Rohny Saylors

**Management, Information Systems, and Entrepreneurship, Washington State
University, United States**

r.saylors@wsu.edu

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6263-0997

Book Review of *How to Use Conversational Storytelling Interviews for Your Dissertation* by David Boje and Grace Ann Rosile. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2022

This review discusses "Relational Process Ontology" (RPO), a central theme in the book by David Boje and Grace Ann Rosile. RPO is about understanding complex ideas through participation, ethics, and inclusivity. The book applies this concept to organizational history and entrepreneurial strategies. It suggests that Boje and Rosile's approach could revolutionize scientific research by making it more inclusive and ethical. The book offers a comprehensive guide for doctoral students on using storytelling in their dissertations. It explores various philosophical backgrounds and stresses the importance of open-mindedness and critical reflection. The authors introduce RPO as a method that combines wisdom, logical analysis, and ethical considerations for a more responsible form of science. RPO advocates for a science that harmonizes intuition and logical analysis. It encourages researchers to immerse themselves in their study areas, combining intuition with empirical analysis to ensure ethical and practical research outcomes. To conclude, the book presents RPO as a method that unites intuitive and scientific approaches, aiming to contribute positively to society and the environment. It encourages scientists to blend intuition with critical analysis for the greater good, offering a new, more inclusive, empathetic, and sustainable scientific methodology.

In their book, *How to use conversational storytelling interviews for your dissertation*, David Boje and Grace Ann Rosile take readers on a journey through the ways a doctoral student can usefully centralize their dissertation on conversational interviews that get at a story – without overwriting the conversationalists own stories. This comprehensive guide covers a wide range of insights grounded in key philosophical schools, from positivism to indigenous research, summarizing lifetimes of work dedicated to moving beyond the qualitative methodological assumptions of the last century.

The authors skillfully explain the complexities of storytelling interviews, pointing out their potential and the important aspects to consider when used alongside techniques like ethnography and autoethnography. They also delve into important links between the ways scholars often generate data and stories that live through conversationalists. As a follower of Boje's work, I was particularly struck by how their emphasizes the importance of moving beyond

traditional approaches and adopting a mindset of openness and critical reflection.

This book sets the stage for discussing Relational Process Ontology (RPO), a concept the enthinkment circle has been driving at for many years (see also to Boje et al., 2024a). Boje and Rosile's focus on methodological mindfulness subtly leads to a deeper understanding of RPO, advocating for a mindful, ethical approach to research that calls for a paradigm shift towards participatory and inclusive methods, where researchers not only study but also experience the dynamics of ecological systems firsthand. Their book sets a new standard for scientific exploration, one that is deeply rooted in ethical responsibility and a commitment to understanding the interconnectedness of all elements within ecological systems.

Relational Process Ontology: Harnessing Collective Wisdom for Ecological Flourishing

Addressing social and ecological challenges requires a fundamental change in how we approach scientific research. This change is embodied in Relational Process Ontology (RPO), a guiding framework for science that combines various modes of inquiry: abductive, deductive, and participatory. RPO emphasizes the importance of cultivating wisdom and being attuned to the myriad relationships that exist within our planet's ecosystems. It encourages researchers to trust their intuition, engage in logical analysis, make ethical decisions, and actively participate in their field of study. This approach advocates for a harmonious blend of unrestricted wisdom and structured investigation (Svane, 2018; Boje et al., 2022). What I present here is my own reading of RPO as we've been developing it over the years (Boje & Saylors, 2014; Boje et al., 2024b).

In studies of ecology, using intuition helps us see complex connections that standard scientific methods might miss. This kind of insight is crucial, as it leads to new paths for exploration and discovery. Relational Process Ontology (RPO) combines this intuition with logical analysis, turning initial ideas into hypotheses that can be tested. Moreover, to truly understand ecological

systems, researchers need to be in the natural environment itself. This direct experience turns theoretical ideas into real-world observations, making science more hands-on and inclusive.

But RPO goes beyond just intuition and analytical thoroughness. It strongly focuses on ethics that are compassionate. This means that scientific work is not just about thinking and analyzing; it's about contributing to social justice and the health of our planet. The real measure of truth in RPO is how it affects the well-being of society. RPO's philosophical principles influence its approach to understanding reality, knowledge, and values. It treats every experience as unique and beyond full understanding, embracing life's mysteries. Knowledge is seen as something that comes from being actively involved in our social and ecological systems. By sharing experiences, researchers can build empathy and work together, leading to discoveries that matter.

Ultimately, RPO aims to direct science towards the betterment of our planet and all its inhabitants. The goal of scientific research, under this approach, is to foster inclusion, justice, and sustainability. This ethical perspective helps turn our collective understanding into practical solutions that have a real impact, making theoretical ideas useful in everyday life.

RPO bridges the gap between intuition and formal science. It suggests that scientific research should be a joint effort that brings together different ways of understanding for the benefit of society and the environment. This shift in how we do science aligns individual work with the greater good, creating a balance between intuitive insight and careful analysis. This results in a science that is both empowering and responsive, with researchers contributing to our understanding of the complex world we live in.

