Chapter 14

Demystifying the Mainstream: Moving from Theories to Stories

Adewumi Kehinde Christopher 🆔
Durban University of Technology

Abstract

Africa, as we have it today, is a direct implication of the researches of the past. Likewise, the future of Africa depends on the quality and relevance of current researches and innovations in education and society. However, in recent years, researchers such as Clegg (2012), Hammond (2018) and Wood, Phan and Wright (2018) have problematized the contemporary relevance and usage of theories in researches. Oftentimes, the impact and understandability of an idea are sacrificed at the altar of theorizing. In such cases, theories and structures are given more attention than the potential impact and contribution of the researcher's idea. Are theories truly problematic? How do we reconcile the place of theory in contemporary researches and education? How can theorizing be rid of its abstractive tendencies? How can theorizing be decolonized? What are the alternatives to the mainstream approach to theorizing? All these are the questions this chapter seeks to raise and attempt to answer. The argument in this chapter shall be based on Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's ideas on storytelling and Sir Ken Robinson's ideas on seeking creativity as an alternative to rigid adherence to a standardized curriculum.

1.   Introduction

This chapter is not against theories. It is important to point out that theories are the lenses through which researchers view different phenomena. Much of the work done in higher education is dependent on theories (Rasmussen, 2017). With theories, complex issues in the world are better understood (Goodson, 2010). Theories help researchers sort information in order of relevance to the overall aim of academic exercises. Theories help in making sense of observed patterns. Social theories, for instance, offer fresh perspectives and explanations in the understanding of social structures and observed social occurrences. Through feminist theory structures and notions of inequality and injustices along the lines of gender are better recognised and perhaps comprehended. Theories enable critical thinking and the in-depth analysis of social norms or abnormalities (Rasmussen, 2017). The application of theoretical perspectives to phenomena provokes the need to re-think and question established structures. From simple theories such as common-sense or conspiracy theories to more complex scientific theories, most theoretical explanations seek to create meaning and make sense of reality (Goodson, 2010).

While the importance of theories to the explanation and comprehension of phenomena is apparent, how then does one define and use theory? Theory as an entity has always evaded different scholars' attempts at a simplified, one-dimensional definition and summation (Hoffman, 2003). This has resulted in a proliferation of definitions (Denzin, 1986; Cohen, 1989; Moore, 1991; Coleman, 1994; Goodson, 2010; Turner, 2013; Craib, 2015; Lemert, 2017; Collins & Stockton, 2018), often specific to disciplines and contexts. For instance, film theory seeks to identify and solve problems within the domain of cinema (Bordwell & Carroll, 1996). The multifaceted dimensions of theory, which are both the implication and evidence of its intricate complexity (Hoffman, 2003), have constantly impacted students' recognition and proper usage of theories in their writings. The different proliferation of theories, especially in the social sciences, offer little

understanding and consensus on what determines a strong or weak theory or even what a theory is (Sutton & Staw, 1995). Consequently, theory becomes a familiar term, yet obscure and dreaded.

The misguided tendencies of theories are nicely captured in the opening statement of Rasmussen's (2017) seminal chapter on the *Role of Theory in Research*. She writes: "Theory is a word that is evocative. It evokes confusion, frustration, trepidation, discomfort, shame, joy, disorientation, invention, and derision. At times researchers will likely experience all of the above in regard to theory" (p. 53). Having painted such a troubling picture with which most researchers are familiar, she then explains that the confusion is part of the 'joyful' process of applying theories to a problem. Like Rasmussen, Hoffman (2003) also thinks theory is 'beautiful' and its beauty lies in its complexity.

