



Open Research Online

Citation

Sancino, Alessandro (2021). Local political leadership: from managerial performances to leaders-hip hop on social media? *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 17(3) pp. 283–297.

URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/75780/>

License

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding



Local Political Leadership: From Managerial Performances to Leaders-Hip Hop on Social Media?

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Public Leadership</i>
Manuscript ID	IJPL-01-2021-0001.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Leadership, social media, managerialism, Local government, Italy, followership

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Local Political Leadership: From Managerial Performances to Leaders-Hip Hop on Social Media?

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank the special issue editors, the anonymous reviewers and all the participants at the workshop on “Decentering Local Leadership” which was held at the University of Berkeley, California, on Friday 13 September 2019. This work was presented in a preliminary version at that workshop and benefited very much from the intensive discussion and all the constructive and thoughtful comments received.

1. Introduction

Leadership is a phenomenon that evolves over different time spans (Dinh et al., 2014). Based on this assumption, in this paper I try to offer an account of the evolution of practices performed by local political leaders in the last decade (2009–2019, a period which might be called post-global financial crisis and pre-COVID-19). Specifically, I focus on leadership practices implemented in pursuit of the institutional role of local political leaders. By institutional role I refer to “the social interpretation of the actual daily working function¹” (Sundgaard Andersen et al., 1999, p 10). This concept should be distinguished from the formal role (what is written in constitutions and regulations) and the inner role (each leader own perception of a given role).

The main research question that lies behind this paper is the following: how have the leadership practices of local political leaders evolved in the last decade? At a moment when profound technological and socio-cultural changes are impacting democracy (e.g., Bloom and Sancino, 2019), I believe it is essential to understand the evolving institutional role performed by some of the most important figures of democracy, namely (local) politicians.

In this respect, while acknowledging the cultural polyphony and the multiple practices of local political leadership (Orr and Vince, 2009), the argument that this paper makes is that there has been a fundamental shift in the dominant technologies of local political leadership from the logic of managerialism towards the logic of social media, with implications as to where the sources of influencing power reside and their related technologies.

This is what I refer to in the title as “from managerial performances to leaders-hip (hop) on social media.” By managerial performances I mean local politicians who exercise

¹ “A role represents the construction of a standardized form of action – of that which is done, the means by which it is done, and the actor who is responsible for the action in question. The role has an internal and an external side. The external side is the socially institutionalized interpretation of a role’s context and its substance. The role is the basis for institutionalization. The sustainability of an institution depends upon the actors fulfilling their roles.” (Sundgaard Andersen et al., 1999, p 9).

1
2
3 leadership and enact followership by acting and talking in a managerial way in the different
4 theatres of local politics, from the city hall to local assemblies with citizens. The word
5 leaders-hip takes inspiration from the work of Grint (2005) who played with the words within
6 leadership by putting an ideal dash between leader and ship to make the point—among
7 others—that we need to understand the ship (i.e., purposes, processes, places, and
8 performance, see for example Jackson and Parry, 2018) of leadership and not only the leader
9 (person) and her/his position. Drawing from empirical observations and reflexive personal
10 reasoning, in this study I place the focus on leaders-hip to illustrate two things: first a leader
11 is one because of the interactions and relations with other leaders (and followers) who
12 legitimize her/him (or not), as in the plural/collective (e.g., Cristofoli et al., 2020; Denis et al.,
13 2012) and socially networked views of leadership (e.g., Balkundi and Kilduff, 2006). Second,
14 practices of public leadership (Hartley, 2018) are now increasingly characterized by an
15 artistic, aesthetic, and popular political attitude, something I refer to as the “hip” of
16 leadership. Given the focus on the hip of leadership a link with the musical practices of hip-
17 hop² emerges and that is why I added the word “hop” to leaders-hip. I discuss these concepts
18 later in the paper.

19
20
21 From a theoretical point of view, the paper builds on the work of traditions in local
22 government practices of Kevin Orr (e.g., Nicholson and Orr, 2016; Orr, 2005), using an
23 interpretive and reflexive approach to storytelling which is inspired by the work of Bevir and
24 Rhodes (2004) and Alvesson (e.g., Alvesson and Sköldbberg, 2018). The paper attempts to
25 contribute both to theory and practice. In terms of theory, I offer the concepts of leaders-hip
26 hop and later in the paper of “charismatic followership” to understand and make sense of
27 emerging contemporary public leadership practices. In terms of practice, the paper sheds light

28
29
30 ² Drawing from several definitions reported in the Cambridge Dictionary, hip-hop can be defined as a type of
31 popular African-American music and dance, with songs about politics and society using words that are spoken
32 rather than sung, and often performed by a group of people (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.).

on some leadership practices through which local political leaders legitimize and nurture their position of leadership in a given temporal and socio-cultural context. Specifically, the paper highlights the increasing importance of social media and digital leadership (e.g., Gilani et al., 2020; Gustafsson and Weinryb, 2020). Following Orr and Vince (2009), the managerial implications of this study deal with encouraging and enabling “researchers and practitioners to have a reflexive view of local circumstances ...[to] help diagnose the ‘softer’ contextual variables in these organizations” (Orr and Vince, 2009, p 656).

The paper is structured as follows. The second section provides the theoretical backdrop. The third section provides information about the methodology of the research. Findings are presented in the fourth section in the form of three stories of local political leadership, which are discussed in the fifth section. Preliminary conclusions and perspectives for future research are discussed in the sixth and last section.

2. Understanding Leadership Practices: The Importance of Relationality and Traditions

According to Alvesson (2017, p 67), “leadership is about a relation and a set of interactions involving people in an asymmetrical relation in a social (organizational) context, where, although there is mutual influencing, one part (‘the leader’) is supposed to have a more far-reaching and goal-directed impact than others (the ‘followers’).” This definition emphasizes the importance of the concept of relationality in order to understand leadership, in line with relational leadership theory (Uhl-Bien 2006; Uhl-Bien and Ospina, 2012) and, more broadly, with collective leadership theories and approaches (e.g. Ospina et al 2020). As Carroll, Levy, and Richmond (2008, p 366) have highlighted, “relationality represents the commitment to understanding individuals or collectives not as separate, isolated or discreet entities but as a

1
2
3 ‘field of re-lat-ionships’ (Cooper, 2005, p 1693) or ‘bundles of practices’ (Schatzki, 2005, p
4
5 12).”