For social scientists, RPO is more than just a theory; it's an invitation to be part of a more inclusive, empathetic, and sustainable approach to science. It encourages using intuition to find connections, using analytical skills to examine them, and relying on the scientific community to refine these ideas. This combination of creativity and discipline leads to impactful science that helps our environment thrive. RPO isn't just a concept; it's the foundation of science, now and in the future. The question is, how will you engage with it?

Relational Process Ontology: A Definition

Relational Process Ontology is a normative theory of science that recognizes the scientific process as the participatory practice of carefully nurturing wisdom and attunement to the multidimensional relationships within the living Earth community. It integrates intuitive sensing, logical analysis, compassionate ethics, and embodied action to advance collective flourishing.

Relational Process Ontology reconciles intuitive ways of knowing with analytical rigor through a creative interplay of abductive, deductive, and participatory modes of inquiry grounded in compassionate ethics. This holistic integration of diverse epistemic approaches provides a paradigm upgrade for science by balancing open-ended wisdom with critical discipline in service of social and ecological flourishing.

As Charles Peirce explained, abductive reasoning forms explanatory hypotheses about the world through creative intuition and inference (Peirce, 1931–1958). These abductive leaps propose conjectures about potential relationships between phenomena that can be tested and refined. Abduction thus initiates inquiry through speculative wisdom. As Peirce noted, abduction is the only logical operation that expands knowledge (Peirce, 1933–1937). It generates the novelty of new theoretical connections.

However, unconstrained intuition risks logical inconsistency, bias, and inaccuracy. Therefore, Relational Process Ontology employs analytical rigor to refine abductive conjectures. Formal techniques like Bayesian probability, sensitivity analysis, and hypothesis deduction constrain and extend intuitive insights through logical scrutiny (Trafimow, 2017). Deductive implications are derived, assumptions probed, and alternative models compared to evaluate explanatory power. Analytical methods thereby provide constructive criticism, tempering creative wisdom with disciplinary constraints.

At the same time, overly conceptual approaches lose touch with concrete realities. Hence, Relational Process Ontology emphasizes participatory testing and grounding of hypotheses through embodied experience and intersubjective confrontation with the world (James, 1907/1975). Individual

intuition opens into communal understanding developed through shared action, observation, and experimentation. Participation in relational networks interweaves concepts with somatic, emotional, and collective ways of knowing.

Moreover, while analytical methods enhance explanatory rigor, not all that is technically possible is prudent or ethical. As Indigenous scholars like Love (2018a) argue, rational intellect alone risks objectification and disruption of living systems. Thus, compassionate ethics are needed to guide science toward inclusive and ecologically sustainable goals. Relational Process Ontology therefore orients analytical efforts toward pragmatic outcomes that enhance collective wellbeing and justice.

In sum, intuitive wisdom generates creative theoretical possibilities; analytical rigor refines and tests these conjectures; participatory grounding integrates conceptual and embodied knowledge; and ethical discernment guides appropriate application. The synergistic interplay of these diverse modes of understanding enhances the sophistication, benefit, and responsibility of scientific inquiry. Analytical rigor thereby complements and potentiates collective intuitive insights toward elucidating our complex cosmos.

Philosophical Commitments

Relational Process Ontology is founded upon an ineffable ontology that recognizes the ultimate unknowability and mystery of being (Sternfeld, 1966). While positivist science assumes an objective reality governed by immutable laws, Relational Process Ontology embraces the unquantifiable uniqueness of each moment of experience (James, 1907/1975). As Peirce (1933–1937) explained through synechism, reality is continuous, evolutionary, and shot through with spontaneity. Thus, Relational Process Ontology accepts an ineffable ontology that exceeds full conceptualization.

Epistemologically, Relational Process Ontology is based on a relational view of knowledge as participatory and intersubjective. As theorists like Boje (1995) describe, understanding emerges through embodied embeddedness and social sensemaking within fluid ecologies. Knowing is an ongoing co-creation, not

an extracting of absolute truths. As such, Relational Process Ontology cultivates wisdom through intimate attunement and careful nurturing of relations within the living Earth community (Savall & Zardet, 2011). It recognizes all beings as co-constructing a shared, albeit partial and pluralistic, understanding of the world.

Axiologically, Relational Process Ontology orients science toward collective flourishing within the planetary ecology. Drawing from Indigenous relational ethics (Cajete, 2000; Love, 2018a), it sees scientific insight as inseparable from compassionate responsibility. Understanding must serve inclusion, justice, and sustainability for all beings. Thus, truth is tested against its pragmatic effects for mutual wellbeing (Peirce, 1958). Relational Process Ontology aligns scientific discovery with moral intuitions developed through care, community, and embodied spirituality.

In summary, the ontology of Relational Process Ontology embraces ineffable uniqueness, its epistemology recognizes relational intersubjectivity, and its axiology prioritizes ecological flourishing. This participatory, compassionate, and holistic paradigm offers a new foundation for scientific inquiry that integrates intuitive wisdom with analytical rigor in service of our shared world. Relational Process Ontology thereby provides a timely upgrade to outdated positivist assumptions that reduce reality to lifeless objects governed by immutable laws.