From a different perspective, Hammond (2018) admits that theories and their understanding and use can be confusing. Such confusion became even more troubling for Hammond when he received a reviewer's comment on an article saying, "an interesting paper but not sufficiently theoretical" (para. 1). A student was also quoted by Kiley (2015) as saying "people kept asking me about my theoretical perspective but I didn't have a clue what they were talking about" (p. 57). The abstract nature of theories and theorists' explanations of their ideas often presents higher education students with the wrong idea about academic writing. Theorists such as Foucault have been accused of such abstractive tendencies in their explanations (Silvestri, 2022). In a discussion with Shatz (2020), Michael Wood talked about an encounter he once had with a student to illustrate some academics' love for obscurity and abstraction when dealing with theories:

> "I had a student at Columbia...a very clever guy who was a movie editor and worked on the *Exorcist*. He was writing an M.A. thesis about Joseph Conrad and he wrote about eighty or ninety pages full of about every jargon he could find. I read it then I said to him 'do you understand this?' and he said, 'no, I don't, but I thought you had to write

like that.' I suggested he should write so that he and I can understand, then we can take it from there." (5:48).

In the hysterical laughter that accompanied Shatz's (2020) final advice to the student, the ridiculousness of the obscurity and abstractness displayed in most mainstream theoretical accounts was particularly illustrated. In a sense, some students' inability to properly account for the theoretical bases of their works can be a result of laziness in terms of critical thinking and in-depth analysis. That being said, another way to look at the matter would be to assume that some theories, in themselves, are unnecessary, overused, or distracting altogether.

In their article, *Against Theory*, Knapp and Michaels (1982) challenged the place of theory in clarifying authorial intentions from the beliefs based on texts. In their opinion, theory is rather useless in such an exercise because both the author's intentions and the texts are one and the same. Thereafter, Knapp and Michaels (1982) proposed, rather boldly, that if they were right in their argument on the uselessness of theory in literary criticism and discourse, "then the whole enterprise of critical theory is misguided and should be abandoned" (p. 724). While judging whether their argument is valid is not the aim of this chapter, it offers an interesting grist for my argument here. This chapter seeks to answer a few questions: Are theories truly problematic? If they are, how do we then reconcile the place of theory in contemporary research and higher education? I shall answer these questions, especially the latter, by proposing an alignment with the tenets of Post-Theory.

Before I make this proposal, it is important to attempt to proffer an answer to the first question. The answer is quite simple: Yes, theories are problematic, at least I think so. The major problem of theory is its abstractive tendencies (O'Connor, 1969), which sometimes are further complicated, over-ciphered, and drastically stylised by some theorists' or academics' displays of linguistic dexterity. The second problem identified in this chapter is theory's tendency to

exclude certain realities in its accounts in order to maintain the neatness of its postulations. These shall be discussed further in the chapter.

Further in the case against theory, in their article *What Theory is Not*, Sutton and Staw (1995) identify a few problems with theory. They argue that "lack of consensus on exactly what theory is may explain why it is so difficult to develop strong theory in the behavioural science" (p. 372). This, perhaps, is why reviewers and editors react differently and hold different beliefs about the same iteration of theory. Another problem with theory in the authors' account is the contradictions in the process of building theory further problematise the use and comprehension of theory. Even the use of the word 'theory' is excessive and diverse, thereby perpetrating obscurity rather than fostering understanding (Merton, 1967). Nonetheless, it is worthy of note that the problematic nature of theory has prompted scholars to activate a process of re-thinking and re-assessment of the place of theory in higher education to discern whether it truly helps or distracts (Knapp & Michaels, 1982).

Such a process of re-thinking, for instance, accompanied the collaboration between the fields of humanities and medicine. The need for more humane medical practices meant that practitioners sought an alternative to strict adherence to pure biomedical theoretical frameworks. The unilateral focus on technology and biomedicine dehumanised the practice of medicine. As Bates (2014) puts it, "the patient was understood only in terms of cells, germs, and snapshots of body parts. This type of medical knowledge apparently dehumanised doctors who increasingly saw patients as objects rather than subjects" (p. 9). The alignment with the humanities—the arts, social sciences, and behavioural sciences—provided a solution to such scientific objectification of patients.

2.   Post-Theory: A Very Short Introduction

I find the Oxford University Press's *Very Short Introduction* series useful here as I do not intend to offer all that there is

to know about Post-Theory. My plunge into Post-Theory here is a means to an end—the end being to postulate that stories that illuminate the human exceptions to neatly packaged theoretical explanations should be given a chance in theoretical constructions.