6
7
8 According to Ospina and Foldy (2010, p 293), “relationality refers to the theoretical
9
10 understanding that self and other are inseparable and co-evolve in ways that must be
11
12 accounted for.” Therefore, the source of leadership is “one level up from the individual or the
13
14 relationship, at the system of relationships’ (Ospina, 2017, p 281).

15
16
17 A relational perspective to leadership practices is relevant because “meaning-making
18
19 processes associated with leadership also become visible as practices— recurrent ways of
20
21 doing things that group members experience as good solutions to their attempts at
22
23 organizing” (Ospina 2017, p 281). In this paper, I use this definition of leadership practices
24
25 provided by Ospina. From a relational perspective, it is important to note that leadership
26
27 practices are intrinsically non-individualistic phenomena as they are performed in relation to
28
29 some people, contexts, situations, and purposes. Accordingly, it is by investigating the
30
31 relational (un)intentions of these practices and their effects on who, where, what and why is
32
33 following that we could get a better understanding on the situated meaning(s) of leadership.
34
35
36

37
38 The focus on practices is shared by another important theory, which is the decentered
39
40 theory of governance proposed by Bevir (2013). With a decentered approach, governance
41
42 could be understood as a vast array of meaningful actions as they coalesce into contingent,
43
44 shifting, and contestable practices. Within this perspective, governance practices can be seen
45
46 as situated and dispersed agency which is in a relational tension between historical and
47
48 conceptual traditions and dilemmas of action generated by contextual and contingent features,
49
50 including cultural, material, organizational and relational dynamics among people. According
51
52 to Carroll, Levy, and Richmond (2008), the notion of practice is particularly important for
53
54 “its attentiveness to leadership as discourse, identity and modus operandi” (p 376). Practices
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are indeed underpinned by narratives resembling both how actors socialize multiple
4 competing governmental traditions and how they respond to dilemmas (Bevir et al. 2003).
5
6

7
8 On this, Bevir and Rhodes argued:
9

10
11
12 people can engage in a practice only because they hold certain beliefs, and that
13 interpretive approaches can help researchers to illuminate how the *beliefs* and
14 *actions* of individuals are shaped by, and in turn shape the social contexts that
15 may be evoked by particular “aggregate concepts” such as traditions or ideologies
16
17
18
19
20
21 (Bevir and Rhodes 2004, p 131, our italics)
22
23
24
25

26 The concept of “traditions” is important in order to explore the relationship between
27 *beliefs* and *actions*. Kevin Orr studied traditions in local government organizations by
28 drawing from Bevir and Rhodes who defined them as “a set of connected beliefs and habits
29 that intentionally or unintentionally passed from generation to generation at some point in the
30 past” (2003, p 34 cited in Orr and Vince, 2009). As Orr and Vince (2009, p 656) explained,
31 “traditions can be used in the study and evaluation of political and managerial practices in
32 local government settings. They provide lenses through which the routines, structures and
33 processes of management and politics may be viewed.”
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Thus, issues of context, culture, place, and power which are blended in traditions are
45 fundamental for the analysis of the beliefs behind social, managerial, and political practices
46 (Bevir and Rhodes 2003), where realities are “multiple, local-historical constructions” (Van
47 Der Haar and Hosking, 2004, p 1020).
48
49
50
51
52

53 Summing up, the collective leadership theories and the decentered theory of
54 governance share a relational ontology which decenters leadership from an individual
55 perspective of the leader and governance from the institutionalist perspective of the state
56
57
58
59
60

(e.g., Bevir, 2020), toward a conception that emphasizes relationality (Sutherland et al., 2014, p 763), and interactions and practices (Crevani et al., 2010) which take place in a socio-cultural and temporal context characterized by multiple and potentially competing traditions which may originate dilemmas in and for action.

These perspectives help to shed light on the plurality and dispersed nature of the social processes of leadership and governance (e.g., Denis et al., 2012), where leadership practices are enacted because they are perceived and legitimated as such by others in a given temporal, social, and cultural context. This approach has been pursued by other prominent scholars in the field of public administration by researching the working characteristics and the reasoning behind the professional practices of politicians and managers (e.g., Nalbandian, 1994; Rhodes, 2005). In particular, these scholars have emphasized the implications of taking this interpretive and reflexive approach on the types of research methodologies and methods to be used, pointing to the importance of using longitudinal, immersive, and field types of enquiry (on this, see, for example, Sutherland, 2018), a research strategy that I employed for this study and which is outlined in the next paragraph.

3. Methodology

This research is a longitudinal and reflexive analysis of the evolution of the practices performed by local political leaders in the pursuit of their institutional role in the last decade (2009–2019, post-global financial crisis, pre-COVID-19). The paper is based on a single case study and it relies on qualitative data drawn from multiple sources and collected at different points in time, namely: interviews, participant and non-participant observations³ from an ethnography conducted in 2009; interviews conducted between 2019 and 2020, and an

³ Participant observations consisted of meetings with other local political leaders, and with public managers. Non-participant observations consisted of formal (e.g., public hearings with citizens) and informal meetings held in different locations (from the local authority to cafés and pubs).

1
2
3 analysis of the posts made within one Facebook group⁴ between February and May 2016,
4
5 akin to a netnographic approach (Kozinets, 2015). Data have also been triangulated by
6
7 consulting other sources (e.g., institutional documents of the municipality, newsletters, local
8
9 magazines, and local newspapers).

10
11
12 The empirical context of the research is an Italian local authority in North Italy where
13
14 I had privileged access because of having held local political leadership positions in the
15
16 region where the municipality is located. Both Copus (2003) and Gains (2011) welcomed this
17
18 privileged access to the site of the research.
19
20

21
22 To protect the anonymity of research participants, the local authority has been
23
24 referred to as Cheese-Town and pseudonyms have been used when research participants have
25
26 been named. Cheese-Town is a post-industrial center in the north-west of Italy; in terms of
27
28 size, it has between 15,000 and 100,000 inhabitants. More information on the main features
29
30 of the Italian public sector is offered in Box 1.
31
32
33

