

It's About Time: Catching Method Up to Meaning—The Usefulness of Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration Research

As a form of interpretive research, narrative inquiry contributes to the pursuit of high-quality public administration scholarship, along with other forms of explanatory research that have dominated the field. In this article we discuss the unique features of narrative inquiry, review how this research orientation has been used in public administration, and use our experience with a national, multimodal, multiyear research project on social-change leadership in the United States to identify and illustrate the contributions of narrative inquiry to address two key issues in the field: the concern with good research and the aspiration to cultivate a meaningful connection between researchers and practitioners in the field.

Stories are compelling. When someone tells us a story about his or her experience, we become alert, tuned in, curious. But this is not the only reason—perhaps not even a good reason—we might want to use stories as the basis of public administration scholarship. It is because stories contain within them knowledge that is different from what we might tap into when we do surveys, collect and analyze statistics, or even draw on interview data that do not explicitly elicit stories with characters, a plot, and development toward a resolution. For researchers of social life, narratives not only help to explore issues such as personal identity, life-course development, and the cultural and historical worlds of narrators, they also help to explore specific phenomena, such as leadership and organizational change, and how they are experienced by social actors.

Over the past decades, scholars have increasingly used narratives to enhance their understanding of diverse experiences and their meanings. In the humanities, the social sciences, and applied fields (such as law and public administration), scholars have used narratives to move beyond efforts to describe a universalized, orderly social world and to put themselves in touch with “local knowledges,” or aspects of experience that are unique to specific contexts and tell us something important about the human condition. In the process, scholarly fields have taken a “nar-

rative turn” that directs attention to questions about what it means to interpret and experience the world (rather than explain or predict it), both from the perspective of scholars and the people they study.

Public administration and related fields such as policy, planning, and public management have not been absent from these developments. The narrative turn in public administration has contributed to the theoretical and methodological development of the field by encouraging scholars to explore and highlight the multidimensional aspects of public institutions and their administrative and policy problems. Despite the richness of this emerging work, its logic is still not widely understood (White 1999), and the inroads that have been made so far are limited. As White (1999) con-

Sonia M. Ospina is an associate professor of public management and policy and codirector of the Research Center for Leadership in Action at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, New York University. Her research interests include organizational and management theory; leadership in public contexts; public management reform, governance, and collaborative problem solving in public service in the United States and Latin America; and diversity in public service and human resources management. **E-mail:** sonia.ospina@nyu.edu.

Jennifer Dodge is a research associate at the Research Center for Leadership in Action and a doctoral candidate at the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service at New York University. Her research interests include public and nonprofit management, leadership in public contexts, public participation in policy making in the United States, and environmental and anti-poverty policy. **E-mail:** jed234@nyu.edu.

vincingly argues, public administration and closely related applied fields continue to aspire to build an inquiry tradition that favors explanation over interpretation and understanding, despite the fact that even basic disciplines such as economics, sociology, and political science have increasingly turned to narrative to address the limits of traditional explanatory social science. The theoretical frames, tools, and products of narrative inquiry have stayed in the margins of the research and teaching practices that socialize members into the field, to our own detriment.

A greater turn to narrative inquiry—a theoretical approach with its own methodological tools—will help to strengthen the field of public administration in important ways. We start to develop this argument here and will continue to do so over the course of two other articles that will appear in future issues of *PAR*. We do so from our position as organization and management scholars engaged in research on leadership for social change, and thus as active members of a broadly defined public administration community of practice. Our argument explores the usefulness and promise of narrative inquiry for addressing two key preoccupations in the field: the challenge of doing high-quality scholarship, and the challenge of cultivating authentic connectedness between academicians and practitioners in the field. Our contribution is to call attention to a moment in time in social science and administrative research when narrative inquiry has gained momentum as an important approach to public administration research.

This first article sets the stage for the series by showing the development of the narrative turn in public administration and related applied fields, as well as disciplines such as political science, organization and management theory, and even economics. The heart of the article focuses on how and why narrative inquiry has been used in public administration and how its further development and proliferation holds promise for strengthening the field. In the second article, we will turn to the methodological issues associated with doing narrative research, thus addressing in depth the field's concern with quality research. We will conclude the series with a third article exploring in depth the promise that narrative inquiry holds for helping to reduce the academician–practitioner split.

The structure of this article is as follows: We briefly define narrative inquiry and then offer an overview of the dramatic shift in research known as the narrative turn. We explore the reasons for these developments, their influence in public administration, and the obstacles encountered to fully embrace this turn in our field. We then briefly tell our research story and use it to discuss the contributions of narrative inquiry for public administration, exploring first its potential to strengthen research and then its potential to engage academicians and practitioners in dialogue. We will take you far enough into our story so that you can under-

stand the choices we have made, and to locate it in a broader context to suggest the ways in which narrative inquiry has potential for the field. We then conclude with the argument that fully embracing the narrative turn in public administration offers the promise of a more pluralistic, and thus even stronger, field.

Introducing Narrative Inquiry

Our story began with a research challenge to develop new insights about leadership. The sponsor of our project was launching an awards program to recognize and support social-change leaders in the United States because they saw a disconnect between what the public perceived as a lack of leadership in this country and the reality of successful leadership on the ground. A research agenda, they thought, could help to develop a new understanding of leadership that would encourage people to recognize that leadership abounds. Our mandate was to use the leadership program to develop and implement such an agenda. We thus entered our project full of questions that would influence the direction of our work: How, as researchers, could we contribute to changing the conversation about leadership in this country? Could our research reveal anything new about leadership? Would research about leadership taking place in social-change nonprofits, where the program participants worked, uncover new insights?'

This paragraph represents the beginning of a story whose plot becomes thick and full of twists, and whose characters engaged in complex interactions and negotiations around a national, multimodal, multiyear participatory research project.² It is not possible, nor appropriate, to tell the full story in this article. Yet, because we honor stories as a valuable way to understand ourselves in the world, we will use portions of our story to illustrate the arguments we want to advance.

Narrative inquiry is a research orientation that directs attention to narratives as a way to study an aspect of society. It is not, however, just about studying texts, whether written or visual. It is about finding meaning in the stories people use, tell, and even live. Narrative inquiry, then, has its own theoretical perspective and its own methods of analysis that are distinct from other forms, such as discourse analysis and content analysis.³ What distinguishes narrative inquiry from these and other methods is the focus on narratives and stories as they are told, implicitly or explicitly, by individuals or groups of people, not on texts that are independent of the tellers or institutions where they are scripted.

As a human manifestation that is present in both folk and scholarly traditions, narratives re-present events in space and time.⁴ Narratives have at least five essential characteristics:

- They are accounts of characters and selective events occurring over time, with a beginning, a middle, and an end.
- They are retrospective interpretations of sequential events from a certain point of view.
- They focus on human intention and action—those of the narrator and others.
- They are part of the process of constructing identity (the self in relation to others).
- They are coauthored by narrator and audience.