Theoretical Framework

The Relational Process Ontology framework is a novel approach to scientific inquiry that integrates diverse epistemic approaches and aims to promote social and ecological flourishing. It consists of four key elements: intuitive wisdom, analytical rigor, compassionate ethics, and participatory grounding. These elements interact and complement each other in a dynamic and holistic way, fostering a balance between open-ended wisdom and disciplined inquiry.

Intuitive wisdom refers to the ability to access and apply intuitive ways of knowing, such as insight, creativity, and embodied sensing. It enables scientists to generate novel hypotheses, explore new possibilities, and overcome cognitive biases. Analytical rigor refers to the ability to apply logical and empirical

methods of inquiry, such as deduction, induction, and experimentation. It enables scientists to test hypotheses, validate results, and ensure reliability.

Compassionate ethics refers to the ability to integrate moral and social considerations into scientific practice, such as justice, wellbeing, and responsibility. It enables scientists to align their research with the broader goals of social and ecological flourishing and avoid harmful consequences. Participatory grounding refers to the ability to engage with diverse perspectives and stakeholders in scientific inquiry, such as local communities, indigenous knowledge holders, and policy makers. It enables scientists to enhance the relevance and impact of their research and foster collective decision-making.

The Relational Process Ontology framework proposes that by integrating these four elements in a harmonious way, scientists can achieve a more holistic, inclusive, and ethical approach to science. This approach can potentially lead to more nuanced understandings, innovative solutions, and meaningful impacts on social and ecological wellbeing.

In what follows I outline how RPO, which again is a general explanation of the underlying philosophy within the book *How to use conversational storytelling interviews for your dissertation*, stands in relation to, and as an advancement of, the thinking of others. Clearly entire books could be written on the integration of these ideas, thus it is best to think of these as stubs to future studies that might advance our collective understanding and prove useful to various conversations with in the organizational discourses on culture.

Weick's Sensemaking in Relational Networks

Individual sensemaking and Relational Process Ontology's pursuit of collective wisdom may seem disconnected. However, Weick's work on organizing provides theoretical grounds for intuition emerging through shared meaning-making.

As Weick (1995) descRPOed, sensemaking is an ongoing process of constructing plausible interpretations retrospectively. People intuit coherence and causality among events and cues. However, this intuition relies on

intersubjective concepts, language, and norms (Weick, 2012). Our disjointed experiences only make sense in relational context.

For Weick (1979), enactment posits that we partly create the realities we seek to understand. This co-constitution of subject and object parallels how Relational Process Ontology sees science as participatory nurturing of wisdom about ecological networks we dwell within.

Weick (1995) also showed how small local interactions can generate large-scale patterns through emergence. This echoes how Relational Process Ontology sees intuition as both sensing systemic interrelations and enacting them through embodiment. Our intuitive, imaginative agency shapes reality's becoming.

Thus, while not equivalent, Weick's organizing perspectives resonate with collective intuition. His work substantiates intuition emerging through distRPOuted sensemaking in relational networks. In this way Weick's sensemaking scaffolds Relational Process Ontology.

Popper and a Critical Rationalist Perspective

Relational Process Ontology may appear antithetical to Popper's philosophy of critical rationalism. Popper (1959, 1994, 2008) long advocated falsificationism – the view that scientific theories can only be tentatively corroborated through rigorous empirical attempts at refutation. This contrasts with the pursuit of intuitive wisdom proposed by Relational Process Ontology. However, Popper's critical rationalist approach can incorporate the valuable insights of this new perspective.

Science is indeed a quest for truth about the relational workings of reality. As Popper (1963) argued, we can only approximate truth through conjectures and refutations, not attain absolute certainty. Our intuitions and interpretations of relations between phenomena form conjectures. Logical analysis deduces testable hypotheses from those conjectures. Empirical investigation puts the hypotheses to the falsification test. Embodied participation in the world

aids empirical observation. And compassionate ethics guide us to useful problems that affect human dignity and flourishing (Popper, 1963).

This process aligns with Popper's (1972) corroboration model of scientific progress. Initial relational intuitions gain credibility by surviving rigorous deductive scrutiny. As theories withstand further rounds of conjecture and refutation, we incrementally augment our understanding of reality's relational intricacy. Popper (2008) only cautions against complacency – we must remain ever vigilant against confirmation bias and premature certainty.

Relational Process Ontology resonates with Popper's (1956) qualified embrace of metaphysical realism. Popper argued reality exists objectively, but our knowledge of it remains perpetually fallible. This dovetails with recognizing science's participatory nurturing of collective wisdom. There are relationships in the cosmos waiting to be discovered through human inquiry (Popper, 1978). Yet our intuitions and theories about them must be held tentatively.

In this sense, Relational Process Ontology represents no affront to critical rationalism. It provides a broad, humanistic framework wherein Popper's falsificationist methodology operates. Intuition proposes conjectures, deduction tests them, and collective scrutiny corrects them, all aimed at comprehending reality's relational intricacy (Popper, 1963). This framework for science is both socially empowering and ethically grounded. With apt caveats, Popper's critical rationalist views can thereby be held by those who contribute meaningfully to Relational Process Ontology.