To the disappointment of many young researchers in higher education, post-theory is not necessarily the end of the reign of theory, which "boomed" in the 1960s (Hunter, 2006, p. 79). It, however, illuminates and often advocates for the transformational modifications happening to the mainstream theories. Post-Theory itself is a theory—for to argue against the mainstream theory is to put forward an alternative idea, in other words another theory. This reminds me of Tredell's (1984) notion that "You can appear to invalidate a case against theory by arguing that such a case is itself theoretically based" (p. 28) Post-theory is a response to the perceived inadequacies of mainstream theories to communicate and capture the mind of thinkers and the realities of changing times (Tredell, 1984). So, in a way, different disciplines (and by extension, their theorists) have their particular opinions and propositions on the ideas to embrace as a progression from mainstream theory.

In film studies, like many similar thinkers, Carroll (1996) agrees with the notion that theory in its original form has outlived its usefulness. "For even if theory is dead", he says, "one wonders whether theorising about film has a future" (p. 38). Carroll (1996) writes that film studies have "squandered what may turn out to have been a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity by effectively stifling debate between theory and alternative paradigms" (p. 68) As a proposal for the Post-Mainstream Film Theory, Carroll prescribes a dialectical consciousness in film studies as the only way forward from the imminent demise of film theory. The focus and considerations of film theorists should not be single-edged but double-edged or multi-edged if you like.

"Film theorising…should be piecemeal. But it should also be diversified. Insofar as theorists approach film from many different angles, from different levels of abstraction

and generality, they will have to avail themselves of multidisciplinary frameworks. Some questions about film may send the researcher toward economics, while others require a look into perceptual psychology. In other instances, sociology, political science, anthropology... Film theorising should be interdisciplinary. It should be pursued without the expectation of discovering a unified theory, cinematic or otherwise. That is, it should be catholic about the methodological frameworks it explores." (Carroll, 1996, p. 40).

Similarly, despite Spinney's (2022) scepticism about the move from mainstream scientific theories towards post-theory, in her article titled *Are We Witnessing the Dawn of Post-theory Science?* she recognises the gradual change happening to scientific theories. An example of such is Isaac Newton's law of gravity by the arrival of machine learning tools that "predict your preferences better than any psychologist" (para. 2). As a result, the classic scientific method of hypothesising, predicting and testing, is being challenged and relegated to the backstage.

With so much clarity, Tredell (1984) announces literature's exodus into the age of post-theory in his article titled *Post-Theory*:

> "...it seems to me that the triumph of theory is illusory; that the expansion of theory is on the point of bringing about its downfall. The proliferation of theoretical options and the increasingly obvious weakness of their claims to knowledge is leading to the crisis, not in literary studies, but in theory. This may be temporarily disguised by the institutionalisation of theory in the academy, but as far as literature is concerned, we are entering an age of post-theory." (p. 28).

One would expect that since Tredell made this announcement in 1984 mainstream theoretical discourses in literature would have been rid of their perceived rigidity and one-dimensionality by now. But this is not the case. We must now take a decisive step to embrace and explore the alternative paradigms Carroll suggested. In the age after theory,

unconventional and under-represented forms of data in theoretical discourses, which Muthukrishna and Henrich (2019) categorise in their abstract as "personal intuitions and culturally biased folk theories" (p. 1), should be given a fair chance.

Art, emotions, self-expression, cultural beliefs and distinctive experiences should be given a chance. To totally disarm and defang the abstractive tendencies of theories, personal (or unusual) stories, which sometimes are the exceptions to carefully explained theories, should be given a chance as a form of post-theory. To clearly argue and proffer an explanation of how South African women are affected by the generalised notion of sexuality, for instance, the account of the young girl who was raised by a single mother in the suburbs of Limpopo should not be ignored. When such distinctive voices are given a chance in theoretical explanations, then theory stands a chance of being rid of its strangeness, exclusivity, and abstraction.