These characteristics suggest that narratives are quite suitable for understanding social events and social experiences, either from the perspective of participants or from the perspective of an analyst interpreting individual, institutional, or societal narratives (Soderberg 2003; Riessman 2002; Ewick and Silbey 1995; Schram and Neisser 1997). Narratives are a particular form of the general process of representation that takes place in human discourse, but not the only one. There are others, such as chronicles, analytical models, photographs, and moving visual images (film), among others (Cobley 2001).

Researchers use narratives in different ways to advance their agendas. At a minimum, all research reports are accounts of the process and results of an inquiry, and, as such, they represent narratives authored by the researcher (Ewick and Silbey 1995). More formally, a researcher may decide to use narratives as a tool to obtain meaningful information about a *topic of interest*, using in-depth interviews and analyzing the stories collected. The assumption is that stories convey meaning about something in the world. For example, a researcher may elicit stories about how people move an agenda forward to understand leadership processes in an organizational context (Ospina and Schall 2001).

In contrast, a researcher may be interested in seeing *how narratives express underlying, taken-for-granted assumptions* that people hold about themselves and their situations. In this case, the focus is not so much on the content of the story at its face value, but on narratives as a manifestation of implicit and interrelated ideas that help people make sense of the world. Stories can be written (such as official documents), or they can be “unwritten” or invisible (such as ideologies and theories in use). For example, a researcher may study “political performances” such as lobbying, policy formulation, or mass mobilization, which can be read as texts that help to uncover assumptions about the nature of politics (Schram and Neisser 1997).

These choices indicate the purposes of narrative inquiry may be as diverse as reconstructing social events from the perspective of the informants; learning about human experience by focusing on the meaning making of social actors; or identifying and interpreting underlying general story lines (narratives) that describe, explain, or legitimate particular social practices, institutions, or structures. Early

developments in our own project on social-change leadership illustrate why researchers may turn to narrative as a powerful tool to approach their work, given the purposes and circumstances surrounding their inquiry.

We used in our project a definition of leadership drawn from an emergent body of literature. This literature views leadership as a process of meaning making in communities of practice that are engaged in actions to change something in the world (Drath and Palus 1994; Drath 2001). This working definition was particularly appropriate for a research project connected to a larger leadership program that targeted leaders in nonprofit organizations working with a social-change agenda. Members of these nonprofits work with disadvantaged populations to address an identified systemic inequity, combining at least three types of activities: service delivery, organizing, and advocacy. Their work is characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, complexity, and often hostility from the environment. After preliminary conversations and much reflection, we saw that we could learn something new about leadership by inviting these leaders and their colleagues to explore with us the meaning-making processes behind the actions they undertook to successfully eliminate or reduce the targeted social problem. Narratives became critical to illuminate meaning making for action in these particular communities of practice. With this decision, we took a narrative turn as we plunged into our research.

To conclude this section, we offer a brief illustration of a completed public administration study that uses narrative inquiry—in this case, to illuminate the dynamics of public service delivery. The example gives a flavor of what this kind of scholarship looks like and highlights the types of insights that narrative inquiry provides. In their book *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service*, Maynard-Moody and Musheno (2003) collect and analyze stories from three types of street-level workers: cops, teachers, and counselors. The authors challenge the prevailing narrative about the state and governance, which assumes that street-level workers use “discretionary decision-making” to ensure “equal treatment” for all citizens, to the extent possible.

Maynard-Moody and Musheno show, instead, that cops, teachers, and counselors first engage in judgments about a client’s identity and use these judgments to assess the merits of the client’s worthiness for help. These judgments influence street-level workers’ responses to clients and determine whether they bend the rules for them, offer standard service, or punish those they view as unworthy of their effort. It is very unlikely that this insightful understanding of street-level workers’ exercise of power over their clients’ lives would have been uncovered with the use of a questionnaire or other standard data-collection techniques that are typical of traditional research. The use of narrative

inquiry, with storytelling as the focal point of data collection and analysis, is at the core of these insights.

The Narrative Turn: Catching Meaning up to Method

The recent emphasis on discourse, text, and language as phenomena of theoretical interest across a broad range of fields is both a consequence and manifestation of what scholars have called the “turn to language” across the arts, humanities, and social and behavioral sciences (Denzin 1997; Riessman 2002; Gill 2000).⁵ This turn represents a radical shift (a paradigm shift) in thinking about and the doing of research in each field. While challenging research practices that focus on *explaining* and predicting behavior, this turn has also opened up new pathways for research in the social sciences and applied fields that focus on *interpreting* social events.

To contrast, explanatory researchers aim to explain and predict events and behavior using laws of statistical probability to generalize causal relationships. Interpretive researchers, on the other hand, aim to understand intention and action rather than just explaining behavior. These different modes of research are based on two fundamentally different ways of seeing, with different theories about how we know the world, and therefore different methods and criteria of quality.⁶ Shank (2002) uses metaphors to describe these differences. Because the explanatory mode assumes a separation between the observer and the world being observed, the observer must look through some type of magnifying glass to get an accurate view of what is on the other side. This vision has as its main goal to see the world with as little distortion as possible and explaining it with some degree of detachment. In contrast, in the interpretive mode, seeing—and thus knowing—can only happen from inside the world, and it is always bridged by conversation. Shank uses a lantern to describe this way of seeing. The lantern brings clarity to dark places, it illuminates and provides insights, allowing the observer to discover and reconcile meaning where it was not clearly understood before. This mode of research assumes that meaning can be better unveiled and understood in experience and through practice, and that it is always mediated through language and narrative, thus giving preference to interpretation.

The explanatory mode of research (often referred to as “positivism”) corresponds to the traditional vision of science that has dominated empirical research in the twentieth century, both in the natural and the social sciences, particularly in the United States.⁷ For this reason, explanatory research is often viewed as the best way to accumulate knowledge in a field. Often interpretive research and critical reasoning are viewed as “soft” and less scientific (Shank 2002; White 1999). In spite of this critique, re-

searchers have gradually started to give more attention to interpretive and critical approaches as the critiques of traditional research have gained hold.

These challenges to traditional explanatory research came from emerging schools of thought such as structuralism, poststructuralism, and postmodernism, which had a tremendous influence in many disciplines throughout the twentieth century (Schwandt 1997). For example, structuralism invited scholars to pay attention to the underlying structures that cannot be directly observed but that clearly affect human experience. Later on, poststructuralism posited that multiple sources and perspectives produce meaning, thus highlighting the power of language and challenging the idea of rigid boundaries between truth and falsehood, science and myth.

Finally, postmodernist scholars rejected the core ideas that gave shape to the Enlightenment, such as the emphasis on the scientific method and rationality and their mechanistic applications to other areas of social life. Distrusting all-encompassing frameworks, which they called metanarratives, postmodernists argue that a fragmented, fluid, indeterminate, and diverse social world cannot hold single truths, emphasizing even more that multiple voices and perspectives influence meaning making. All of these ideas emphasize the social nature of language and its role in the construction of the world we inhabit and, taken together, encourage a turn to narrative as a focal point of research.