Butler and Relational Intuiting Flourishing Futures

Butler's theories on performativity, precarity, and ethics of encounter may seem incongruous with the scientific realism implied in Relational Process Ontology. However, Butler's postmodern views are not antithetical to this new perspective when interpreted on a meta-theoretical level. Butler's work can shed critical light on how Relational Process Ontology constructs its objects and modes of inquiry.

Butler (1993, 2004) sees reality as performed rather than innate. Scientific knowledge enacts the phenomena it discovers through situated practices and discourses. This resonates with the participatory nurturing of wisdom in Relational Process Ontology, which co-produces understandings of ecological relations. For Butler (2009), ethical practices emerge through openness to the Other's unknowable alterity. This echoes the attunement to multidimensional relationships in Relational Process Ontology.

Butler (1993) also cautions science against seeking false universality and fixity. Relational intuitions must remain aware of their partiality and plurality. Critical reflection and contestation keep scientific knowledge contingent, localized, and responsive to excluded voices. This prevents premature theoretical closure and leaves space for alternative modes of ecological relating (Butler, 2004).

For Butler (2009), precarity reminds us of life's vulnerability and unchosen co-dependency. Relational Intuiting for Flourishing Futures must foster care and collective action to reduce precarity for marginalized beings and sustain ecological networks. Science becomes an embodied ethical and political intervention (Butler, 2011).

In these ways, a Butlerian meta-perspective can enrich Relational Process Ontology, preventing scientific objectification and grounding knowledge in social justice. With apt caveats, Butler's postmodern theories can guide science toward an agonistic pluralism that nurtures multispecies flourishing (Schneider, 2005). Relational intuiting thereby becomes an unending project rooted in ecological solidarity and response-ability.

Shiva and Weaving Earth Wisdom through Relational Intuition for Holistic Science

Relational Process Ontology's aim to nurture collective wisdom may seem at odds with the instrumentalist view of knowledge in mainstream science. However, Shiva's work reveals deep resonances between this new perspective and the holistic wisdom of ancient indigenous traditions.

As Shiva and Opel (2008) show, mechanistic science divides intellect from intuition and prizes only analytical knowledge. In contrast, indigenous cultures intuit the profound interrelationality between humanity and nature (Shiva, 2013). For them, wisdom inheres in paying heed to the living Earth's existential messages (Latour, 2011).

Relational intuition thus aligns with the goal of weaving diverse ways of knowing. As Shiva (2016) argues, storytelling intertwines spiritual insights with scientific discoveries. Holistic science blends logical deduction with embodied participation and contemplative attunement. It honors emotive and somatic modes of ecological perception (Cajete, 2000).

For Shiva (2013), monocultures of the mind undermine the Earth community's resilience. Weaving Earth Wisdom promotes critical reflexivity and epistemic diversity. It fosters collective responsibility and care for the entire Web of Life (TwoTrees, 2000; TwoTrees & Kolan, 2016).

Through holistic science guided by relational intuition, humanity can rediscover its kinship with Mother Earth. Weaving intuitive and analytical knowing mends the broken dialogue between nature and culture. Shiva's work substantiates that nurturing collective wisdom fosters multispecies flourishing.

Love and Intercultural Relating for Planetary Wellbeing

Relational Process Ontology's scientific realism may seem disconnected from Love's advocacy for indigenous relationality. However, deeper examination reveals potential for fruitful dialogue between Western and indigenous ways of knowing.

As Love argues, Western science tends to objectify nature and prize analytical knowledge over holistic wisdom (Love, 2017b). In contrast, indigenous cultures nurture an intuitive, embodied sense of interrelationship with the living environment (Love, 2017a). Relational Process Ontology's participatory pursuit of collective wisdom mirrors this indigenous approach.

At the same time, Love (2019) cautions against romanticizing indigenous knowledge. Western and indigenous systems have limitations and biases.

Combining logical analysis with intuitive attunement fosters more rigorous, inclusive science (Love et al., 2017).

Intercultural Relating for Planetary Wellbeing suggests that weaving diverse epistemologies enriches understanding of our shared ecology. Science guided by relational intuition bridges indigenous and Western values. It connects analytical knowing with empathetic care for the Earth community (Love, 2018b).

With apt caveats, Love's work substantiates the potential of collective relational intuition that integrates diverse cultural gifts. This intercultural relating can help science better serve social and ecological justice for multispecies flourishing.

Savall and Relational Intuition for Organizational Transformation

At first glance, Relational Process Ontology's participatory approach may seem misaligned with Savall's rigorous socioeconomic methods. However, a closer look reveals potential for synergy between nurturing collective wisdom and Savall's unveiling of hidden organizational knowledge.

As Savall's research shows, mainstream management science often disregards experiential insights from those immersed in organizational realities (Savall & Zardet, 2008). Yet intuition and tacit knowledge contain rich understandings of relational dysfunctions and inefficiencies (Savall, 2010). Tapping this collective wisdom can catalyze organizational transformation.

Savall's socioeconomic approach combines qualitative intuition with statistical analysis for holistic diagnosis (Savall & Zardet, 2011). Similarly, Relational Process Ontology interweaves intuitive, deductive, and participatory modes of inquiry. Savall's iterative investigation of ill-defined problems parallels the attunement to ecological complexity espoused by Relational Process Ontology (Savall, 2010).

