some cases, even though the narratives were constructed by the IT specialists themselves, it seemed clear that the seemingly stupid users willingly or not outfoxed the experts.

We would position the grounded anecdotal evidence method in the tradition of “blurred genres” that transgress traditional disciplinary boundaries (C. Geertz, 1983, pp. 19-35). It stands at the intersection of humanities and social sciences. Empirical material is treated hermeneutically and it has its validity even without direct reference to social life. At the same time methodology is strongly anchored in social sciences and its methodological tradition that values first hand data collection, broader social context and social practices.

Specific realizations of studies of fiction in organization theory field are located at continuum between humanistic tradition and performance studies. At one end of the continuum anecdotes are seen as texts that are subjected to interpretation. Researchers could trace tropes like metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony (White, 1973), or may be interested in finding archetypes (Kostera, 2007a, 2008). What studies in this approach have in common is that broader social context and actual practices are less emphasized than the form. Closer to the center of continuum we would place symbolic-interpretive perspective that acknowledges broader context and social interaction, however, the phenomena under study are seen through the lenses of meaning making and textualization (Alvesson, 1993; C. Geertz, 1973, 1983). Other end of the continuum is occupied by those who question the “earlier generation’s ethnographic textualism that produced books with titles such as *Writing Culture*” (Denzin, 2003, p. 16). It is not the content that matters but rather the performance (Conquergood, 1989, 2003). The way how a story was told, to whom, its connection to previous versions of the story, and social consequences of performance (Bauman, 1975). According to this perspective not the story, gossip, or joke matters but rather practice of storytelling, gossiping, joking. Fictional stories are seen as phenomena changing social reality rather than communicating certain things (Austin, 1962; Schieffelin, 1998). Stories are not texts but always performances, even a novel is performed in the act of reading. Studies situated differently at this continuum address different research questions and apply diverse research tools.

Therefore we suggest that the method, called grounded anecdotal evidence, should be recognized. We further propose that studying organizational anecdotes has particular value, should be considered an important branch of storytelling studies, and be recognized as a valid method of organizational research.

Conclusions

Management and organization studies are one of many social sciences disciplines that are problem based, rather than methodology driven. Anthropology for example could be seen as a discipline where almost exclusively one type of method is in use. However, we can observe that number of disciplines that use both or mixed methods depending on the research problem are growing.

Within management itself both methods are being used. However, mixed methodology is rarely applied. Researchers rather commit themselves to one of the two - “qual” or “quant” - camp. Functioning of those camps and arguments in favor of both methods, presented separately and in rather antagonistic manner, could be traced in discussion that took place in last decade of 20th century between John Van Maanen and Jeffrey Pfeffer (Van Maanen, 1995).

The origins of this divide could be traced in back to 60ties when management have chosen more scientific route while other social sciences, like anthropology, left precedence to be science and followed more humanistic path (Wright, 1994). In recent two decades we can observe a clash of these two approaches. One, sometimes called mainstream, is scientific and quantitative another is qualitative, and inspired by anthropology, psychology and sociology.

Despite the fact, that grounded anecdotal evidence methodology that we propose here is strongly anchored in qualitative tradition, we would like to take a moderate position in qualitative versus quantitative debate. We acknowledge that organization and management theory is a problem rather than method driven discipline and method should be chosen according to research problem.

Grounded anecdotal evidence method links storytelling, organizational archetypes, and humor studies. Analyzes of stories common to organizational actors gives this method power of both relevance and potential for discoveries. Usefulness of grounded anecdotal evidence is especially valid in studies of power relations; inequality; professional identity; organizational change, and organizational innovations. What all these topics have in commons is their

bottom-up character. They are important for understanding workplace reality but at the same time do not belong to dominant managerial discourse that prevails in the literature.

This kind of study is potentially useful for researchers in the critical management studies tradition. However, we believe that methodology could also be inspiring for those who are operating within functional paradigm, which is often considered as an oppositional to CMS. For functionalists, aiming at normative outcomes of their studies, especially promising would be the possibility of discovering future trends and directions of organizational change that are encrypted in fiction, where future and possible scenarios are not restricted by pressures from above.