The concern with the limits of positivism brought about a “crisis of representation” for social scientists, as they found it difficult to continue to adequately describe social reality with any certainty (Denzin 1997; Geertz 1973). The crisis produced a “methodological diaspora” and opened a two-way street between the humanities and the social sciences, so that they exchanged tools to study social texts and discourses (Denzin and Lincoln 2000). Indeed, discussing the crisis of representation within the historical evolution of qualitative inquiry, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) describe qualitative researchers’ struggles in the mid 1980s and 1990s to locate themselves, their voices, and those of their subjects in the texts they collected and created as field notes and final reports. This was a period of experimentation, when literary and rhetorical tropes, storytelling, and social discourses gained currency.

These developments help us to understand why narrative inquiry, as a form of qualitative inquiry, has begun to move from the margins to the mainstream of established scholarly traditions (Jovchelovitch and Bauer 2000; Clandinin and Connelly 2000). The narrative turn involved the search for new models of truth, method, and representation. It encouraged some scholars to develop what they called a “standpoint perspective” on research. This means explicitly using one’s social position as a reference from which to interpret and analyze information—for example,

using a feminist perspective to do research. The turn also highlighted the relevance of voice: not only the voice of the researchers and their subjects in general, but also the voices of groups previously excluded from social texts, such as women, people of color, and others in the social margins (Lincoln and Guba 2000).

The narrative turn has affected a broad range of social science disciplines. In economics, for example, the turn to narrative challenged the disconnect between economics' simple modeling and the world's complex reality. This led to acknowledging some of the limitations of its explanatory approach and opened new opportunities for reframing analysis (Hayek 1967; Lavoie 1991; Brown 1994; McCloskey 1992, 1998).

In political science, researchers have used narrative to study political realities, such as how populations generally assumed to be passive understand the process of political development (Cohen, Jones, and Tronto 1997), how the U.S. Supreme Court sets its agenda (Perry 1990), and how Kuwait developed its democracy (Tetreault 2000). Other political scientists directly explore the power of storytelling in influencing politics and policy making (Stone 1988; Fiske 1993). A good example of relevance to public administration is Schram and Neisser's *Tales of the State* (1997), an edited collection of articles based on the question, "What are public policies but stories narrating our relations (between citizens, between the citizen and the state, between states, etc.) in politically selective ways?" (2). The authors explore the idea that stories mediate how public problems are understood, and thus influence the politics of public policy making. To illustrate this thesis, the contributors study themes such as gay rights, freedom of expression on the Internet, devolution, and the use of statistics in advocacy, among others.

On a different front, the link between narrative and organizing is now central to the interdisciplinary field of organization and management theory. Some scholars focus on storytelling practices of organizational members (Boje 1995); others use narrative to study organizational phenomena such as culture (Martin 1992), organizational change (Soderberg 2003), organizational performance (Corvellec 2003), and strategy (De la Ville and Mounoud 2003). Czarniawska (1997), for example, creates three stories of public management reform in the Swedish public sector: "A new budget and accounting routine in Big City," "Tax Reform," and "The Rehabilitation Program." In her analysis of each story, she links narrative metaphors, such as paradoxes and interruption, to themes of personnel and communication and to the trends of institutional decentralization, computerization, and privatization.

Even though the theoretical importance of narrative in organization studies has influenced public management scholarship, direct applications of narrative inquiry for

public management research are less common in the United States. Our own research project on leadership in nonprofit organizations whose members engage in influencing critical policy debates will, we hope, contribute to filling this gap.

The Narrative Turn in Public Administration

The crisis of representation and the interpretive turn also had a direct manifestation in public administration and applied fields such as policy (Dryzek 1982; Jennings 1987; Roe 1992) and planning (Forester 1993). Within public administration, a group of scholars in the late 1960s similarly began to question the assumptions of traditional explanatory research and raised questions about the future of the field. At the Minnowbrook conference, for example, discussions centered on challenges to the idea of value-free research, the need for public administration to be socially relevant and to foster social equity, and the need for more citizen involvement in decision making. This "new public administration" implied a turn away from an exclusive focus on explanatory accounts, toward giving more importance to interpretation and critique of public institutions. There is a long list of well-recognized public administration scholars who developed these principles or were influenced by them in the next 40 years.⁸ These developments set the stage for the field's participation in the scholarly revolution that scholars have called the narrative turn.

Scholars in public administration have made excellent use of the ideas behind the narrative turn, both to discuss the nature of the field and to do empirical investigations. For example, some argue the type of knowledge required to make policy or administrative decisions may differ from the type of knowledge derived from traditional explanatory research. In particular, they argue that traditional explanatory research is concerned with the explanation and prediction of facts, the separation of facts from values, and the aspiration of leaving the latter out of the research process. These positions are problematic given the assumption that decisions in public contexts require political and moral judgments (Hummel 1991; Rein 1976).

Making a case to embrace the narrative turn in our field, White (1999) uncovers the assumptions of a narrative theory of knowledge for public administration in his insightful book *Taking Language Seriously: The Narrative Foundations of Public Administration*. Drawing from a variety of fields, he argues that better understanding this narrative foundation will give interpretive and critical modes of research their due place in the field, thus creating more research that is relevant for scholars, practitioners, and the public.

There are also excellent empirical studies that reflect the narrative turn in public administration. Yanow (1996), for example, uses a narrative approach to study the Israel

Corporation of Community Centers (ICCC), focusing on the ways that policy meanings were communicated to various audiences as the legislation to create the ICCC was designed and implemented and during its early years of existence. She describes organizational metaphors that shaped agency actions and objects, as well as rituals that communicated meanings symbolically, both of which helped to enact policy and organizational myths. At the core of the story are the multiple interpretations that audiences gave to the meanings communicated as the ICCC was created. She argues that the difference between legislation and its final implementation cannot be understood simply as inadequate legislation or poor policy implementation. Instead, the story of the ICCC, she claims, is better understood as part of a larger story about national identity.

In another study in two U.S. city administrations, Feldman et al. (2002) collect stories obtained from open-ended interviews to explore how city administrators make sense of change processes. They argue that stories have been underutilized as a source of data, and they found in narrative analysis "an important tool for recovering, or some may say, uncovering meaning in data" (28). They found narrative an attractive tool because the arguments or claims that individuals communicate enable a kind of analysis that explores their experiences and attitudes rooted in context.

In sum, the narrative turn in public administration has produced significant insights about many dimensions of public affairs, with considerable implications for theory and practice. The field is stronger because of this scholarship. But these positive developments are clouded by a tension that sets the stage for the work that lies ahead.

An Ongoing Tension in the Field

In public administration in general, there is a preference for explanation over interpretation or critical analysis. This preference becomes a barrier to research approaches such as narrative inquiry, despite their potential. In recurrent waves over the years, concerns about the quality of the scholarship in public administration and public management have consistently led to calls to promote the canons of the traditional explanatory mode as the most legitimate way to build knowledge (Perry and Kraemer 1986; Houston and Delevan 1990; Cleary 1992; Lynn and Heinrich 2000). Additional good explanatory research can certainly help to strengthen the field. However, this view ignores the fact that various ways of knowing can lead to theory development and can help to inform practice, particularly in applied fields.