Unveiling Ecological Insights suggests that melding SEAM with relational intuition can help organizations internalize their environmental externalities. Analyzing hidden costs exposes unsustainable patterns (Savall

& Zardet, 2008). Intuitive wisdom envisions restorative alternatives. These complementary ways of knowing foster ethical and ecological accountability.

Savall's unveiling of organizational blind spots substantiates the potential of collective relational intuition. His rigorous participatory methods can be extended beyond organizations to the Earth community. Relational intuition then catalyzes transformative systemic changes for multispecies flourishing.

Trafimow's Critical Analysis Framework and Probing Relational Conjectures

At first glance, Relational Process Ontology's reliance on intuition may seem at odds with Trafimow's critical perspective on scientific inference. However, closer examination reveals potential synergies between relational intuition and Trafimow's proposed analytical techniques.

As Trafimow argues, intuitive judgments alone are vulnerable to bias and logical fallacies (Trafimow, 2014). While relational intuition can propose productive hypothetical connections, these conjectures require rigorous empirical scrutiny (Trafimow, 2009). Logical analysis and probability calculus help determine the evidentiary validity and explanatory power of conjectured relations (Trafimow, 2017).

Probing Relational Conjectures suggests auxiliary analytical frameworks to complement relational intuition. Bayesian logic clarifies how new data updates the probability of conjectured relations. Improved measurement quantifies the strength and reliability of proposed connections (Trafimow, 2014). And sensitivity analysis probes how inferences depend on speculative assumptions (Trafimow 2023, in press). Ultimately, however, the end product must be that scientists come away from any scientific endeavor with a useful intuition, be it to re-affirm their existing intuitive beliefs or to challenge and update them.

Integrating these tools within a critical analysis framework can sharpen the scientific investigation of relational intuitions. Trafimow's work substantiates that analytical probing enables sound collective intuition and advances robust relational understanding. In sum, relational intuition

proposes connections, critical analysis probes them, and collective scrutiny corrects them. This synergy of intuitive creativity and deductive discipline supports a directed impactful science that assembles multidimensional insights required for ecological flourishing.

Boje's Quantum Relating for Flourishing Futures

At first glance, Relational Process Ontology's assumptions may seem fundamentally realist and thus speak across purposes with Boje's quantum perspective. However, Boje's quantum storytelling approach resonates with collective intuition of ecological interrelationship.

As Boje argues, mechanical science privileges detached analysis over participatory wisdom (Boje, 2014). In contrast, quantum relating recognizes that our knowing is entangled with what we seek to know (Boje & Henderson, 2014). Relational intuition aligns with this reflexive, collective sense-making.

For Boje (2019), antenarrative bets express possibilities for alternative futures. Relational intuiting nurtures transformative becomings within living systems. Science is an ethical co-creation of worlds, not mere mapping of an external reality (Boje, 2017).

Boje's ensemble approach foregrounds plural standpoints (Rosile & Boje, 2003) and situates facts within participative values (Boje, 2019). Similarly, collective intuition builds shared understandings to advance collective flourishing.

Boje's quantum ontology substantiates relational intuition's co-constructive inquiry. Science guided by collective wisdom becomes a joyful, compassionate celebration of our planet's interconnected multiplicities (Saylors & Saylors, 2014). In this way Relational Process Ontology can incorporate Boje's quantum relating that enables the nurturing of flourishing futures.

Peirce's Abductive Relating and Scientific Inquiry as Participatory Growth

At first glance, Relational Process Ontology's reliance on intuition may seem at odds with Peirce's logic-driven philosophy of science. However, Peirce's conceptions of abductive reasoning and synechism provide grounds for reconciling intuitive wisdom with scientific rigor.

As Peirce explained, abduction is the creative act of forming explanatory hypotheses through intuitive inference (Peirce, 1931–1958). Science relies on abductive conjectures about relations between phenomena. Testing then refines these relational intuitions. This aligns with the "careful nurturing" of collective wisdom in Relational Process Ontology.

Peirce also proposed synechism as a metaphysical theory that reality is continuous, evolving, and bound together by relations (Peirce, 1933–1937). He argued that knowledge arises from participatory immersion in the interconnected world. This resonates with the "attunement to relationality" in Relational Process Ontology.

For Peirce, truth is the destination of inquiry (Peirce, 1934). His pragmatic maxim evaluates ideas based on their practical effects. Similarly, Relational Process Ontology values lived utility towards collective flourishing.

Thus, Peirce's concepts integrate intuitive, experiential knowing with logical analysis focused on participatory growth. In this way Peirce's work substantiates cultivating collective wisdom about ecological interrelationship through abductive relating.

Discourse on Imaging History

The evolving study of history within organizational contexts now includes not just factual recounting but also the strategic and rhetorical construction of the past (Suddaby et al., 2010). This discourse aligns seamlessly with the principles of Relational Process Ontology (RPO), which advocates for

a nuanced, participatory, and ethical approach to understanding complex phenomena.

Concepts like "rhetorical history" (Suddaby et al., 2010), "organizational re-membering" (Foster et al., 2020), and "historicizing" (Hatch & Schultz, 2017) resonate with RPO's emphasis on collective wisdom and ethical insight. These approaches scrutinize how organizations craft narratives that link their past to their current identity and future aspirations (Foster et al., 2011).