References:

- Akgün, A. E., Keskin, H., & Byrne, J. (2012). Organizational emotional memory. *Management Decision*, 50(1), 95-114.
- Alvesson, M. (1993). *Cultural Perspectives on Organizations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Alvesson, M., & Berg, P. O. (1992). *Corporate culture and organizational symbolism*: de Gruyter Berlin.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (2001). Bringing work back in. *Organization Science*, 12(1), 76-95.
- Bauman, R. (1975). Verbal Art as Performance. *American Anthropologist*, 77, 290-311.
- Benton, G. (1988). The origin of the political joke. In C. Powell & C. Patton (Eds.), *Humor in society: Resistance and control* (pp. 85-105). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality; a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Boje, D. M. (1994). Organizational Storytelling. The Struggles of Pre-modern, Modern and Postmodern Organizational Learning Discourses. *Management Learning*, 25(3), 433-461.
- Boje, D. M. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: a postmodern analysis of Disney as "Tamara-Land". *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 997-1035.
- Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*. London - Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Boje, D. M. (2008). *Storytelling Organizations*. London - Thousand Oaks, CA - New Delhi: Sage.
- Bowles, M. L. (1993). The gods and goddesses: Personifying social life in the age of organization. *Organization Studies*, 14(3), 395-418.
- Boyce, M. E. (1996). Organizational story and storytelling: a critical review. *Journal of organizational change management*, 9(5), 5-26.

- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical inquiry*, 18(1), 1-21.
- Campbell, J. (1972). *Myths to live by*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Conquergood, D. (1989). Poetics, Play, Process, and Power. The Performative Turn in Anthropology. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 1, 82-95.
- Conquergood, D. (2003). Rethinking Ethnography: Towards a Critical Cultural Politics. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), (pp. 351-374): Altamira Press.
- Cooper, D. J., Hinings, B., Greenwood, R., & Brown, J. L. (1996). Sedimentation and transformation in organizational change: The case of Canadian law firms. *Organization Studies*, 17(4), 623-647.
- Coser, L. A. (1974). *Greedy institutions; patterns of undivided commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1998). *Narrative approach in organization studies*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B., & Guillet de Monthoux, P. (1994). *Good novels, better management: reading organizational realities*. Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Czarniawska, B. (1997). A four times told tale: Combining narrative and scientific knowledge in organization studies. *Organization*, 4(1), 7-30.
- Czarniawska, B. (2000). *The uses of narrative in organization research*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg Research Institute.
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance Ethnography: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture*: Sage Publications.
- Dwyer, T. (1991). Humor, power, and change in organizations. *Human Relations*, 44(1), 1-19.
- Fleming, P., & Spicer, A. (2007). *Contesting the corporation: struggle, power and resistance in organizations*. Cambridge, UK - New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gabriel, Y. (2000). *Storytelling in organizations: facts, fictions, and fantasies*. New York-Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gabriel, Y. (Ed.). (2004). *Myths, stories, and organizations: premodern narratives for our times*. Oxford - New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Understanding strategic change: The contribution of archetypes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(5), 1052-1081.
- Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1996). Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism. *Academy of Management Review*, 1022-1054.
- Hatch, M. J., Kostera, M., & Kozminski, A. K. (2005). *The three faces of leadership: manager, artist, priest*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Höpfl, H. (1995). Organizational rhetoric and the threat of ambivalence. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 1(2), 175-187.
- Höpfl, H. (2002). Strategic quest and the search for the primal mother. *Human Resource Development International*, 5(1), 11-22.
- Hunter, C., Jemielniak, D., & Postuła, A. (2010). Temporal and Spatial Shifts within Playful Work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23(1), 87-102.