The theoretical contribution of narrative scholarship is enormous in this discussion. For example, in *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*, Bruner (1986) describes narrative as one of two distinct and complementary ways in which we order experience. In contrast to the dominant, logicoscientific

mode based on logical proof, tight analysis, argumentation, and hypothesis driven discovery, the narrative mode, he argues, focuses on good stories that convince through lifelikeness. For Bruner, stories are a way of knowing and have knowledge in them. In public administration, Hummel (1991) similarly argues that the stories public managers tell are a form of knowledge that is better suited to developing theories that inform practical action. The implication is that applied fields, which are supposed to help solve problems, may be better served by methodologies such as narrative inquiry that tap into narrative knowing. White (1999) makes the same point when he advocates for action-oriented methodologies for research in public administration.

This discussion suggests that quality can be better addressed by encouraging the use of different modes of inquiry, so that researchers choose the right theoretical lenses and methodological approaches according to the nature of the problem and the purposes of the research. Explanation, interpretation, critical reasoning, and even reflective practice are all useful approaches to theorizing about the nature of public institutions and the structures, systems, and practices that sustain them.

Furthermore, this discussion becomes quite relevant to the ongoing aspiration to connect practitioners and academicians in the field, which is so excellently described by Chester Newland (2000) in his review of *PAR*'s efforts to stay relevant to both. Quality research may also depend on engaging practitioners as stakeholders in the research, according to the nature of the problem and the purposes of the research. When we acknowledge roles for both academic researchers and practitioners in knowledge generation and theory development, the resulting theories may be more useful and relevant for practice.

The narrative turn has contributed to the production of high-quality research. However, the field of public administration will not fully take advantage of these developments unless narrative inquiry and similar types of research become normalized and are given their place next to the explanatory forms that have tended to dominate the field. One step in that direction is to fully explore the ways that narrative inquiry, as a critical exemplar of the interpretive mode of research, contributes to public administration scholarship.

Why Narrative Inquiry in Public Administration?

So far we have laid out the underlying theoretical assumptions of narrative inquiry and how the narrative turn in public administration has been a part of a broader paradigmatic shift taking place in the arts, the humanities, and the natural and social sciences. We can now directly ad-

dress the following questions, using our own experience as a way to illustrate the arguments: Why is narrative inquiry a relevant research orientation for pursuing good public administration scholarship at this time in the field's development? How can this approach to research shed light on some of the key concerns in our field? What are the theoretical and practical implications of using narrative inquiry in public administration scholarship?

Introducing Our Story: Exploring “Meaning” in Research on Leadership

The mandate that originated our research project challenged us to come up with a research agenda that would at the same time (1) pass the test of complying to the highest standards of scholarship; (2) resonate with both practitioners interested in learning about leadership practice and academicians interested in developing theories of leadership; (3) respond to the philosophy and basic demands of a broader social intervention within which the research would be embedded; and (4) be respectful of the participants of that program, who were to encounter research by virtue of their participation in the program.

As we became immersed in the literature, we found that academic research on leadership, while shifting over time, still tends to emphasize traits, styles, and contingency theories to define what is a good leader. The literature in both private and public contexts concentrates mostly on political leaders and managers in formal positions of authority in public and nonprofit contexts (Bryman 1996; Kellerman 1999; Terry 2003). We soon came to believe that narratives about individuals who occupy these types of positions have shaped the mental models that people hold about leadership. While insightful, these understandings rest on a “heroic” version of leadership that is compiled from a narrow set of voices (Allen 1990; Fletcher 2002).

Theories of the last 50 years have not significantly challenged these mental models. Despite providing important contributions for leadership development, most of the traditional literature on leadership has not yielded terribly innovative insights to address the challenges of rapidly changing contemporary organizations. Rost (1993) argues that traditional theories of leadership have stayed stuck in an industrial model that dominated the twentieth century—they are overly management oriented, individualistic, rationalistic, linear, and technocratic in language and methodology—rather than reflecting postindustrial values more in accordance with our times, such as collaboration, global concern, diversity and pluralism, critical dialogue, qualitative language and methodologies, and consensus-oriented policy-making processes (27, 181).

Despite voluminous research on leadership and a multitude of people practicing it, these two worlds continue to be disconnected. Many practitioners seem dissatisfied with

what the academic leadership literature offers. Scholars' attempts to produce research that is relevant to practice yields lists of features that make ideal leaders rather than ways to understand and approach the work of leadership. The leadership literature continues to be, generally speaking, focused on narrow contexts and populations. The knowledge derived may not ring true for women and minorities or for others working in contexts that are different from public office, corporations, or large bureaucracies.

We recognized that alternative approaches to study leadership were in order. We were not alone. New directions in the field were focused on developing the transformational and symbolic nature of leadership (Burns 1978; Schein 1990), exploring the role of cognition in the emergence of leadership (Gardner 1995), documenting shared leadership (Bennis and Biederman 1997), and highlighting its practical value as a means to produce socially useful outcomes through adaptive work (Heifetz 1994). But these works are still person centered.

Influenced by the narrative turn, some organizational scholars had long proposed the idea that leadership emerges from the constructions and actions of people in organizations. In this view, leadership happens when one or more individuals in a social system succeed in framing and defining how the demands of the group will be taken up and what roles, including “the role of leader,” will be attributed to whom (Pfeffer 1997; Smircich and Morgan 1982; Tierney 1987).

In the public leadership studies field, some scholars were describing a more collective type of leadership in the collaborative processes of urban governance (Chrislip and Larson 1994; Huxham and Vangen 2000). Others suggested the interconnectedness of contemporary society demands a different kind of leadership to address public problems, one that is more collective than individual (Bryson and Crosby 1992; Crosby 1999; Luke 1998). But not much empirical research has been done to test these ideas. Our project was an opportunity to do so.

Choosing the Right Lens. We chose a conceptual lens that views leadership as a collective achievement or the property of a group, rather than something that belongs to an individual (Hunt 1984; Meindl 1995; Drath 2001). This post-heroic model of leadership (Fletcher 2002) views it as a process of meaning making in communities of practice—groups of people who are “involved with one another in action” (Drath and Palus 1994). This lens could help us to explore ways that people understand and attribute leadership and would allow us to distinguish between the emergence of collective practices that constitute the work of leadership and the individuals involved in those practices. This shift from an emphasis on traits and behaviors to meaning making in communities of practice moved us from explanation to interpretation.

Our Turn to Narrative: Implications for Research. Our choice of lens had clear research implications for both focus (what to study) and stance (who defines what is important and does the research). If leadership is about the meaning making required to produce action, if it is relational and collective, then we must focus our attention on the sense-making experience to achieve a common goal. Once the focus was on the experiences associated with the work that calls for leadership (Drath 2001), it became compelling to invite the people engaged in the work to inquire about its meaning, thus studying leadership from the inside out. The stance we have chosen is one of coinquiry, a participative approach where we conduct research *with* leaders *on* leadership.¹⁰ Thus, we have invited the participants of the leadership program to join as coresearchers of our project. We have also chosen to take an appreciative approach to research like that advocated in the “positive organizational scholarship” (Cameron, Dutton, and Quinn 2003), with a focus on the forces and factors that sustain the work of leadership and make it flourish. Given these choices, language and narratives became central to our enterprise.