Moreover, the strategic use of imagined histories for legitimizing change (Suddaby et al., 2010; Maclean et al., 2014; Foster et al., 2017) aligns with RPO's focus on ethical considerations and participatory involvement. RPO could serve as a framework for understanding how rhetorical history establishes continuity, legitimizes change, and even delegitimizes alternatives during uncertain times (Foster et al., 2017).

Critically, some scholars have examined rhetorical history as a form of political and ideological work (Aeon & Lamertz, 2021; McGaughey, 2013). This critical perspective is integral to RPO, which calls for an ethical and inclusive approach to research. Alternative forms of history, such as antenarratives (Boje et al., 2016), also find a natural home within the RPO framework, which values multiple perspectives and collective wisdom.

The role of materiality and space in sustaining institutional history (Schultz & Hernes, 2013) can be further enriched by RPO's emphasis on inclusivity and participatory values. Critics who argue for a more critical approach to history (Durepos & Mills, 2012) would find RPO a useful ally, as it inherently questions hegemonic narratives and power structures.

In summary, the emerging research on imagined histories offers valuable insights into the discursive processes that shape organizational understanding of the past (Suddaby et al., 2010; Ybema, 2014). Integrating these insights with the principles of RPO can provide a more nuanced, ethical, and inclusive understanding of how and why different versions of the past are constructed and mobilized within organizational settings. This integration not only enriches the discourse on imagined history but also exemplifies the transformative potential of RPO in advancing the philosophy of science.

The Science of Imagining in Entrepreneurial Pivoting

The literature on entrepreneurial pivoting offers a rich tapestry of insights that can be synthesized through the lens of Relational Process Ontology (RPO). Pivoting, the act of making a fundamental change to a business model or strategy, is a common phenomenon in new ventures (McDonald & Gao, 2019). The literature reveals that the success of a pivot often hinges on how it is communicated and justified to stakeholders (Hampel et al., 2020; Burnell et al., 2023).

Communication and Justification

McDonald and Gao (2019) emphasize the importance of carefully staging and justifying pivots to maintain stakeholder support. This aligns with RPO's focus on the role of communication in building relationships. Hampel et al. (2020) extend this by discussing "identification reset work," which involves managing relationships with stakeholders through exposing struggles and mythologizing the venture's devotion. Here, RPO can offer a framework for how entrepreneurs can effectively manage these relationships over time, especially when pivots are involved.

Identity and Flexibility

Kirtley and O'Mahony (2020) provide a grounded definition of a pivot as a reorientation strategy, which is particularly useful when considering RPO's emphasis on flexibility and adaptability. Snihur and Clarysse (2022) discuss how organizational identity can both enable and constrain pivoting, a point that resonates with RPO's focus on the role of identity in relational dynamics.

Strategic Considerations

Pillai, Goldfarb, and Kirsch (2020) highlight that strategic pivots were crucial for survival and innovation in the early auto industry. This aligns with RPO's

emphasis on strategic intuition, where understanding the broader landscape is key for making informed decisions. Berends, van Burg, and Garud (2021) discuss how entrepreneurs rework the past into a new timeline, making actions contingent and complex, which can be understood as a form of Relational Process Ontology.

The Dark Side of Pivoting

The literature also reveals a "dark side" to pivoting. Too much experimentation can impede learning (Chen et al., 2022), and entrepreneurial framing can lead to deception and legitimacy loss (Garud et al., 2014). These insights can be integrated into RPO by emphasizing the need for balance and ethical considerations in relational building.

Gender and Identity

Arshed, Martin, and Knox (2022) discuss how women entrepreneurs' identities shape their acceptance or rejection of gendered support spaces. This is particularly relevant for RPO, which can offer a nuanced understanding of how identity factors into relational dynamics and decision-making processes.

Rhetorical History and Institutional Work

Finally, the work by Suddaby, Israelsen, Bastien, Saylors and Coraiola (2023) on rhetorical history as institutional work provides a theoretical lens that complements RPO. It focuses on how the strategic use of the past can influence audiences and shape institutional outcomes, which is in line with RPO's emphasis on the importance of history and narrative in building relationships and intuition.

In summary, the existing literature on the science of imagining in entrepreneurial pivoting offers numerous points of intersection with Relational Process Ontology. RPO provides a holistic framework that can integrate these diverse insights, offering a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in entrepreneurial pivoting.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Relational Process Ontology (RPO) reflects the deep insights from Boje and Grace Ann Rosile's book, "How to use conversational storytelling interviews for your dissertation." This approach advocates for a holistic view of scientific inquiry, moving beyond traditional divisions. RPO, which I have endeavored to simplify, promotes a balanced method that combines analytical thinking with intuitive understanding, all aimed at ecological well-being. My goal has been to distill these complex academic ideas into more accessible terms, maintaining their value for both scholarly discussion and practical application. While capturing every detail of Boje's rich work is challenging, the essence of RPO remains clear: it encourages a shift in scientific thinking, emphasizing open-mindedness, ethical insight, and inclusivity. This approach not only preserves the core merits of the original work but also paves the way for a radical reimagining of scientific methodologies, fostering collective flourishing through transformative expression.