34
35 **Box 1: "Some notes on local government system in Italy"**

36 Italy is organized into four levels of government: central government, twenty regions (*Regioni*), namely the
37 intermediate sub-national governments which have strong legislative powers, provinces and metropolitan
38 cities (*Province e Citta' Metropolitane*), and municipalities (*Comuni*). In this configuration, provinces,
39 metropolitan cities (about 110 in total) and municipalities (slightly less than 8,000) make up Italy's two-layer
40 local government system. Each municipality has a directly elected mayor, an executive cabinet, a city council,
41 and an administrative body, plus—depending on the size—it might have several municipal bodies (e.g.,
42 foundations or agencies) and/or corporations to provide public services. The mayor is the head of the
43 executive branch and is elected directly by the citizens (as are the city councillors) and appoints the
44 members of the cabinet (*Assessori*), who are not necessarily elected by the citizens in municipalities of over
45 15,000 inhabitants (see on this for example Sancino and Castellani, 2016).
46

47
48 The units of analysis for our study were the leadership practices of local political
49
50 leaders who held local political leadership positions during the period between 2009 and
51
52 2019 in the municipality which was the empirical setting of the research. Specifically, I focus
53
54
55
56
57

58
59
60 ⁴ This analysis was done as a result of the interviews conducted in the second round, which highlighted the
importance of the Facebook group to understand changing local political leadership practices. Unexpected
opportunities are typical and part of good qualitative research (Aguinis and Solarino, 2019).

on the institutional role of executive local political leaders who are members of the cabinet or councilors in charge of executive tasks.

To analyze the data, I took a reflexive approach to qualitative and interpretive research (Alvesson and Sköldbberg, 2018). Specifically embracing a hermeneutics stance (Alvesson and Sköldbberg, 2018), I used an abductive process and thematic narrative analysis (Czarniawska, 2004). Some of the ideas contained in this paper have accompanied my personal reasoning and reflection in the last years resulting in the writing of several memos which have been presented to academic colleagues (peer-debriefing) and local politicians beyond the context of Cheese-Town (external check). To accompany this process of reflexive analysis of the qualitative material, I have also employed an iterative—but hierarchical—order of coding to help organize the main themes emerging from the empirical material. As an example, a representation of the coding exercise is offered in Table 1. Coding has been pursued manually following a mix of deductive and inductive codings (Cappellaro, 2017).

Table 1. Analysis of the qualitative data: from first order codes to stories

A representation of the interpretive coding process	Third order codes and themes	Second order codes and themes	Examples of first order codes and themes (selection)
Story 1: Good leadership is good management	Political Managerialism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability • Citizen participation • Public Innovation • Public governance • Politics and administration 	Social reporting; managerial practices; consultants; innovations; appointments; spoil system; openness; public meetings; participation; inter-governmental relations
Story 2: Facebook changed our lives	Charismatic Followership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society • Digital citizen participation • Charismatic leadership • Populism 	De-politicization; Anti-government; citizen voice; Facebook; social networks; trust; discontent; mayor; bureaucrats; power

Story 3: Shaking hands at the pub and getting “likes” on Facebook	Hands-on Relational Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emotions and empathy • Social networks • Relational leadership 	Digital leadership; place; charisma; social status; political parties; social networks; friendship; organizational politics
---	--------------------------------------	--	--

Source: own elaboration.

To present the data, I try to follow Orr and Bennett (2017) by using a story-telling method which is informed by an event-centered narrative and an interpretative approach, where, as in the words of Grønbæk Pors (2021) also in this special issue, “[data] is constructed and interpreted in particular manners as part of the complex encounter between researcher and field.” Stories are particularly appropriate in interpretive approaches for offering a decentered account (Durose, 2009) and to make sense of different contexts. Of course, they have limits because—as Sullivan argued—“as constructions, they are partial and subject to challenge, so different and competing narratives can operate in relation to the same set of events.” (Sullivan 2007, p 144).

4. Findings

Story no. 1—Good political leadership is good management (2009)

Premise

This story is about the permeation of the neoliberal discourse⁵ of managerialism (e.g., Bloom and Rhodes, 2018) into micro-behaviors and languages used by local political leaders. A necessary backdrop to understanding this story is a consideration of the institutional structure of local authorities in Italy which gives a key role to executive political leaders (see Box 1).

⁵ Discourses can be defined as “ideas and practices which condition our ways or relating to, and acting upon, particular phenomena” (Knights and Morgan, 1991, p 253).

1
2
3 They oversee a policy area and work as *Assessore* (members of a cabinet) appointed by the
4 mayor. This work in Cheese-Town is a part-time job with a decent salary.
5
6

7
8 *End of the premise*
9
10

11
12 When you speak to executive political leaders in Cheese-Town, it is all about good
13 management and public sector innovation. For example, while discussing local government
14 with the member of the cabinet in charge of economic affairs, he speaks with me very
15 proudly of having introduced managerial innovations to the local authority, such as the
16
17
18
19
20
21 “Social Report.”
22
23
24
25

26
27 *“We had recently won the elections and, as the leadership of the council*
28 *changed, we had to stand out and change managerial processes. I took my role as*
29 *Assessore responsible for finance very seriously and started doing some research.*
30
31 *I found this initiative for introducing a Social Report very interesting and*
32
33 *discussed it with the Mayor, who immediately approved the idea.” (our*
34
35
36
37
38 *underscore)*
39
40
41

42 The same applied for a very different character in Cheese-Town, Mrs. Caliente, a strongly
43 passionate and popular local political leader, who spoke with me about the idea to engage
44 citizens and stakeholders to support the design for the new urban plan as the best
45
46
47
48
49 achievement in her political term:
50

51
52 *“Regional law suggests doing participation forums, but we planned the participation process*
53 *independently, expanding it considerably. All went well and we [the politicians and*
54
55
56 *appointed consultants] managed citizen participation forums very well.” (Our underscore).*
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The third character of this story is the deputy Mayor who is responsible for cultural and sport
4 policies. He created local quangos in the name of good management, but also to appoint
5 experts in his political network as managers of these quangos. Below are the words he used to
6 justify his choice of the creation of a local quango (a foundation) to manage the local theatre:
7

8
9
10
11
12 *“There are some theatres that work very well near here and I noticed that they were run by*
13 *council-owned foundations. I prepared a kind of business plan and I realized that it could*
14 *work. There is nobody in the municipality who has worked with theatres, and it is reasonable*
15 *to create a new structure to do a new thing.”* (Our underscore)
16
17
18
19
20