To uncover the relational, shared, and meaning-making aspects of the work of leadership in the nonprofit organizations where our new coresearchers work, we created a multimodal design with three parallel streams of inquiry—ethnographic inquiry, cooperative inquiry, and narrative inquiry.¹⁰ These are anchored in our belief in the value of conversational encounters with research participants as the core activity of the research process. The multimodal design is aimed at generating practice-grounded products that will help our coresearchers learn something about their own practice and help us answer the guiding question: In what ways do communities trying to make social change engage in the work of leadership? Narrative inquiry, with its theoretical insights and its methodological tools, took center stage in this research design. It offered critical contributions to the quality of our research and served as a bridge to establish a strong connection between the program practitioners and the core research team.

Improving the Quality of Public Administration Scholarship

We chose narrative inquiry in our project because we understood three distinct contributions it could make to produce stronger research. First, narrative inquiry provides an internally consistent research approach when asking questions that relate to meaning and interpretation. Second, narrative inquiry is an excellent methodology to capture complex interpretations of experience because it captures context and makes space for the multiple representations of various voices with a stake in the research. Finally,

narrative inquiry taps into the unique kind of knowledge that is communicated through stories and narratives.

Matching Method to Lens

The theoretical challenges posed by the narrative turn have led social scientists to see the shortcomings of traditional methodologies, such as experimental and survey research, for exploring meaning making, social identities, culture, and so on. New approaches to research were necessary to respond to these interests. Indeed, an internally consistent approach to research in which methods match theoretical perspectives is a key feature of good scholarship, what is referred to as *indication of method* (Gaskell and Bauer 2000).

In our story, taking this point seriously, we struggled to find a research methodology that would help us to learn about leadership as meaning making in action and to develop new insights about leadership. We chose narrative inquiry, in part, because its theoretical assumptions had great resonance with our definition of leadership. We view both leadership and narrative as socially constructed and begin with the understanding that narratives do not objectively mirror reality, but are constructed in interaction (Riessman 1993). We are interested precisely in seeing how participants interpret the work they do and how those interpretations tell us something about leadership.

For example, conversations with program participants and their colleagues are the primary source for accessing information in each organization. The narrative-inquiry component of our design consists of in-depth group conversations with the leaders and others members of their organizations and communities. We construct unique leadership stories for each organization and search for themes by comparing across stories. We use a fluid and open interpretive interview technique to allow the story line to take any direction, as each participant’s experience is captured in the course of these group conversations, held during field visits to each organization. Doing narrative inquiry in this way helps us answer the questions we have posed for ourselves in a way that is internally consistent with our theoretical perspective.

Attention to Context, Voice, and Perspective

The narrative turn suggests that social phenomena are not universal, that people in different contexts construct the world in different ways. To understand any phenomenon, such as leadership or organizational change, we must understand the way it plays out in particular contexts for particular actors. An exciting contribution of narrative inquiry in public administration has been work that brings to the forefront attention to the local knowledge and perspectives of key public service stakeholders (Dryzek 1982), including citizens (Herzog and Claunch 1997), managers

(Hummel 1991), and local planners (Forester 1993). Illuminating public issues from these different perspectives makes our understanding more grounded and, therefore, more complete. In addition, context lends texture to our interpretations of events, relationships, challenges, and triumphs. Narrative inquiry is appropriate for learning about social phenomena in context because it allows people to tell stories that reflect the richness and complexity of their experience. This contrasts to a survey, for example, where the analyst reduces that complexity, intentionally leaving out context.

We agree with contingency theorists that context matters in order to understand leadership. We push this further by arguing that the leader should not be the primary focus of the research. If we consider leadership to be a shared act of meaning making in the context of a group's work to accomplish a common purpose, then the context is as important as the visible leaders. This view directs us to be open to the possibility that leadership takes different forms in different contexts, and that leadership carries different meanings depending on the requirements that a particular group has to accomplish their work. Therefore, our interview protocols are designed to collect information about context, and our narrative analysis revolves around contextual issues to understand the meaning making processes and the actions derived from them.

An important theoretical concern about voice and perspective follows from the understanding that narratives are embedded in context. As Jovchelovitch and Bauer (2000) argue, "language, as the medium of exchange, is not neutral but constitutes a particular worldview" (61). The narrative turn has led social scientists to develop more sensitivity to issues related to voice as a key bridge to interpretation. Bringing in the voice of participants not only helps to ground the research in context, but also helps us to see things from the inside out. The concern here is with whose point of view is privileged in the inquiry: Narrative analysts reconstruct social events and processes that reflect interviewees' point of reference and voice.

In our project we privilege participants' point of view to generate greater insights about the experience of leadership (rather than leadership as a behavior). In addition, we invite participants to be coresearchers so that they identify the aspects of their work to focus on and highlight in research products; they choose people to be part of group interviews to explore these issues; and they engage in the analysis process with us. Hence, we receive important feedback to ensure that we get it right from their perspective. Because we view leadership as a collective process, we also organize group interviews, thus including multiple stakeholders in the telling of the experience, not just a single leader's voice. Bringing in multiple voices helps to reconstruct the complexity of the situation, as different people have different

perspectives of the same reality. The researcher's voice in the process and research texts is also important.

Illuminating the Social World

Narrative inquiry also contributes to stronger scholarship because some phenomena are better understood through narrative rather than through other methods of inquiry (such as surveys or experiments). Stories tell us something that other forms of data do not (recall Bruner's claim that *narrative is a way of knowing*). We illustrated this insight earlier when we shared Maynard-Moody and Musheno's (2003) findings about how street-level workers make identity judgments that influence how they treat clients.

By eliciting stories about the work that calls for leadership, our inquiry contrasts with traditional leadership research, which favors surveys and in-depth interviews as a way to learn about leaders. We learn something new from doing narrative inquiry by focusing on the way people make meaning of the experience of leadership. But here we point to something that goes beyond this understanding. The *stories themselves* have knowledge that can be generalized to other contexts, which enrich our learning in ways that are relevant for both practitioners and academics. For this reason, we made some of our products into stories that we hope resonate with other practitioners struggling with similar challenges. We will return to this point in our discussion of the theory–practice divide.

The following propositions summarize our arguments about the potential contributions of narrative inquiry to enhance the quality of research in public administration:

1. Narrative inquiry enhances the quality of public administration scholarship by:
 - **Matching method to lens:** Offering researchers appropriate *methods* for answering *theoretical* questions generated by interpretive approaches
 - **Attending to context, voice and perspective:**
 - o Allowing the researcher to pay more attention to the ways that experience, attitudes, and knowledge develop in particular times and places
 - o Highlighting the multiple representations of experience and phenomena that different people or groups of people make
 - **Illuminating the social world:** reminding the researcher of the importance of tapping into the particular kind of knowledge that is communicated through stories and narratives.