References

Arshed, N., Martin, G., & Knox, S. (2022). Ties That Bind or Blind? The Role of Identity and Place in Understanding Women Entrepreneurs' Support Needs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 47*(6). DOI: 10.1177/10422587221134786.

Berends, H., van Burg, E., & Garud, R. (2021). Pivoting or persevering with venture ideas: Recalibrating temporal commitments. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *36*(4), 106126.

Boje, D. M. (2019). *Global storytelling: There is no planet B*. Singapore/London/NY: World Scientific.

Boje, D. M. (2014). *Storytelling organizational practices: Managing in the quantum age*. London & New York: Routledge.

Boje, D. M. (2017). The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. In *The Aesthetic Turn in Management* (pp. 211-231). London: Routledge.

Boje, D. M., Haley, U. C. V., & Saylors, R. (2016). Antenarratives of organizational change: The microstoria of Burger King's storytelling in space, time and strategic context. *Human Relations, 69*(2), 391-418. DOI: 10.1177/001872671558581.

Boje, D. M., & Henderson, T. L. (Eds.). (2014). *Being quantum: Ontological storytelling in the age of antenarrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Boje, D., Pelly, R. D. M., Saylors, R., Saylors, J., & Trafimow, S. (2022). Implications of Tamara-Land Consciousnesses Discourses for Organization Culture Studies. *Discourses on Culture*, *16*(1), 101-123.

Boje, D. M., & Saylors, R. (2014). An ontological perspective on process. In F. Cooren, Eero Vaara, A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *Language and communication at work: Discourse, narrativity, and organizing* (pp. 197–218). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boje, D. M., Saylors, R., Svane, M. S., Hillon, Y. C., & Saylors, J. (2024a). Enabling a Turn Toward Relational Process Ontologies via Grounded Theory: Creating Theories that Perform Better Organizations. In *A World Scientific Encyclopedia of Business Storytelling Set 2: Methodologies and Big Data Analysis of Business Storytelling Volume 5: Business Storytelling and Grounding Methodology* **(pp. 13–47).**

Boje, D. M., Saylors, R., Svane, M. S., Hillon, Y. C., & Saylors, J. (2024b). There is No Ground and No Theory in Grounded Theory! Can We Create Both With Dialectic Ontology?. In *A World Scientific Encyclopedia of Business Storytelling Set 2: Methodologies and Big Data Analysis of Business Storytelling Volume 5: Business Storytelling and Grounding Methodology* (pp. 49-78).

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter. On the discursive limits of sex.* London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex.* London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2009). *Giving an account of oneself.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing gender.* New York & London: Routledge.

Burnell, D., Neubert, E., & Fisher, G. (2023). Venture tales: Practical storytelling strategies underpinning entrepreneurial narratives. *Business Horizons*, *66*(3), 325-346.

Cajete, G. (2000). *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers.

Chen, J. S., Elfenbein, D. W., Posen, H. E., & Wang, M. Z. (2022). Programs of Experimentation and Pivoting for (Overconfident) Entrepreneurs. Academy of Management Review. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers. cfm?abstract_id=3757801. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.3757801.

Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2012). Actor-network theory, ANTi-history and critical organizational historiography. *Organization*, *19*(6), 703-721.

Foster, W. M., Coraiola, D. M., Suddaby, R., Kroezen, J., & Chandler, D. (2017). The strategic use of historical narratives: A theoretical framework. *Business History, 59*(8), 1176-1200.

Foster, W. M., Coraiola, D., Trank, Ch., & Bastien, F. (2020). Unpacking organizational remembering. In K. Bruce (Ed.), *Handbook of research on management and organizational history* (pp. 256-274). Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Foster, W. M., Suddaby, R., Minkus, A., & Wiebe, E. (2011). History as social memory assets: The example of Tim Hortons. *Management & Organizational History, 6*(1), 101-120.

Garud, R., Schildt, H. A., & Lant, T. K. (2014). Entrepreneurial storytelling, future expectations, and the paradox of legitimacy. *Organization Science, 25*(5), 1479-1492. DOI: 10.1287/orsc.2014.0915.

Hampel, C. E., Tracey, P., & Weber, K. (2020). The art of the pivot: How new ventures manage identification relationships with stakeholders as they change direction. *Academy of Management Journal*, *63*(2), 440-471.

Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (2017). Toward a theory of using history authentically: Historicizing in the Carlsberg Group. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 62*(4), 657-697.

James, W. (1975). *Pragmatism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kirtley, J., & O'Mahony, S. (2020). What is a pivot? Explaining when and how entrepreneurial firms decide to make strategic change and pivot. *Strategic Management Journal, 44*(1), 197-230.

Love, T. R. (2017a). *Mana, Māori (Indigenous New Zealand) and critical studies of management in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Britannia Adelphi Hotel, Liverpool, United Kingdom: Critical Management Studies.

Love, T. R. (2017b). *Māori values, care and compassion in organisations: a research strategy*. Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, Denmark: European Group for Organizational Studies.