21 Moral

22
23 This story includes excerpts about some “key events” that happened in Cheese-Town. In
24 conducting my ethnographic research in 2009, I was impressed by how the local political
25 leaders whom I have spoken with were all using a managerial vocabulary and referring to
26 public sector managerial innovations to legitimize what was done during their administrative
27 term. This was part of a broader trend at that time in Italian local government politics to bring
28 in professionals to replace a cadre of local politicians perceived to be as inefficient, and of an
29 even bigger international ideology characterized by the adoption of New Public Management
30 ideas, which arrived in Italy in the 1990s. The moral of this story is that local political leaders
31 were supposed to be custodians and agents of democratic wishes expressed by citizens.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 However, almost all of the main democratic appeals which animated the electoral campaign
45 in Cheese-Town disappeared after the elections. Local political leaders were talking and
46 acting as managers. However, if the local political leaders had become like managers, who
47 then performed the role and institutional tasks of local politicians?
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 **Story no. 2 – Facebook changed our lives (2014–2016)**

57 *Premise*

58
59
60

1
2
3 This story is about how social networks changed the dynamics of political leadership and
4 public administration. Given the historical moment of the story please consider it in the
5 context of austerity and cuts in funding from central government, and their effects on public
6 services which Italian local authorities experienced.
7
8
9
10

11
12 *End of premise*
13
14
15
16

17 In 2014 a group of Cheese-Town citizens started a new virtual social group on Facebook. The
18 aim was to be the official group for collecting all the information and news related to Cheese-
19 Town. The group was a success and in less than one year a third of the adult population living
20 in Cheese-Town was part of it. However, nobody could have realized that virtual group
21 would lead to the resignation of the Mayor. In 2015 several citizens started to post queries on
22 the group about public administration issues, such as public works for example. Many people
23 also complained about rising unemployment and the fact that many local firms were closing
24 down (issues which were technically beyond the scope of the local authority). I spoke
25 informally with a young local political leader whom I had known since I was young and who
26 had executive responsibilities in education and social care at that time. He described that
27 period as:
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *“All the negative energy present in our community was channeled into that group. All of the*
43 *people posting something were blaming the Mayor for not doing this and that.”*
44
45

46 Another local political leader whom I interviewed described the personal dynamics of having
47 to deal with that group and more generally with Facebook:
48
49
50

51 *“You make a post out there and then wait compulsively for likes and comments. You are in an*
52 *important meeting, but you cannot resist checking your i-phone to look at what is happening*
53 *below your post.”*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In another interview, conducted while we were getting a coffee together in the local bar
4 located just in front of the town hall, a public manager in charge of public works was
5
6 speaking about the member of the cabinet (*Assessore*) he was working with, and in a moment
7
8 of quiet he broke the silence by telling me:
9

10
11
12 “No doubt. Facebook has changed our lives.”
13

14 I asked how.

15
16
17 “You go to sleep thinking about groups of citizens blaming you on Facebook. You wake up
18
19 and see what it is going on Facebook to see if everything is ok”/
20

21
22 “Then, I enter the office and my plans change because the *Assessore* saw something on
23
24 Facebook and asks me to go and sort that out.”
25

26
27
28 The Mayor was not immune from the temptation to go on Facebook to post something in the
29
30 “Cheese-Town Facebook official group.” All political leaders want likes. However, it was
31
32 actually an high risk exercise which spurred opposite effects. Criticism on Facebook rose at
33
34 the end of 2015 and at the beginning of 2016; what was supposed to be just a social group
35
36 became full of political comments opposing the Mayor and the local authority. One of the
37
38 most popular posts was the one below which adopted an angry and direct tone toward the
39
40 Mayor:
41
42

43
44
45 “Make yourself available to the citizens, accept and listen to the criticisms and the proposal
46
47 and above all GIVE THE REPLIES concretely, looking at us...” (Post on Facebook, February
48
49 25, 2016).
50

51
52
53 Due to the high activism of people with time to spend criticizing the local administration on
54
55 Facebook, the discontent spread and was so extensive and widespread that the Mayor decided
56
57 to resign. However, in Cheese-Town many silent followers watching what was going on in
58
59
60

1
2
3 this group are now regretful of what happened. Nevertheless, they were silent on Facebook
4
5 while they were passively watching others blame the Mayor.
6
7
8
9

10 Moral

11
12 This story is centered around real-life events and documents how social media became a
13
14 central arena for local politics to such a point that some local political leaders of Cheese-
15
16 Town commented that there was more political debate during the day on Facebook than in
17
18 city council meetings held in the late afternoons and evenings. However, Facebook might
19
20 appear to make things more transparent, but it also created distortions of local opinions⁶.
21
22 Using the words of Gabriel (2005), it may seem to be a glass palace, but it is actually a glass
23
24 cage, where being visible in the public sphere influences the type and contents of leadership
25
26 practice. For example, the possibility of tracking citizens preferences can result in fabricating
27
28 types of leadership according to specific tastes and preferences, the so called “wall effect”
29
30 where you see on social media only what you want to see according to your previous
31
32 behaviors. Thus, there is a risk, as Gabriel wrote prophetically fifteen years ago, that “today’s
33
34 organizations resort to far subtler, yet deeper, controls, controls that are pervasive and
35
36 invasive, that do not merely constrain a person but define a person.” (Gabriel, 2005, p 17).
37
38 These may include cultural and ideological controls, continuous measurement, electronic
39
40 surveillance, and so on. Social media have undoubtedly had great impacts on politicians,
41
42 managers, and citizens both in terms of what people do and where the influencing power
43
44 resides. However, what are the democratic implications of this?
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁶ I am indebted to one of the reviewers for this point.

Story no. 3 – Shaking hands at the pub and getting likes on Facebook (2017–2019)

In Cheese-Town it was time to decide who was going to run as a mayoral candidate. The decision was quite important as the most important local political party in Cheese-Town was pretty sure to win the election. There were several potential leaders suitable for the job, but at the end Mr. Bag was chosen. All the key local political leaders of Mr. Bag's party that I spoke with agreed on the reasons, which were threefold. First, because he was supported by other relevant leaders within Cheese-Town; in other words, he was well positioned in the network of relevant local leaders. He had good relationships with everybody. Second, because he used to attend local pubs and cafes and shook hands with people attending them. Third, he had a good reputation on the web too. He was used to interacting quite a lot with other citizens of Cheese-Town on Facebook, by liking their posts and sending them good wishes and congratulations for their achievements shared on Facebook.