When we speak of contemporary art, we refer mainly to a Western construct, but there is also contemporary art in Africa. The term 'contemporary African art' then refers to the practice of contemporary art in Africa. Contrary to different opinions about identity politics and the underlying intention of othering the art and artists from and in Africa, I believe that the term contemporary African art or African art is major an essential identity marker. The moment we say 'contemporary art' without such an identity marker, then Africa is forgotten from the equation. This is simply because contemporary art originated from the West. This is also the case with theory. The formal construction and application of theory are also of Western emanation (Bordwell & Carroll, 1996; Hunter, 2006). For us to properly account for the presence of theory in the context of African higher education and research, we may need to give due attention to the African peculiarities which are often embedded in our stories. To further reinforce this stance, I suspect that what constitutes the nitty-gritty of feminist discourse in France will be different from that in South Africa or any part of Africa.

Let me add here that what I am proposing is simply a focus on stories and their intrinsicality. Usually, when mention is made of stories, one or two of the few thoughts that come to mind are: 'Isn't that simply narrative inquiry?' or 'are we not just referring to phenomenology?' I honestly think there are no simple answers to these questions. While stories and people's lived experiences are common to both narrative inquiry and phenomenology (Clandinin & Caine, 2008; Randles, 2012; Kim, 2015; Van Manen, 2017; Ford, 2020), attaching such theoretical labels to the appreciation of stories is risking a retrogression back to the abstractive and structural crises that accompany mainstream theory. That way, we give the power back to theory and not the truth. My worry is that as academic researchers, we sometimes filter these stories through the tiny holes created in our theories. In the process, some parts of the subject's experiences are judged useless as they cannot fit into our prearranged theoretical moulds. The question is: to what end do we engage in research? To unravel the truth; for social impact; for theoretical affirmations; or for PhD degrees?

It is necessary, at this point, to turn to Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's (2021) ideas on storytelling as an alternative to the idolatry of theory. Before that, it is important to note that although my proposition here is mainly couched in the arts and humanities, it also carries with it some interdisciplinary consequences.

3.   Storytelling as Reinforcement of Theory

In February 2022, six months after the Taliban took over power in Afghanistan, VICE News published a documentary by Yeung (2022) on its YouTube channel. The documentary explores the state of women's rights in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan. Despite the obvious fact that women are rarely seen in public, and the billboards carrying women's images have been blacked out, the Taliban government[1] seems determined to put forward and defend the idea that women are happy, women are safe,

---

1   You can also refer to it as 'the Taliban men' as the government is constituted by men alone.

and their rights are secure under the Taliban. When Iftikhar Samilluh, the Taliban judge in Wardak Province was asked about the nature of cases women bring to his court, his answer reads (as cited in Yeung, 2022):

> "Women's issues don't come up too often because there are no problems. Women's rights are protected…Two days ago we received a case. It was an issue between a husband and wife. When we listened, there was no real issue between them. I solved the problem and she left. Now, she is living a peaceful life." (7:28).

Two separate accounts of two women, representing several other cases of women's abuse in Taliban-ruled Afghanistan, challenge the Taliban's claim that women are happy and living peacefully with their rights properly protected. The first case was referenced by Judge Iftikhar above. The woman's brother, Bismillah[2], who had been jailed so as to coerce his family to accept the ruling of the Taliban court over his sister's case, told a different story to Yeung (2022). His sister Miriam[3] and her husband Abdullah[4] have been married for several years. They have seven children together but Abdullah has been violent. He beats her till she is hospitalised with several broken bones. Abdullah married another woman and kicked Miriam out of their home.