Love, T. R. (2018a). *Anteresearch in Indigenous Organization Studies*. In Gender, Work and Organization Conference, June 13-16, 2018.

Love, T. R. (2018b). *Organizing Indigenous-Māori Identities at Work*. In EGOS Colloquium, Tallinn, Estonia.

Love, T. R. (2019). *Indigenous Organization Studies: Exploring Management, Business and Community*. Cham: Springer.

Love, T. R., Finsterwalder, J., & Tombs, A. (2017). Māori knowledge and consumer tribes. *MAI Journal, 7*(1), 44-50.

Maclean, M., Harvey, C., Sillince, J. A., & Golant, B. D. (2014). Living up to the past? Ideological sensemaking in organizational transition. *Organization, 21*(4), 543-567.

McDonald, R., & Gao, C. (2019). Pivoting isn't enough? Managing strategic reorientation in new ventures. *Organization Science, 30*(6), 1289-1318.

McGaughey, S. L. (2013). Institutional entrepreneurship in North American lightning protection standards: Rhetorical history and unintended consequences of failure. *Business History, 55*(1), 73-97.

Pillai, S. D., Goldfarb, B., & Kirsch, D. A. (2020). The origins of firm strategy: Learning by economic experimentation and strategic pivots in the early automobile industry. *Strategic Management Journal, 41*(3), 369-399.

Popper, K. R. (2008). *After the open society: Selected social and political writings*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. R. (1963). *Conjectures and refutations*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. R. (1972). *Objective knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Popper, K. R. (1956). *Quantum theory and the schism in physics*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. R. (1959). *The logic of scientific discovery*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. R. (1994). *The myth of the framework: In defence of science and rationality*. London: Routledge.

Popper, K. (1978). *Three Worlds. The Tanner Lecture on Human Values*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.

Rosile, G.A., & Boje, D. M. (2002). Restorying and postmodern organization theatre: Consultation in the storytelling organization. In R. R. Sims (Ed.), *Changing the way we manage change* (pp. 271-290). London: Quorum Books.

Savall, H. (2010). *Work and people: An economic evaluation of job enrichment.* North Carolina: IAP.

Savall, H., & Zardet, V. (2008). *Mastering hidden costs and socio-economic performance.* IAP – Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Savall, H., & Zardet, V. (Eds.). (2011). *The qualimetrics approach: Observing the complex object.* North Carolina: IAP.

Saylors, R., & Saylors, J. (2014). Quantum Restorying of the Intentionality-Perception Process: Implications for Strategy Processes, Entrepreneurial Ideation, and Sustainability. In D. M. Boje, & T. L. Henderson (Eds.), *Being Quantum: Ontological Storytelling in the Age of Antenarrative.* Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Schneider, J. (2005). *Donna Haraway: live theory.* New York & London: Continuum.

Schultz, M., & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity. *Organization Science, 24*(1), 1-21.

Shiva, V. (2013). *Making peace with the Earth: Beyond resource and land wars.* New Delhi: Women Unlimited.

Shiva, V., & Opel, A. (2008). From water crisis to water culture. *Cultural Studies, 22*(3-4), 498-509.

Snihur, Y., & Clarysse, B. (2022). Sowing the seeds of failure: Organizational identity dynamics in new venture pivoting. *Journal of Business Venturing, 37*(1), 106-164.

Sternfeld, R. (1966). *Frege's logical theory.* SIU Press.

Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Trank, C. Q. (2010). Rhetorical history as a source of competitive advantage. In J. A. C. Baum, & J. Lampel (Eds.), *Globalization of strategy research*, Vol. 27 (pp. 147-173). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Suddaby, R., Israelsen, T., Bastien, F., Saylors, R., & Coraiola, D. (2023). Rhetorical history as institutional work. *Journal of Management Studies, 60*(1), 242-278.

Svane, M. (2018). Organizational-world creating: being-in-becoming. A quantum relational process philosophy. In *The Emerald handbook of quantum storytelling consulting* (pp. 245-279). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Trafimow, D. (2023). A new way to think about internal and external validity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 18*(5), 1028-1046.

Trafimow, D. (2014). Considering quantitative and qualitative issues together. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 11*(1), 15-24.

Trafimow, D. (2017). Five nonobvious changes in editorial practice for editors and reviewers to consider when evaluating submissions in a post p <. 05 universe. *The American Statistician, 73*(1), 340-345.

Trafimow, D. (2009). The theory of reasoned action: A case study of falsification in psychology. *Theory & Psychology, 19*(4), 501-518.

TwoTrees, K. S. (2000). Seven directions practice: A practice for the crossroads. *The Fourth, 92*.CRENet.

TwoTrees, K. S., & Kolan, M. (2016). The trees are breathing us: an indigenous view of relationship in nature and business. In G. A. Rosile (Ed.), *Tribal Wisdom for Business Ethics* (pp. 211-222). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Weick, K. E. (1979). Cognitive processes in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *1*(1), 41-74.

Weick, K. E. (2012). Organized sensemaking: A commentary on processes of interpretive work. *Human Relations*, *65*(1), 141-153.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3). Sage.

Ybema, S. (2014). The invention of transitions: History as a symbolic site for discursive struggles over organizational change. *Organization*, *21*(4), 495-513.