Moral

This is another story centered on a real-life event that happened in Cheese-Town. In the first instance, my analysis of this story pointed me to the notion of charisma. In the end, charisma could explain why Mr. Bag was chosen. However, a more careful analysis of the leadership practices performed by Mr. Bag suggested a connection with the practice of hands-on relational leadership which is described in Ayres (2019). According to Sarah Ayres, hands-on relational leadership brings the leader into closer contact with network participants based on face-to-face inter-personal connections, something which I refer to as "shaking hands at the pub." Another concept emerged as important after discussing this story in an academic presentation at the International Studying Leadership Conference held in Bristol in 2019. This is the concept of digital charisma. By digital charisma I refer more precisely to the digital fabrication of charisma, which is the professional management in the digital sphere of the charisma of the leader(s) which is created in an automated and/or professional way (for

1
2
3 example through managed hands-on relational leadership by Facebook “liking” and writing
4 birthday wishes, making positive replies to other comments, writing messages that connect
5 with the popular mood of the moment on topical events according to analyses of the web
6 sentiment, and so on). All these activities could be interpreted as digital hands-on relational
7 leadership. Summing up, this story seems to point to the importance of exercising charisma
8 through hands-on relational leadership (see on this for example Antonakis et al., 2012).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 However, we now also have digital charisma.
18
19
20
21

22 **5. Discussion**

23
24 In this paper I took as focus for analysis a positional view of local political leadership (on the
25 six lenses of leadership see Jackson and Parry, 2018), but I studied it through a relational
26 ontology and using a longitudinal research strategy, investigating leadership practices enacted
27 in a given temporal and socio-cultural context (2009 to 2019 in North Italy). The idea was to
28 understand the leadership practices that were implemented by executive local political leaders
29 and perceived by other local leaders and followers as creating and legitimizing their local
30 political leadership role. The findings shed light on one fundamental pattern of change and on
31 one pattern of persistence. The change refers to the disruptive impact of social media which
32 has turned political managerialism into what I call charismatic followership. Political
33 managerialism (e.g., Seal and Ball, 2005) refers to practices where local political leaders talk
34 about managerial issues to conform with the discourse of managerialism (e.g., Parker, 2002),
35 but still with a very fundamental political aim—often pursued in a hidden, deviant, or
36 deliberately ignorant way (see also Teasdale and Dey, 2019)—of increasing their political
37 consensus and interests. This was clearly epitomized in the three characters of the first story
38 who were all making sense of their political role by narrating how they successfully
39 implemented what were perceived at that time to be public sector managerial innovations,
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 namely a social report, a new urban plan, and a local quango. These situated accounts match
4
5 with a broader trend of managerialization in Italian local politics. In other words, 10 years
6
7 ago in North Italy, a local political leader was considered as such because of their highly
8
9 regarded professional credentials and because they were acting and talking as a manager able
10
11 to save the local authority from public sector inefficiencies. Clearly, these situated accounts
12
13 powerfully touch on many important topics within the field of public administration, such as
14
15 the blurring of relationships between politicians and managers in local government, for
16
17 example (e.g., Sancino et al., 2018; Svava, 1999) and the role of politicians in public
18
19 innovation (Hartley et al., 2013; Sørensen and Torfing, 2019).
20
21
22

23
24 However, according to the longitudinal analysis conducted, “political managerialism” has
25
26 now evolved from the management of the local authority with a language characterized by
27
28 issues such as innovation, efficiency, and effectiveness toward the management of citizens’
29
30 emotions on social media. We introduce the concept of “charismatic followership” here to
31
32 explain this evolving follower-driven leadership practice. Specifically, charismatic
33
34 followership refers to practices of local political leadership characterized by the deployment
35
36 of an emotional language to please and appeal to followers; this term also denotes how the
37
38 most active and vocal followers can influence the type of leadership enacted by local political
39
40 leaders. In other words, being able to communicate effectively on social networks today,
41
42 rather than expressing a managerial orientation and using a managerial vocabulary, is
43
44 perceived by other leaders (e.g., city councilors and public managers) and/or followers (e.g.,
45
46 citizens) as well as by the local political leaders themselves, as a more important technology
47
48 of leadership. However, as described by Kellerman (2008), this leadership is actually very
49
50 often a followership, where languages and contents are co-produced by leaders and followers
51
52 with a shift of power from the leader toward the followers with “potentially tilting
53
54 information asymmetries in favour of the follower” (Gilani et al. 2020, p 343).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Some of these dynamics are present in the second and third stories, which describe a
4 paradigmatic shift both in what local political leaders do (spending time on social networks)
5 and in what was driving their actions and words (the logic of social media). The discourse of
6 local political leaders has thus evolved from a technocratic stance infused with a managerial
7 vocabulary toward a populist stance infused with emotional underpinnings. The links
8 between charisma, populism, and leadership on social media were also noticed by Gustafsson
9 and Weinryb (2020) who highlighted that “this self-infatuated imperative to show, tell, and
10 cheer engagement online may be labeled as charismatic: its individuality entails the boom
11 and bust cycle of digital enthusiasm (Gerbaudo, 2016), and it peddles populist beliefs in the
12 power of the individual in opposition to the elite” (Gustafsson and Weinryb, 2020, p 4).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 On this issue Gilani, Bolat, Nordberg, and Wilkin (2020) have pointed out that “the social
27 media context raises important questions about power dynamics that leaders cannot exist
28 without followers, but that followers can co-create their leaders, sometimes with nurturing,
29 sometimes with toxifying effects” (Gilani et al., 2020, p 345). According again to Gustafsson
30 and Weinryb (2020, p 2), “social media platforms to organize mass action contributes to a
31 networked individualism driven by an emotional vocabulary, which promotes populism, and
32 potentially undermines the legitimacy of the bureaucratic organizational structures that
33 uphold liberal democracies.”

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 As anticipated above, findings also shed light on patterns of persistence in the practices of
46 local political leaders. Here, I refer to the centrality of the ties and relationships of the local
47 leaders (e.g., Ayres, 2019). The third story presented above highlights the importance of
48 personal contact between the leaders and their ties (something described as “hands-on meta-
49 governance” by Ayres [2019]) and of performing charismatic and popular acts of leadership.
50 Working with the components of the word leadership and using the metaphor of performers
51 of hip-hop music, as Grint (2005) emphasized the role of ship in leadership, I point to the role
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of hip—intended as artistic and popular acts of leadership—enacted by the leader within their patterns of relationships (the leaders in leaders-hip). Thus, going to the pub and shaking hands, sharing messages and videos on social networks, participating in and convening informal meetings with key actors, keeping close contacts through intense communications with other key leaders, and persistently walking in the piazzas greeting people, these were all acts of leaders-hip hop that constructed the institutional role of the most successful local political leaders in Cheese-Town.