Connecting Theory and Practice, Academic Researchers and Practitioners

Narrative inquiry also has the potential to help heal the theory–practice divide, another key concern in the public administration community. This divide seems to be fueled

by a feeling on the part of practitioners that academic research often does not produce meaningful, actionable knowledge. Some researchers in public administration have developed case studies that are perhaps more relevant, or at least more resonant, for practitioners. But other academicians have criticized this research as too anecdotal or too normative and not rigorous enough (Cleary 1992; Lynn and Heinrich 2000). The standards that practitioners have for actionable knowledge and that academicians have for rigor are seemingly at odds. Yet this split is false because it is based on an assumption that only explanatory modes of research are rigorous and can produce valid knowledge.

Research that takes a narrative turn offers a way to heal the theory–practice divide that has come to characterize much applied social science research because it may offer information that rings true to practitioners’ experiences, making them more likely to consume it. The narrative turn, especially in combination with an “action turn” (Reason and Bradbury 2001), has two important effects. First, it helps to legitimate practitioners as producers of valid knowledge, and second, it helps to open a two-way street so that both practitioners and researchers have their interests addressed through scholarship. These two contributions help to bring practitioners and academicians closer together.

Practitioners as Knowledge Producers

We made an argument earlier in the article that narrative is a way of knowing. This insight has encouraged practitioners to build theory based on their own practice. Influenced by Schön’s (1991) practice-based theory of knowledge, some “reflective practitioners” have constructed narratives to reflect on their own experiences. Telling and reflection are intimately intertwined in this work, as mirrored in the kinds of products that emerge from it: They share lessons learned from experience and are intended to enhance practice, not just to understand it. Schall’s (1997) work on public management innovation is an exemplar of this approach. Using her own experiences as commissioner of the Department of Juvenile Justice, she developed lessons for practitioners trying to create a climate of innovation. She focused on three fundamental tasks that public managers must do: manage the work of the staff (the front line), structure the work of the organization (the main line), and deal with more sophisticated and difficult dynamics (over the line). Schall’s story offers “hope and guidance” for addressing these tasks.

Practitioners can also play a role in producing more academic research. In our story, we grounded narrative inquiry in participative traditions of research not only to understand the experience of leadership from participants’ perspective, but also to ensure they had a stake in shaping research inquiry, from defining research questions to do-

ing analysis. We organize our interviews around themes that participants identify as central to their success. We engage participants in the assessment of analytical memos that we write about the stories they tell us, to make sure the analysis and the products of the research will resonate with their experience. We then write a story for each organization and compare themes across organizations to generate propositions for further exploration. This approach is based on an assumption that academic research can better contribute both to theory and practice if academicians can engage practitioners in conversations to articulate research problems, gather data, and do analysis.

Reciprocity, Relevance, and Opportunities for Growth

Academic research is often criticized for taking learning from organizations and communities without giving back in real and practical ways. This is true in community-based research contexts, where people have expressed feeling like guinea pigs for academicians, and perhaps it has some resonance in other organizational contexts as well. White (1999) advocates for greater use of action-oriented research to make research more applicable to administrative problems: action theory, action research, and action science. In contrast to traditional pure or applied research, and in contrast to narrative inquiry without an action orientation, these approaches aim to help practitioners perceive, understand, and act on their own environment (White 1999).

In our project we have been sensitive to these challenges and were intentional about creating activities for our coresearchers that would give back to them and, we hope, to a broader community of practitioners. In part, we did this by further grounding narrative inquiry with an appreciative stance so that it becomes an inquiry not simply about (re)telling stories, but “retelling of stories that allow for growth and change” (Clandinin and Connelly 2000, 71). In particular, when we initiated conversations about the key factors participants identified as central to their work, we asked them to tell us how these factors contributed to their success. Jim Ludema (1996) notes the generative connection between narrative inquiry and appreciative inquiry: “Eliciting positive narrative responses from interviewees [is] most generative of collective hope, knowledge, and action in the organizational and communal contexts” (15). Appreciative inquiry helps to discover, understand, and foster innovations in social arrangements and processes because it generates new positive images that can help to discover and construct new possibilities to enhance system effectiveness and integrity (104–5).

By creating a container for participants to step back and reflect on their work, we offered direct opportunities for participants to grow and learn. Participants commented on

the usefulness of these conversations for sharing learning with each other and for taking some time to reflect on their work, and how leadership happens in their communities. It even encouraged one participant to write extensively about leadership in his organization. In this way, working collaboratively has the potential to be directly relevant for our coresearchers and, if we are able to generate sound theory, for others as well.

The following propositions summarize the second part of our argument about how narrative inquiry can contribute to address the connection between academicians and practitioners in the field:

2. Narrative inquiry, when combined with an action orientation, reduces the theory–practice divide in public administration by:
 - **Engaging practitioners as knowledge producers:** Elevating their role in developing valid theoretical knowledge
 - **Creating reciprocity, relevance, and opportunities for growth:** Providing research processes and products that are directly relevant and applicable to practice and provide opportunities for participants’ development.

Conclusion

Academic researchers and practitioners make decisions in their practice based on explicit or implicit assumptions. The assumptions one makes have implications for how one does inquiry, how one sees what one is looking at, and how one does analysis to produce insight for theory and practice. In the public administration field, like in many other academic fields, a certain set of assumptions about what is valid knowledge and what is good, legitimate research, have become taken for granted. We have thus given preference to certain research methodologies and certain modes of research.

In this article we have offered some formal propositions about the contributions that narrative inquiry can make to public administration scholarship. First, narrative inquiry has the potential to help strengthen the quality of public administration research because it offers an orientation to inquiry and methodologies that are well suited to the nature of the problems and questions in a field, which, as White demonstrates, have narrative foundations. As a form of interpretive research, narrative inquiry provides an appropriate method for tapping into “local knowledges,” multiple voices, and experiences in context. Second, it has the potential to make strides toward healing the divide between theory and practice, which, in turn, helps to cultivate a more meaningful connection between academicians and practitioners in the field. This is especially the case when researchers combine narrative inquiry with an ac-

tion orientation. When this happens, practitioners become involved with researchers as producers of valid theoretical knowledge, and research products and processes are designed to give back to practitioners.

We propose, more generally, that narrative inquiry, with its commitment to interpretation, helps to illuminate dimensions of public affairs in ways that deepen our understanding. Narrative inquirers appreciate the value of and tap into the practical and narrative knowing that is characteristic of many dimensions of public life. The insights gained this way complement, add, and sometimes challenge the insights produced through explanatory research, offering opportunities for constructive conversations among researchers of different orientations.

Even though the narrative turn has taken place in public administration, its potential has not been fully realized. This is the case in part because, as an exemplar of interpretive research, narrative inquiry is still considered less legitimate for producing valid and relevant knowledge. The consequences are significant for the future of the field. The preference for explanation over interpretation and critical analysis prevents the normalization of research approaches such as narrative inquiry, despite their great potential. The theoretical orientation and methodological tools of narrative inquiry are relatively absent from the curricula of our doctoral programs. The products of this type of research are not as readily available in many of the prime journals of the field. Constructive exchanges among researchers engaged in different modes of research are less frequent, as each goes about their ways, doing their own work. Our goal has been to explore the implications and value of fully embracing the narrative turn in the field, hoping to deepen a conversation that has key implications for addressing the big questions and challenges we face.