At the time, the Afghan government was still in power. She went to court seeking a divorce in Kabul. Several witnesses corroborated her story and the judge ruled that the couple be separated. But Abdullah did not want the separation, so he fled to the Wardak Province where he could not be forced to sign the divorce papers. He joined the Taliban, and then filed a complaint against his wife. Miriam was summoned and Judge Iftikhar presided over the case. The judge, not believing her story, ordered that the Taliban takes Miriam back to her husband's house where the violent abuse continued. This time, Miriam's skull was broken. In the words of Judge Iftikhar

---

2   A pseudonym
3   A pseudonym
4   A pseudonym

"the accuser demanded a divorce because she was beaten. There weren't any witnesses of the beatings … He took an oath saying that he didn't beat her and that was the end of the case" (20:32). The oath of Abdullah was upheld by the court against the testimony of Miriam which was corroborated by X-rays of her broken bones.

Twenty-two-year-old Fatimah[5] is another victim of violence and abuse in Afghanistan. Fatimah, who is from an area where the Taliban had been in control for over ten years now, hides in a shelter for women who have been victims of abuse and violence. As she has no other place to run to, Fatimah has lived in the shelter for four years. Fatimah lost her parents at the tender age of one-and-a-half years and was left with her step-brothers. At age seven, her brothers gave her out in marriage to an 80-year-old man who needed someone to bear him a son. He paid $526 and 120 sheep to Fatimah's brothers as dowry.

Fatimah's violent husband started beating her for her inability to bear a son for him. The repeated beating and rape got Fatimah admitted to the hospital. Her husband, who would not pay the hospital bill, fled. Fatimah's brothers re-married her to someone else (another abusive man). When her first husband returned, he was furious. He accused Fatimah of adultery and reported her to the Taliban court. Fatimah was sentenced to death by stoning. "They wanted other women to see me dead and deter them from going to the government," Fatimah laments, "they called and said they were going to stone me. Later on, a judge whom I can't name helped me … Now that they are here, I don't know what to do" (17:24). The stories of Miriam and Fatimah are the exceptions to the carefully constructed idea that women's rights are protected under the Taliban rule in Afghanistan.

This is why Chimamanda Ngozie Adichie, a writer and storyteller from Nigeria, calls for more focus on stories instead of theories. In her lecture titled *Idolatry of theory: a defence of storytelling* at the University of Cape Town's second Vice-

---

5   A pseudonym

Chancellor's Open Lecture for the year 2021,[6] Adichie (2021) argues that personal experiences should be respected and appreciated when dealing with theory. Unfortunately, this is often not the case. For "we are often afraid to run afoul of theory" she says, whereas "we should be afraid to run afoul of truth" (10:58). For the Taliban, it is important to maintain the front that women are safe in Afghanistan under their new rulership; whether that goes contrary to the truth evidenced in Miriam's and Fatimah's stories or not. Under the scrutiny of the entire world, this is perhaps a way to show that theirs is a better and preferred government. Therefore, all such stories that contradict their claims, or theory if you like, have to be suppressed at all costs.

During Adichie's (2021) lecture, she notes that it is often the case that we reject any ideas that interrupt our neatly concluded and accepted theory. Although she recognises that theory is important as it "gives us a framework to think about the world," she warns that "we should not give it primacy. Because when we do, we start to walk backwards. We go from theory to life. We start with theory and we try to make life fit our theory" (11:46). Life is messy. Stories illuminate the messiness of and the differences in human existence. Instead of embracing this reality, we often "try to make ... life, fit into the neat and tidy confines of theory. And when life doesn't fit perfectly, we silence those bits that stick out. We pretend they are not there" (12:03). Just as the Taliban Judge ignored Miriam's rights and cries for help, "we look away because we must preserve the sanctity of theory. And so, we give to theory an exaggerated and uncritical reverence" (12:21).

To reinforce theories with stories is to "look back in other to look ahead" (Chawla, 2007, p. 26). This call for more stories is not oblivious to the fact that there are stories in the form of theories and theories in the form of stories. That is, the notion of theories as stories and stories as theories is not new

---

6   The lecture is available on University of Cape Town's YouTube Channel at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y4ixkKuYenE&t=2615s.