6. Concluding remarks

Local political leadership is a field of study which investigates the behaviors, roles, and contexts (institutional, organizational, and social) in which local politicians exercise their leadership role (e.g., Lowndes and Leach, 2004; Stoker, 2003; Torfing et al., 2019). This field of study can be considered as relatively new and emerging, given the recent trends of reforms which assigned a more relevant role to local governments in and across regions, nations, and countries (e.g., Beer et al., 2019; Budd and Sancino, 2016; Hambleton, 2014; Heinelt et al., 2018; Sancino and Hudson, 2020).

This paper adopts an interpretive and reflexive approach and connects with other similar studies of local political leadership that try to enhance our cultural, social, and organizational understanding of the evolving role of local politicians in contemporary democratic governance and in society overall (e.g., Karsten and Hendriks, 2017; Magnier 2004; Sørensen 2006, 2020; Sweeting 2012). The study highlights the changing social technologies of leadership, and points to the increasing (but at the same time problematic) role of social media logic.

The paper focuses on three stories of local political leadership at three different points of time describing three specific leadership practices: political managerialism,

1
2
3 charismatic followership, and hands-on relational leadership. A pattern of persistence as well
4
5 as a pattern of change emerges from the analysis. Persistence refers to the importance of
6
7 hands-on relational leadership through popular acts of leadership, performed face to face
8
9 and/or on social media. Change refers to a fundamental shift in the dominant technologies of
10
11 local political leadership from the logic of managerialism toward the logic of social media.
12
13 Drawing from Orr and Vince (2009) I argue that social media logic is a new tradition in local
14
15 government practices. This paper comes with several limitations: it is focused on a limited
16
17 temporal (2009–2019) and socio-cultural context (North Italy). The findings are presented as
18
19 three stories, whereas other ways of showing qualitative data could have been used.
20
21
22

23
24 Moreover, this study was conducted in the empirical context of a small to medium size city;
25
26 this is a limitation as big cities might have different social dynamics of leadership even in the
27
28 same temporal and socio-cultural context.
29

30
31 As a final note I would like to share some reflections on ways forward for studying,
32
33 researching, and developing public leadership (see also Crosby and Bryson, 2018). Being
34
35 invited to, and participating at, the Berkeley Workshop on “Decentering Local Leadership”
36
37 was an eye-opener event for me. As it was accompanied by the legitimate possibility of using
38
39 storytelling as a method for studying, researching, developing, and disseminating public
40
41 leadership knowledge, this gave me the opportunity to make better sense of several empirical
42
43 research and professional experiences that I have had in local government politics in Italy.
44
45

46
47 In writing this paper I have tried to create an ideal bridge between the works on
48
49 storytelling in public administration and governance (e.g., Bevir, 2011; Orr and Bennet,
50
51 2017) and on collective and critical leadership studies (e.g., Alvesson and Spicer, 2012;
52
53 Collinson, 2011; Ospina et al., 2020). It seems to me there is and/or could be a strong
54
55 possibility for cross-fertilization by interpretive and critical approaches, the latter being
56
57 mentioned here to better understand the political, socio-cultural, and power-related
58
59
60

1
2
3 dimensions which are inherently embedded in the practices of leadership in its situated
4
5 temporal and material settings. In my view, the use of stories of situated accounts of
6
7 leadership and governance is a great common terrain where the interpretive can meet and link
8
9 with the critical, which in some ways is my take on the tension among beliefs, actions, and
10
11 traditions and ideologies described by Bevir.
12
13

14
15 However, I wonder how what has been for me an eye-opening experience can be
16
17 shared with other scholars to further develop an academically sound and reliable use of
18
19 storytelling, which—from a knowledge transfer and dissemination perspective —could also
20
21 potentially and usefully contribute to building an archive of evolving public administration
22
23 and leadership practices. In this respect, I believe there could be more attention and a
24
25 collective effort to developing shared research protocols for using storytelling as a method
26
27 and epistemology for investigating and explaining practices of leadership and governance.
28
29 For example, there are issues about who should contribute to writing these stories and about
30
31 how different morals of stories on a similar topic relate to each other, calling into questions
32
33 on the one hand new ways of generating knowledge based on a closer collaboration between
34
35 scholars and communities of practice, and on the other hand issues related to enabling and
36
37 fostering more reflexivity, debate, and comparison among scholars, especially those located
38
39 in different cultural contexts. The notion of the moral of a story seems to me particularly
40
41 powerful for co-producing generalizable knowledge relevant across contexts and times, as
42
43 well as being very important for training, debate, and learning purposes.
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 I genuinely hope that this special issue can represent the first of a renewed endeavor
51
52 of a broader movement aimed at using storytelling in leadership and governance studies to
53
54 advance social science research, teaching, development, and dissemination within and across
55
56 different communities.
57
58
59
60

References

- Aguinis, H., & Solarino, A. M. (2019). Transparency and replicability in qualitative research: The case of interviews with elite informants. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40(8), 1291-1315.
- Alvesson, M. (2017). 'Studying Leadership. Taking Meaning, Relationality and Ideology Seriously'. In J. Storey, J. Hartley, J. L. Denis, P. t' Hart & D. Ulrich (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Leadership* (pp. 67-88). Routledge: New York.
- Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A., 2012. Critical leadership studies: The case for critical performativity. *Human Relations*, 65(3), 367-390.
- Alvesson, M., Sköldbberg, K (2018), 3rd edition, *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications: London.
- Antonakis, J., Fenley, M., & Liechti, S. (2012). Learning charisma. Transform yourself into the person others want to follow. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(6), 127-30.
- Ayres, S. (2019). How can network leaders promote public value through soft metagovernance? *Public Administration*, 97(2), 279-295.
- Balkundi, P., & Kilduff, M. (2006). The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 419-439.
- Beer, A., Ayres, S., Clower, T., Faller, F., Sancino, A., & Sotarauta, M. (2019). Place leadership and regional economic development: A framework for cross-regional analysis. *Regional Studies*, 53(2), 171-182.
- Bevir, M. (2011). Public administration as storytelling. *Public Administration*, 89(1), 183-195.
- Bevir, M. (2013). *A theory of governance*. University of California Press.
- Bevir, M. (2020). What is the decentered state?. *Public Policy and Administration*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076720904993>
- Bevir, M. and R.A.W. Rhodes. 2003. *Interpreting British Governance*. London: Routledge.