Yet, we also recognize that narrative inquiry is not a panacea, but is most suitable for doing research concerned with the “systematic study of personal experience and meaning: how events have been constructed by active subjects” (Riessman 2002, 263). Rather than promoting narrative inquiry as the best approach to research, our point is that interpretive approaches to research are valid and can complement more traditional explanatory approaches that answer different questions better and elevate other, more logikorational ways of knowing. Both of these approaches produce valid knowledge relevant to the theory and practice of public administration. Thus, we advocate for a pluralist view in which competing approaches to inquiry are nurtured and supported.

To continue to develop this argument, in the second article of this series we will address the methodological issues related to narrative inquiry. We will discuss when narrative inquiry is an appropriate research choice. We will also focus on standards for judging the quality of interpre-

tive work, addressing the question of how good narrative research can be done in public administration. To engage this discussion, we will offer a more elaborate map of the various approaches to narrative inquiry that we find in public administration. We will discuss the methodological challenges, opportunities, and techniques associated with each, using empirical examples from our own project and from other research in the field. Finally, in the third article we will return to explore in depth the potential role of narrative inquiry in continuing to cultivate connectedness between academicians and practitioners, and for contributing to reducing the theory–practice gap.

It is about time we engage in conversations that acknowledge the contributions of the narrative turn in public administration and to give narrative inquiry and other forms of interpretive inquiry their place in the field. It is about time to catch method up to meaning. To arrive there, both academicians and practitioners in the field must first stop taking their assumptions for granted. We must articulate these assumptions clearly, and then we must make sure there is a logical, clear connection between our assumptions and the choices we make in research, the claims we make about the results of that research, and the uses we give to these claims.

Acknowledgments

We want to thank Ellen Schall for her excellent suggestions as we were writing this article and for her invaluable contributions as an active member of the research team during the first cycle of the research project we describe here. Many thanks to Marian Krauskopf for her feedback on an earlier draft of this article. Thanks also to Randall K. Johnson for his thoughtful research assistance and for his well-crafted write-ups, many of which became embedded in the text of this article.

Our experience in the Research and Documentation component of the Leadership for a Changing World (LCW) program informs the ideas we have developed in this article. We would like to acknowledge the many contributions of coresearchers and partners who, over the course of the years, have been active participants in shaping our learning. We would also like to thank the Ford Foundation for its generous support of the LCW research.

Notes

1. This research is part of a larger program, Leadership for a Changing World, developed by the Ford Foundation in partnership with the Advocacy Institute and the Research Center for Leadership in Action, at Wagner/New York University. For more information, please visit the research link at www.leadershipforchange.org.
2. See Ospina et al. (2004) for a glimpse of this complexity and for the story of the first encounters between the program practitioners and the research group.
3. Discourse analysis focuses on the structure of the argument presented in a text, and content analysis focuses on the quantity and quality of ideas represented in a text.
4. Formal narrative analysis distinguishes story (the events depicted) from narrative (the showing or telling of these events and the way they are told) (Cobley 2001). We use them interchangeably here.
5. The emergence of cultural studies as a discipline expanded the scope of a *theoretical* approach to narrative (independent of literary studies, and applicable to diverse fields) and expanded the focus from written texts to include other forms of representation, such as films, advertisements, and jokes (Soderberg 2003; Currie 1998).
6. White (1999) refers to a third mode of research that is based on critical reasoning as an additional way of seeing. Critical researchers, he argues, aim to uncover false beliefs about reality so people can see how these beliefs constrain action and change.
7. Postpositivism is an updated version of positivism, using the same assumptions within a more sophisticated methodological tool kit that address some of the critiques.
8. Marini, Frederickson, Dunn, Harmon, Hummel, Stivers, Balfour, Peters, Denhardt, Miller and Farmer are only a few of those exploring alternatives to traditional research, drawing from philosophical traditions as varied as existentialism, phenomenology, critical theory, action theory, feminism, psychoanalysis, hermeneutics, and postmodernism (White 1999).
9. Stafford (1996) has pioneered the idea of coproduction of knowledge as a way to incorporate the perspective of people of color in public policy debates.
10. For a fuller description of these three streams and how they relate to each other, see Ospina and Ospina and Schall (2001) and Schall et al. (2004).

References

- Allen, Kathleen E. 1990. *Diverse Voices of Leadership: Different Rhythms and Emerging Harmonies*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.
- Bennis, Warren G., and Patricia W. Biederman. 1997. *Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Boje, David M. 1995. Stories of the Storytelling Organization: A Postmodern Analysis of Disney as "Tamara-land." *Academy of Management Journal* 38(4): 997–1035.
- Brown, Vivienne. 1994. The Economy as Text. In *New Directions in Economic Methodology*, edited by Roger E. Backhouse, 368–82. London: Routledge.
- Bruner, Jerome S. 1986. *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bryman, Alan. 1996. Leadership in Organizations. In *Handbook of Organization Studies*, edited by Stewart Cleegg, Cynthia Hardy, and Walter Nord, 276–92. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bryson, John, and Barbara Crosby. 1992. *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, James. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Cameron, Kim S., Jane E. Dutton, and Robert E. Quinn, eds. 2003. *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Chrislip, David D., and Carl E. Larson. 1994. *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, D. Jean, and F. Michael Connelly. 2000. *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cleary, Robert E. 1992. Revisiting the Doctoral Dissertation in Public Administration: An Examination of the Dissertations of 1990. *Public Administration Review* 52(1): 55–61.
- Cobley, Paul. 2001. *Narrative*. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, Cathy, Kathleen Jones, and Joan Tronto. 1997. *Women Transforming Politics: An Alternative Reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Corvellec, Herve. 2003. Narratives of Organizational Performance. In *Narratives We Organize By*, edited by Barbara Czarniawska and Pasquale Gagliardi, 115–33. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Crosby, Barbara. 1999. *Leadership for Global Citizenship: Building Transnational Community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Currie, Mark. 1998. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Czarniawska, Barbara. 1997. *Narrating the Organization: Dramas of Institutional Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- De la Ville, Valerie-Ines, and Eleonore Mounoud. 2003. How Can Strategy Be a Practice? Between Discourse and Narration. In *Narratives We Organize By*, edited by Barbara Czarniawska and Pasquale Gagliardi, 95–113. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1997. *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices for the 21st Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 2000. Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 1–28. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drath, Wilfred. 2001. *The Deep Blue Sea: Rethinking the Source of Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Drath, Wilfred H., and Charles J. Palus. 1994. *Making Common Sense: Leadership as Meaning-Making in a Community of Practice*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Dryzek, John. 1982. Policy Analysis as a Hermeneutic Activity. *Policy Science* 14: 309–29.
- Ewick, Patricia and Susan S. Silbey. 1995. Subversive Stories and Hegemonic Tales: Toward a Sociology of Narrative. *Law and Society Review* 29(2): 197–226.
- Feldman, Martha, Kaj Skoldberg, Ruth Nicole Brown, and Debra Horner. 2002. Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Conference, December 8–11, Boston, MA.
- Fiske, John. 1993. *Power Plays, Power Works*. London: Verso.
- Fletcher, Joyce. 2002. The Paradox of Post-Heroic Leadership: Gender, Power and the "New" Organization. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Organization and Management Theory Division, August 9–14, Denver, CO.
- Forester, John. 1993. *Critical Theory, Public Policy and Planning Practice: Toward a Critical Pragmatism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gardner, Howard E. 1995. *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gaskell, George, and Martin W. Bauer. 2000. Towards Public Accountability: Beyond Sampling, Reliability and Validity. In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, edited by Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, 336–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2000. Discourse Analysis. In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, edited by Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, 172–90. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hayek, Friedrich A. 1967. *Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heifetz, R. 1994. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Herzog, Richard J., and Ronald G. Claunch. 1997. Stories Citizens Tell and How Administrators Use Types of Knowledge. *Public Administration Review* 57(5): 374–79.
- Houston, David J., and Sybil M. Delevan. 1990. Public Administration Research: An Assessment of Journal Publications. *Public Administration Review* 50: 674–81.