(a good example is Arthur's (1995) *The Wounded Storyteller*). But they remain an "uncommon approach to theoretical thinking" (Goodson, 2010, p. xiii). In fact, Goodson (2010) concludes that "theories are stories" (p. 11). Goodson arrived at this conclusion after he had accounted for the narrative and phenomenological propensities of theories to explain events "logically and meaningfully, often following narrative structures." This reinforces the symbiotic relationship between theories and stories and how stories are viable collaborators in the theorisation process. Demonstrating the particular role and impact of stories and lived experiences in the creation of theories, Hooks (1991) writes:

> I am grateful to the many women and men who dare to create theory from the location of pain and struggle, who courageously expose wounds to give us their experience to teach and guide, as a means to chart new theoretical journeys. Their work is liberatory. (p. 11).

Beyond theory, stories teach in a more personal way. Thus, theoretical and ideological underpinnings often emerge from stories told by community actors and the participants of history (Chawla, 2007). While it has been evidenced that stories play a part in the explanations and creation of some theories (Kim, 2015) it is however important to further stress the need for the reinforcement of theories with stories. The increasingly abstractive nature of theory, which "leaves a reader more rather than less confused about how to write a paper that contains strong theory" (Sutton & Staw, 1995, p. 371) is one of the reasons why the reiteration of the need for stories is important. In the preface to *Theory in Health Promotion Research and Practice: Thinking Outside the Box*, Goodson (2010) concedes that "theory can be a horribly abstract and unattractive topic" (p. xi). Stories are about meaning-making. Stories help to create "experienced meaning" as opposed to "abstract meanings" (O'Connor, 1969, p. 69). Thus, you tell a story when a statement or theoretical explanation would be inadequate to communicate meaning or would not help to fully experience that meaning (O'Connor, 1969).

A second reason to reiterate the need for stories in the reinforcement of theory is illustrated by Chawla (2007). In her article *Between Stories and Theories*, Chalwa (2007) demonstrates the constraints of the mainstream and its demand for the theorisation of stories, by acting as gatekeepers to the derivatives and implications of stories. The need to theorise and "operationalize" (p. 25) lived experiences seem to be more paramount than the stories being told or the storyteller. Faced with such constraints, Chawla adopts narrative theory in interrogating her participants because this was closest to what she desired. She longed to satisfy both divides. On one hand, she desired to account for the undiluted and uninterrupted narration of the Indian women who had experienced arranged marriages. Such personal narrations of lived experiences in the construction of theories have been described as a "fundamental cognitive process, which is crucial to the interpretation and reconstitution of cultural, social and personal reality" (Sinclair, 2005, p. 56). On the other hand, Chawla (2007) needed to satisfy the mainstream academic demand for the inclusion of formal theories in research. For her, narrative theory was the closest theoretical frame to resolving her dilemma.

The need to focus on stories and not force situations to fit into established theoretical models is one of the major propellers of the interdisciplinary alliance between the humanities and the medical discipline (Bates, 2014; Macnaughton, 2014). In dismantling the established or nuanced rigidity of the medical discipline, it has become evident that for far too long patients have been excluded from the treatment process. Patients are treated as objects of science and not as subjects with feelings, emotions, experiences, history, and identities (Bates, 2014). Their persona is often ignored in the process of healing as they get pulled and poked; just a bit higher than the relationship that exists between science and cadavers.

Nonetheless, Macnaughton (2014) thinks the alliance between medicine and the humanities has the capacity to turn this situation around. Her perspective on the matter is that

such change can and should be fostered through conversations with clinical scientists (and patients) in unconventional ways. Similar to the alternative paradigms prescribed by Carroll (1996), such conversations should be based on understandings that are conventionally alien to hospital spaces; "understandings that underpin individual experience" (Macnaughton, 2014, p. 31). Stories are a good source of such understanding.