1
2
3 Bevir, M., Rhodes, R.A. and Weller, P., 2003. Comparative governance: prospects and lessons.
4
5 *Public Administration*, 81(1), 191-210.
6

7 Bevir, M. and R. A.W. Rhodes (2004), Interpreting British governance, *British Journal of*
8
9 *Politics and International Relations*, 6(2): 130–6.
10

11 Bloom, P. and Rhodes, C. (2018). *The CEO Society: The Corporate Takeover of Everyday Life*.
12
13 London: Zed Books.
14

15 Bloom, P. and Sancino, A.(2019). *Disruptive Democracy: The Clash Between Techno-*
16
17 *Populism and Techno-Democracy*. SAGE Publications Limited.
18

19 Budd, L. and Sancino, A. (2016). A Framework for city leadership in multilevel governance
20
21 settings: the comparative contexts of Italy and the UK. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*,
22
23 3(1), 129-145.
24

25 Cambridge Dictionary (n.d.), Hip-Hop, available at
26
27 <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/it/dizionario/inglese/hip-hop>, accessed on 08th January 2021.
28

29 Carroll, B., Levy, L., & Richmond, D. (2008). Leadership as practice: Challenging the
30
31 competency paradigm. *Leadership*, 4(4), 363-379.
32

33 Cappellaro G. (2017). Ethnography in Public Management Research: A Systematic Review
34
35 and Future Directions, *International Public Management Journal*, 20(1), 14-48.
36

37 Collinson, D. (2011). Critical Leadership Studies, Chapter 13. In: *The SAGE handbook of*
38
39 *leadership*. Sage Publications.
40

41 Cooper, R. (2005) 'Relationality', *Organization Studies*, 26(11): 1689–710.
42

43 Copus, C. (2003), Re-Engaging citizens and councils: the importance of the councillor to
44
45 enhanced citizen involvement. *Local Government Studies*, 29(2): 32-51.
46

47 Crevani, L., Lindgren, M., & Packendorff, J. (2010). Leadership, not leaders: On the study of
48
49 leadership as practices and interactions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(1), 77-86.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Cristofoli, D., Trivellato, B., Sancino, A., & Markovic, J. (2020). Public network leadership
4 and the ties that lead. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 25(1): 251–274.
5

6
7 Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2018). Why leadership of public leadership research matters:
8 and what to do about it. *Public Management Review*, 20(9), 1265-1286.
9

10
11 Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. London: Sage.
12

13
14 Denis, J. L., Langley, A., & Sergi, V. (2012). Leadership in the plural. *Academy of Management*
15 *Annals*, 6(1), 211-283.
16

17
18 Dinh, J. E., Lord, R. G., Gardner, W. L., Meuser, J. D., Liden, R. C., & Hu, J. (2014).
19 Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing
20 perspectives. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 36-62.
21
22

23
24 Durose, C. (2009). Front-Line Workers and ‘Local Knowledge’: Neighborhood Stories in
25 Contemporary UK Local Governance. *Public Administration*, 87(1): 35–49.
26
27

28
29 Gabriel, Y. (2005). Glass cages and glass palaces: Images of organization in image-conscious
30 times. *Organization*, 12(1), 9-27.
31
32

33
34 Gains, F., 2011. Elite ethnographies: potential, pitfalls and prospects for getting ‘up close and
35 personal’. *Public Administration*, 89(1):156-166.
36
37

38
39 Gerbaudo, P. (2016), Constructing Public Space| Rousing the Facebook Crowd: Digital
40 Enthusiasm and Emotional Contagion in the 2011 Protests in Egypt and Spain, *International*
41 *Journal of Communication*, 10: 254–73.
42
43
44

45
46 Gilani, P., Bolat, E., Nordberg, D., & Wilkin, C. (2020). Mirror, mirror on the wall: Shifting
47 leader–follower power dynamics in a social media context. *Leadership*, 16(3), 343-363.
48
49

50
51 Grint, K. (2005). *Leadership: Limits and possibilities*. Macmillan International Higher
52 Education.
53
54

55
56 Gustafsson, N., & Weinryb, N. (2020). The populist allure of social media activism:
57 Individualized charismatic authority. *Organization*, 27(3), 431-440.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hambleton, R., 2014. *Leading the inclusive city: Place-based innovation for a bounded planet.*

4
5 Bristol: Policy Press.

6
7
8 Hartley, J. (2018). Ten propositions about public leadership. *International Journal of Public*
9
10 *Leadership*, 14(4): 202-217.

11
12
13 Hartley, J., Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2013). Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative
14
15 to market competition and organizational entrepreneurship. *Public Administration Review*,
16
17 73(6), 821-830.

18
19
20 Heinelt, H., Magnier, A., Cabria, M., & Reynaert, H. 2018. *Political Leaders and Changing*
21
22 *Local Democracy. The European Mayor*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

23
24
25 Jackson, B., & Parry, K. (2018) (3rd ed.). *A very short fairly interesting and reasonably cheap*
26
27 *book about studying leadership*. London: Sage.

28
29
30 Kellerman, B., 2008. *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*.
31
32 Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

33
34
35 Karsten, N. and Hendriks, F., 2017. Don't call me a leader, but I am one: The Dutch Mayor
36
37 and the tradition of bridging-and-bonding leadership in consensus democracies. *Leadership*,
38
39 13(2): 154-172.

40
41
42 Knights D and Morgan G (1991) Corporate strategy, organisations and subjectivity: A critique.
43
44 *Organisation Studies* 12(2): 251–273.

45
46
47 Kozinets, R. V. (2015). Netnography. The international encyclopedia of digital communication
48
49 and society, 1-8, available at [https://doi-](https://doi-org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1002/9781118767771.wbiedcs067)
50 [org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1002/9781118767771.wbiedcs067](https://doi-org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1002/9781118767771.wbiedcs067)

51
52
53 Lowndes, V. and Leach, S., (2004). Understanding local political leadership: constitutions,
54
55 contexts and capabilities. *Local Government Studies*, 30(4), 557-575.