- Hummel, Ralph. 1991. Stories Managers Tell: Why They Are as Valid as Science. *Public Administration Review* 51(1): 31–34.
- Hunt, Sonja. 1984. The Role of Leadership in the Construction of Reality. In *Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Barbara Kellerman, 157–78. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Huxham, Chris, and Siv Vangen. 2000. Leadership in the Shaping and Implementation of Collaboration Agendas: How Things Happen in a Not Quite Joined-Up World. *Academy of Management Journal* 43(6): 1159–75.
- Jennings, Bruce. 1987. Interpretive Social Science and Policy Analysis. In *Ethics, the Social Sciences and Policy Analysis*, edited by Daniel Callahan and Bruce Jennings, 3–36. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Jovchelovitch, Sandra, and Martin W. Bauer. 2000. Narrative Interviewing. In *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound*, edited by Martin W. Bauer and George Gaskell, 57–74. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kellerman, Barbara. 1999. *Reinventing Leadership: Making the Connection Between Politics and Business*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Lavoie, Don, ed. 1991. *Economics and Hermeneutics*. London: Routledge.
- Lincoln, Yvonna S., and Egon G. Guba. 2000. Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 163–88. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ludema, James. 1996. *Narrative Inquiry*. PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University.
- Luke, Jeffrey S. 1998. *Catalytic Leadership: Strategies for an Interconnected World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lynn, Laurence E., and Carolyn J. Heinrich. 2000. *Governance and Performance New Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Martin, Joanne. 1992. Stories and Scripts in Organizational Settings. In *Cognitive Social Psychology*, edited by Albert H. Hastorf and Alice M. Isen, 255–305. New York: Elsevier.
- Maynard-Moody, Steven, and Michael Musheno. 2003. *Cops, Teachers, Counselors: Stories from the Front Lines of Public Service*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McCloskey, Deirdre N. 1992. *If You're So Smart: The Narrative of Economic Expertise*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1998. *The Rhetoric of Economics*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Meindl, James. 1995. The Romance of Leadership as a Follower-Centric Theory: A Social Constructionist Approach. *Leadership Quarterly* 6(3): 329–41.
- Newland, Chester A. 2000. The Public Administration Review and Ongoing Struggles for Connectedness. In *Public Administration Review* 60(1): 20–38.
- Ospina, Sonia, and Ellen Schall. 2001. Perspectives on Leadership: Design for the Research and Documentation Component for the LCW Program. <http://leadershipforschange.org/research/papers/perspectives.php3>.
- Ospina, Sonia, Jennifer Dodge, Bethany Godsoe, Joan Minieri, Salvador Reza, and Ellen Schall. 2004. From Consent to Mutual Inquiry: Balancing Democracy and Authority in Action Research. *Action Research* (2)1: 47–69.
- Perry, James L., and Kenneth L. Kraemer. 1986. Research Methodology in the Public Administration Review 1975–1984. *Public Administration Review* 46: 215–26.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1997. The Ambiguity of Leadership. *Academy of Management Review* 2: 104–12.
- Reason, Peter W., and Hilary Bradbury, eds. 2001. *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rein, Martin. 1976. *Social Science and Public Policy*. New York: Penguin.
- Riessman, Catherine K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- . 2002. Narrative Analysis. In *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion*, edited by A. Michael Huberman and Matthew B. Miles, 217–70. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Roe, Emery M. 1992. Narrative Analysis for the Policy Analyst: A Case Study of the 1980–1982 Medfly Controversy in California. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 8: 251–74.
- Rost, Joseph C. 1993. *Leadership for the Twenty-first Century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Schall, Ellen. 1997. Notes from a Reflective Practitioner of Innovation. In *Innovation in American Government: Challenges, Opportunities and Dilemmas*, edited by Alan A. Altshuler and Robert D. Behn, 360–77. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Schall, Ellen, Sonia Ospina, Bethany Godsoe, and Jennifer Dodge. 2004. Appreciative Narratives as Leadership Research: Matching Method to Lens. In *Constructive Discourse and Human Organization: Advances in Appreciative Inquiry*, edited by David L. Cooperrider and Michel Avital, 147–70. New York: Elsevier.
- Schein, Edgar H. 1990. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, Donald A. 1991. *The Reflective Turn: Case Studies in and on Educational Practice*. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Schram, Sanford F., and Philip T. Neisser. 1997. *Tales of the State: Narrative in Contemporary U.S. Politics and Public Policy*. Lanham, MA: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Schwandt, Thomas A. 1997. *Qualitative Inquiry: A Dictionary of Terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shank, Gary D. 2002. *Qualitative Research: A Personal Skills Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Smircich, Linda, and Gareth Morgan. 1982. Leadership: The Management of Meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 18: 257–73.
- Soderberg, Anne-Marie. 2003. Sensegiving and Sensemaking in an Integration Process: A Narrative Approach to the Study of an International Acquisition. In *Narratives We Organize By*, edited by Barbara Czarniawska and Pasquale Gagliardi, 3–35. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Stafford, Walter. 1996. Black Civil Society: Fighting for a Seat at the Table. *Social Policy* 27(2): 11–16.
- Stone, Deborah. 1988. *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*. Glenville, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Terry, Larry D. 2003. *Leadership of Public Bureaucracies: The Administrator as Conservator*. 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Tetreault, Mary Ann. 2000. *Stories of Democracy: Politics and Society in Contemporary Kuwait*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tierney, William. 1987. The Semiotic Aspects of Leadership: An Ethnographic Perspective. *American Journal of Semiotics* 5: 223–50.
- White, Jay D. 1999. *Taking Language Seriously: The Narrative Foundations of Public Administration Research*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Yanow, Dvora. 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.