Through the personal accounts of the women from Khayelitsha in South Africa who were HIV positive, the need for better and clearer communication between healthcare workers and their patients becomes evident. Because patients are often vulnerable and are at the shorter end of the power dynamic in a doctor-patient relationship, they are often at the mercy of the doctors' 'professional instructions', however abstract and ciphered that is. Vasquez (2004) narrates the story of Nwabisa, who is HIV-positive. She was pregnant while living with HIV. She had been told that her baby stands the risk of contracting the virus if she breastfeeds. Confronted with this difficult task, Nwabisa[7] in Vasquez (2004) explains:

> "...it was not so easy for me not to breastfeed ... When I went to Site B clinic to get my baby, maybe they saw to my folder that I'm HIV positive then the nurses forced me to get out of the bed then they forced me to breastfeed my child. I was confused because when they diagnosed my status they told me at the clinic that I will get the free formulas and I mustn't breastfeed my child because I can then give my child my HIV. It was very sad to me but I listened to those nurses and just did that." (p. 9).

If only the instructions given to Nwabisa were clearer and less abstract, her baby would have stayed HIV-negative. If only she was not so powerless and vulnerable in her relationship with the healthcare givers, perhaps she would have been

---

7   As cited in Vasquez (2004:9). The author has deliberately presented the Nwabisa's account as she said it with minimal editorial modifications. Hence the grammatical and structural inconsistencies in her account.

able to seek more clarity on her confusion. How about we change things a bit? Let us begin with the small stuff such as conversations instead of instructions; subjectivity instead of objectivity; clarity and simplicity instead of abstractions and ambiguities; and stories in addition to theories.

Two major issues have been raised against theory here: one is that theory can be too abstract and so it evades clarity and understanding. Secondly, that theory sometimes does not always give a true representation of lived realities. I reiterate that this chapter is not against theory, as theories are clearly important to higher education. However, theories are textual framings of events, lived experiences and ideas; sometimes removed from reality and often bereft of their humanity (Chawla 2007). They are often an obscure retelling of the actual story. Nonetheless, to quote Adichie (2021), "If we allow ourselves to be guided too closely by theory, we will end up being blinded by theory" (12:38).

References

Adichie, C. N. (2009, October 7). The danger of a single story [Video]. YouTube. https://www.ted.com/talks/ chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_ single_story/transcript.

Adichie, C. N. (2021, July 28). *Idolatry of theory: A defence of storytelling* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/ watch?v=y4ixkKuYenE&t=2615s.

Arthur, F. W. (1995). *The wounded storyteller: Body, illness and ethics* (2nd ed.). The University of Chicago Press. https://doi. org/10.1038/nm0196-98

Bates, V. (2014). Being human. In J. Holden, J. Kieffer, J. Newbigin, & S. Wright (Eds.), *Where does it hurt: The new world of the medical humanities* (pp. 8-11). Wellcome Trust. https:// www.wellcomecollection.org/wheredoesithurt.

Bordwell, D., & Carroll, N. (1996). *Post-theory: Reconstructing film studies.* The University of Wisconsin Press.

Carroll, N. (1996). Prospects for film theory: A personal assessment. In D. Bordwell, & N. Carroll (Eds.), *Post-theory: reconstructing film studies* (pp.37–68). The University of   Wisconsin Press.

Chawla, D. (2007). Between stories and theories: Embodiments, disembodiments, and other struggles. Storytelling, Self, Society. *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Storytelling Studies*, 3(1), 16–30. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15505340sss0301_2

Clandinin, D., & Caine, V. (2008). Narrative inquiry. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The sage   encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 542–545). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n275

Cohen, B. P. (1989). *Developing sociological knowledge: Theory and method.* Nelson–Hall.

Coleman, J. S. (1994). *Foundations of social theory.* Harvard University Press.

Collins, C. S., & Stockton, C. M. (2018). The central role of theory in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 17(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918797475

Craib, I. (2015). *Modern social theory.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315656502

Denzin, N. K. (1986). Postmodern social theory. *Sociological Theory*, 4(2), 194–204. https://doi.org/10.2307/201888

Ford, E. (2020). Tell me your story: narrative inquiry in LIS research. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(2), 235. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.2.235.

Goodson, P. (2010). *Theory in health promotion research and practice: Thinking outside the box.* Jones & Bartlett Publishers.