- Jemielniak, D. (2008). Little Johnny and the Wizard of OS: The PC User as a Fool Hero. In M. Kostera (Ed.), *Organizational Olympians: Heroes and heroines of organizational myths*. London: Palgrave.
- Jemielniak, D. (2009). Time as symbolic currency in knowledge work. *Information and Organization*, 19, 277-293.
- Jemielniak, D., & Kostera, M. (2010). Narratives Of Irony And Failure In Ethnographic Work. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 27(4), 335-347.
- Jung, C. G. (1968). The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious. In H. Read (Ed.), *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung (vol. 9)*. London: Routledge.
- Kahn, W. A. (1989). Toward a sense of organizational humor: Implications for organizational diagnosis and change. *The Journal of applied behavioral science*, 25(1), 45-63.
- Kirkpatrick, I., & Ackroyd, S. (2003). Archetype theory and the changing professional organization: a critique and alternative. *Organization*, 10(4), 731.
- Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1999). *Management lives: power and identity in work organizations*. London - Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE.
- Kociatkiewicz, J., & Kostera, M. (2010). Experiencing the Shadow: Organizational Exclusion and Denial within Experience Economy. *Organization*, 17(2), 257-282.
- Kostera, M. (2006). The narrative collage as research method. *Storytelling, Self, Society*, 2(2), 5-27.
- Kostera, M. (2007a). Archetypes. In S. Clegg & J. R. Bailey (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*. London: Sage.
- Kostera, M. (2007b). *Organizational ethnography. Methods and inspirations*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Kostera, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Organizational Olympians*. London: Palgrave-McMillan.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: control and commitment in a high-tech corporation* (Rev. ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Lynch, O. H. (2009). Kitchen antics: The importance of humor and maintaining professionalism at work. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 37(4), 444-464.
- Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(2), 52-64.
- McCloskey, D. N. (1990). *If You Are So Smart: The Narrative of Economic Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCloskey, D. N. (2010). *Bourgeois Dignity: Why Economics Can't Explain the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moxnes, P. (1999). Deep roles: Twelve primordial roles of mind and organization. *Human Relations*, 52(11), 1427-1444.
- Oliver, C. (1992). The antecedents of deinstitutionalization. *Organization Studies*, 13(4), 563.
- Oring, E. (2004). Risky Business: Political Jokes under Repressive Regimes. *Western Folklore*, 63(3), 209-236.
- Phillips, N., Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (2004). Discourse and institutions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 29(4), 635-652.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*: State University of New York Press.
- Rhodes, C., & Brown, A. D. (2005). Writing responsibly: Narrative fiction and organization studies. *Organization*, 12(4), 467-491.
- Romero, E., & Pescosolido, A. (2008). Humor and group effectiveness. *Human Relations*, 61(3), 395-418.
- Schieffelin, E. L. (1998). Problematizing Performance. In F. Hughes-Freeland (Ed.), *Ritual, Performance, Media* (pp. 194-207). London: Routledge.

- Schwartzman, H. (1993). *Ethnography in organizations*. Newbury Park – London – New Delhi: Sage.
- Shifman, L., & Blondheim, M. (2010). The medium is the joke: Online humor about and by networked computers. *New Media & Society*, 12(8), 1348-1367.
- Silverman, D. (2006). *Interpreting qualitative data: methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*: SAGE Publications.
- Sköldberg, K. (1994). Tales of change: Public administration reform and narrative mode. *Organization Science*, 5(2), 219-238.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Organizations as shared meanings. In L. R. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan & T. Dandridge (Eds.), *Organizational symbolism: Monographs in Organizational and Industrial Relations* (pp. 55-66). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Van Maanen, J. (1995). Styles as Theory. *Organization Science*, 6(1), 133-143.
- Watson, T. J. (2000). Making sense of managerial work and organizational research processes with Caroline and Terry. *Organization*, 7(3), 489-510.
- Weaver, S. (2010). The ‘Other’Laughs Back: Humour and Resistance in Anti-racist Comedy. *Sociology*, 44(1), 31-48.
- Weick, K. E. (1969/1979). *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publications.
- White, H. V. (1973). *Metahistory: the historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wolf, M. (1992). *A thrice-told tale: Feminism, postmodernism, and ethnographic responsibility*. Stanford: Stanford Univ Press.
- Wright, S. (1994). *The Anthropology of Organizations*. London: Routledge.