56
57
58 Magnier, A., (2004). Between Institutional Learning and Re-legitimization: Italian Mayors in
59
60 the Unending Reform. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1): 166-182.

1
2
3 Nalbandian, J. (1994), Reflexions of a “pracademic” on the logic of politics and administration,
4
5 *Public Administration Review*, 54(6): 531-536.
6

7
8 Nicholson, J., & Orr, K. (2016). Local government partnership working: a space odyssey. Or,
9
10 journeys through the dilemmas of public and private sector boundary-spanning actors. *Policy*
11
12 *& Politics*, 44(2), 269-287.
13

14
15 Orr, K. (2005). Interpreting narratives of local government change under the Conservatives and
16
17 New Labour. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(3), 371-385.
18

19
20 Orr, K., & Vince, R. (2009). Traditions of local government. *Public Administration*, 87(3),
21
22 655-677.
23

24
25 Orr, K. and Bennett, M.(2017). Relational leadership, storytelling, and narratives: Practices of
26
27 local government chief executives. *Public Administration Review*, 77(4), 515-527.
28

29
30 Ospina, S. M. (2017). Collective leadership and context in public administration: Bridging
31
32 public leadership research and leadership studies. *Public Administration Review*, 77(2), 275–
33
34 287.
35

36
37 Ospina, S., & Foldy, E. (2010). Building bridges from the margins: The work of leadership in
38
39 social change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 292-307.
40

41
42 Ospina, S. M., Foldy, E. G., Fairhurst, G. T., & Jackson, B. (2020). Collective dimensions of
43
44 leadership: Connecting theory and method. *Human Relations*, 73(4), 441-463.
45

46
47 Parker, M. (2002). *Against management: Organization in the age of managerialism*.
48
49 Cambridge: Polity Press.
50

51
52 Pors, J. G. (2020). Local meaning-making in discursive, embodied and affective registers.
53
54 *International Journal of Public Leadership*. [https://doi-](https://doi-org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1108/IJPL-06-2020-0053)
55
56 [org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1108/IJPL-06-2020-0053](https://doi-org.libezproxy.open.ac.uk/10.1108/IJPL-06-2020-0053)
57

58
59 Rhodes, R.A.W. (2005), Everyday Life in a Ministry: Public Administration as Anthropology,
60
American Review of Public Administration, 35(1): 3–25.

1
2
3 Sancino, A., & Castellani, L. (2016). New development: Directly elected Mayors in Italy—
4 creating a strong leader doesn't always mean creating strong leadership. *Public Money &*
5
6 *Management*, 36(2): 153–156.
7

8
9
10 Sancino, A., Meneguzzo, M., Braga, A. & Esposito, P. (2018). The relationship between
11 politics and administration: from dichotomy to local governance arenas. In R. Kerley, J. Liddle,
12 & P.T. Dunning (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of International Local Government*: 70–81.
13
14
15
16
17
18 Routledge: New York/Oxon.

19 Sancino, A., & Hudson, L. (2020). Leadership in, of, and for smart cities—case studies from
20 Europe, America, and Australia. *Public Management Review*, 22(5), 701-725.
21

22
23 Schatzki, T. R. (2005) 'The Sites of Organizations', *Organization Studies*, 26(3): 465–84.
24

25
26 Seal, W., Ball, A. (2005), Regulating corporate performance and the managerialization of local
27 politics, *International Public Management Review*, 6(1): 117-138.
28

29
30 Sørensen, E. (2006), Metagovernance. The changing role of politicians in the process of
31 democratic governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1): 98-114.
32

33
34
35 Sørensen, E. (2020). The future of democratic governance lies with interactive political
36 leadership. *Public*, (39), 17th July 2020, available at [http://esadepublic.esade.edu/posts/post/el-](http://esadepublic.esade.edu/posts/post/el-futur-de-la-governanca-democratica-esta-en-el-lideratge-politic-interactiu)
37
38 [futur-de-la-governanca-democratica-esta-en-el-lideratge-politic-interactiu](http://esadepublic.esade.edu/posts/post/el-futur-de-la-governanca-democratica-esta-en-el-lideratge-politic-interactiu), accessed on 10th
39
40
41
42
43 January 2020.

44
45 Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2019). Designing institutional platforms and arenas for interactive
46 political leadership. *Public Management Review*, 21(10), 1443-1463.
47

48
49 Stoker, G. 2003. *Transforming Local Governance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

50
51 Sullivan, H., 2007. Interpreting 'community leadership' in English local government. *Policy &*
52
53 *Politics*, 35(1), 141-161.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Sundgaard Andersen H., Jensen L., Jaeger B., Sehested K., Sorensen, E. (1999), Roles in
4 Transition! Politicians and Administrators between Hierarchy and Network, Working Paper,
5 Roskilde University.
6
7

8
9
10 Sutherland, N., 2018. Investigating leadership ethnographically: Opportunities and
11 potentialities. *Leadership*, 14(3), 263-290.
12

13
14 Sutherland, N., Land, C., & Böhm, S. (2014). Anti-leaders (hip) in social movement
15 organizations: The case of autonomous grassroots groups. *Organization*, 21(6), 759-781.
16

17
18 Svara, J. H. (1999). The shifting boundary between elected officials and city managers in large
19 council-manager cities. *Public Administration Review*, 59(1): 44-53.
20
21

22
23 Sweeting, D., 2002. Leadership in urban governance: the Mayor of London. *Local Government*
24 *Studies*, 28(1), 3-20.
25
26

27
28 Teasdale, S., & Dey, P. (2019). Neoliberal governing through social enterprise: Exploring the
29 neglected roles of deviance and ignorance in public value creation. *Public Administration*,
30 97(2), 325-338.
31
32

33
34 Torfing, J., Sørensen, E. and Bentzen, T.O., 2019. Institutional design for collective and holistic
35 political leadership. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 15(1), 58-76.
36
37

38
39 Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the Social Processes of
40 Leadership and Organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6): 654 – 76.
41
42

43
44 Uhl-Bien, M., & Ospina, S. M. (Eds.). (2012). Advancing relational leadership research: A
45 dialogue among perspectives. Charlotte, NC: IAP.
46
47

48
49 Van Der Haar, D., Hosking, D.M. (2004). Evaluating appreciative inquiry: A relational
50 constructionist perspective. *Human Relations*, 57(8): 1017-1036.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60