Hammond, M. (2018) 'An interesting paper but not sufficiently theoretical': What does theorising in social research look like? *Methodological Innovations,* 11(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2059799118787756.

Hoffman, M. (2003). Constructing a complex world: The frontiers of international relations theory and foreign policy-making. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 11(3), 37 – 57. https://doi.org/10.1080/02185370308434226.

Hooks, B. (1991). Theory as liberatory practice. *Yale Journal of Law & Feminism,* 4, 1–12. http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yjlf/vol4/iss1/2.

Hunter, I. (2006). The history of theory. *Critical Inquiry,* 33(1) 78-112. https://doi.org/10.1086/509747.

Kiley, M. (2015). 'I didn't have a clue what they were talking about': PhD candidates and theory. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 52(1): 52–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.981835.

Kim, J. H. (2015). *Understanding narrative inquiry: The crafting and analysis of stories as research.* Sage publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071802861

Knapp, S., & Michaels, W. B. (1982). Against theory. *Critical Inquiry,* 8(4), 723–742. https://doi.org/10.1086/448178

Lemert, C. (Ed.). (2017). *Social theory: The multicultural, global, and classic readings* (6th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494635.

Macnaughton, J. (2014). 'Take a deep breath…'. In J. Holden, J. Kieffer, J. Newbigin, & S. Wright (Eds.), *Where does it hurt: The new world of the medical humanities* (pp. 28- 31). Wellcome Trust. https://ugc.futurelearn.com/uploads/files/22/c9/22c964eb-3fa2-40d0-916b-85e391c43c9d/Take_a_deep_breath_Jane_Macnaughton_pp._28-31_-_Where_does_it_hurt.pdf.

Merton, R. K. (1967). *On theoretical sociology.* Free Press.

Moore, M. G. (1991). Editorial: Distance education theory. *The American Journal of Distance Education.* 5(3), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923649109526758

Muthukrishna, M., & Henrich, J. (2019). A problem in theory. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3(3), 221–229. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0522-1.

O'Connor, F. (1969) Writing short stories. In S. Fitzgerald, & R. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Mystery and manners.* Straws and Giroux.

Randles, C. (2012). Phenomenology: A review of the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education,* 30(2), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123312436988.

Rasmussen, L. M. (2017) Role of theory in research. In D. Wyse, N. Selwyn, E. Smith, & L. E. Suter (Eds.), *The BERA/SAGE handbook for educational research* (pp. 53-71). SAGE Reference and British Educational Research Association.

Shatz, A. (Host). (2020, May 12). The theory truce [Audio podcast episode]. *LRB Podcast.* https://podcastaddict.com/episode/108675943.

Silvestri, F. (2022). Between madness and literature by Michel Foucault from a philosophical point of view of language. In A. V. Azcárate (Ed.), *Mind and matter: Challenges and opportunities in cognitive semiotics and aesthetics* (pp. 165-179). IntechOpen. https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.100358

Sinclair, J. (2005). The impact of stories. *The Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management,* 3(1), 53-64. http://www.ejkm.com.

Spinney, L. (2022, January 9) Are we witnessing the dawn of post-theory science? *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/jan/09/are-we-witnessing-the-dawn-of-post-theory-science.

Sutton, R. I., & Staw, B. M. (1995). What theory is not. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(3), 371-384. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393788.

Tredell, N. (1984). Post-theory. *PN Review*, 11(3), 28. https://www.proquest.com/openview/45a2f5f6b804b562d58776b8a7af01c5/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=1817849.

Turner, J. H. (2013). *Contemporary sociological theory*. SAGE Publications.

Van Manen, M. (2017). But is it phenomenology?. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 775-779. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732317699570

Vasquez, G. (2004). *Body perceptions of HIV and AIDs: The memory box project.* Centre for Social Science Research, University of Cape Town. http://www.cssr.uct.ac.za/cssr/publications/working-paper/2004/body-perceptions-hiv-and-aids-memory-box-project.

Yeung, I. (2022, February 13). *Life in the Taliban's Afghanistan* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iIFi_Rgm-T8.