Strengthening Interactive Political Leadership through Institutional Design of Arenas for Collaborative Policy Innovation:

Theoretical reflections and empirical findings

Professor Eva Sørensen & Professor Jacob Torfing

The Roskilde School of Governance

Roskilde University, Denmark

1. The need for developing an interactive political leadership

We are living in turbulent times characterized by the pervasiveness of wicked and unruly problems and the proliferation of policy deadlocks and government failures (Light, 2015) that in most OECD countries tend to cause a decline in the trust in government (Edelman, 2012; OECD, 2013). In Europe, the recent refugee crisis, the failure to integrate large numbers of immigrants, the escalation of public security problems, rapid climate change, persistent unemployment, and the destructive effects of economic globalization clearly demonstrate the need for a stronger democratic political leadership that enables political communities at different levels to create and realize innovative policy solutions (Mouritzen and Svara, 2002; Nye, 2008). The big societal problems can be solved neither by well-known standard solutions, nor by increasing public expenditure. Instead they require the development of new and bold policies that in turn call for elected politicians to move beyond managerial and custodial policy making and lead disruptive and risk-prone processes of policy development

Unfortunately, the current conditions for exercising democratic political leadership at the local, national and European level are rather unfavorable, resulting in frequent instances of weak political leadership and poor societal governance (Helms, 2012). As such, the exercise of political leadership is challenged by: 1) the fragmentation of the European populations along crisscrossing socio-economic and post-materialist cleavages (Inglehart, 1977; Lijphart, 1999); 2) the surge of democratic disenchantment that reveals itself in the declining voter turnout and party membership (Warren, 2002; Norris, 2011); 3) the development of a system of distributed governance in which power is dispersed among a growing number of public and private agencies and actors (Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004; Torfing et al., 2012); and 4) the formation of a multi-layered governance system in which old and new state powers are shifted upward to supranational institutions, downward to local governments and outward to cross-border regions and non-majoritarian institutions (Jessop, 2002; Hooghe and Marks, 2002; Bache and Flinders, 2004). As such, elected politicians face a complex world of distributed and multi-level governance in which the attempt to unify the fragmented and disillusioned citizenry appears to be a mission impossible.

While the conditions for governing Western societies are rapidly changing in dramatic and seemingly irreversible ways, the theory and practice of political leadership has remained relatively unchanged. Politicians continue to be locked into parliamentary committee work (Strøm, 1998), administrative processes of technocratic policy adjustments (Katz and Mair, 1995; Page, 2012) and public blame games played out in the mediatized drama-democracy (Hood, 2011; Klijn, 2014). The prevailing political leadership practices are supported by the perception of politicians as 'elected kings' who once the people have bestowed them with a democratic mandate have the power to make sovereign decisions and delegate policy implementation to bureaucratic agencies (Olsen, 1978). Hence, classical leadership theory portrays elected politicians as sovereign decision makers and the voters as passive followers with little interest in or capacity for governing (Hamilton et al., 1966 [1787]; Schumpeter, 2008 [1942]).

Today, there are clear signs that the classical hierarchical model of government is challenged by the rise of interactive forms of governance (Torfing et al., 2012) and the development of an assertive citizenry in the wake of the educational and anti-authoritarian revolutions in the 1960s and 1970s (Warren, 2002; Dalton, 2014). Hence, the upsurge of network society means that an increasing number of political decisions are made in horizontal arenas of multi-actor collaboration in which relevant and affected actors from state, marked and civil society aim to manage their internal differences in order to find joint solutions to common

problems (Gray, 1989; Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997; Sørensen and Torfing, 2007). At the same time, citizens have become increasingly competent, empowered and engaged in all kinds of political grass-root activities (Togeby, 1993) and new forms of 'everyday making' (Bang and Sørensen, 1999). Citizens want to be more actively involved in shaping their living conditions than the current forms of liberal representative democracy permit them to be. The new type of assertive citizens do not match the old description of the voters as passive and allegiant followers (Dalton, 2014). They want to be listened to, to be actively involved in political decision making, and to be able to monitor, scrutinize and discuss the actions and inactions of elected politicians (Nye, 2008).

The rise of networked forms of governance and the formation of a new type of critical followers provide a new and promising condition for the development of a new type of interactive political leadership. In sharp contrast to the classical form of sovereign political leadership, the new forms of interactive political leadership prompt politicians and their administrative aids to define policy problems, design innovative policy solutions and generate support for their implementation in and through a sustained dialogue with citizens, civil society actors, interest organizations and private firms (Sørensen, 2018). Unfortunately, elected politicians are frequently excluded from the more or less inclusive policy and governance networks that may help them to understand the policy problems at hand and to develop and implement new and better solutions through the exchange of knowledge, ideas and resources (Richardson, 2000; Ansell and Torfing, 2017). Moreover, the way that politicians engage with the increasingly assertive citizens still tends to be confined to hearings and consultations that, because they are often placed towards the end of the policy process, leave citizens with no choice but to oppose and criticize the proposed policies. The late and often tokenistic involvement of citizens in public policy making give rise to a 'counter-democracy' (Rosanvallon, 2011) in which politicians become frustrated because the room for responsive policy revision is limited by political compromises and advanced implementation plans and the citizens become frustrated because they rightly feel that they are not really listen to.

This paper explores how we can find a way out of this impasse by developing a more interactive political leadership that enhances the capacity of elected politicians to create innovative solutions to complex and unruly problems and thereby contribute to restoring trust in the political system. It reports on findings from a recent research project in which academics and practitioners worked closely together to design, implement and assess institutional reforms of the political working conditions for local councilors in the Danish municipality of Gentofte. The municipality implemented the new institutional design of the political working conditions in the spring of 2015 and at the end of 2016, it decided to consolidate, revise and extend the new political format. The new institutional design sought to strengthen the exercise of local political leadership by constructing new arenas for collaborative policy innovation in which politicians, citizens and local stakeholders assisted by administrative facilitators aim to tackle the biggest problems and challenges confronting the local political community. The new political-organizational design has achieved its main objective that was to allow the politicians to focus on policy formation and develop policy in close dialogue with relevant and affected citizens. It is already attracting massive attention from other Danish municipalities, and in Norway, the ongoing municipal amalgamation reform has generated considerable interest among local municipalities some of which are now trying to implement the so-called 'Gentofte Model'. Our paper will carefully describe the contents of the Gentofte Model and present the main findings a research-based evaluation study conducted in 2015-2017.

Before presenting the empirical findings, we first engage in a theoretical discussion of how to exercise political leadership in the world of interactive governance and then present the strategy and methods for data collection and data analysis. The empirical analysis of the Gentofte Model is followed by a discussion of the scope conditions for the Danish experiences with the development of interactive political leadership and a more speculative assessment of the prospects for invoking a transition from the traditional counter-democracy to a new kind of interactive democracy based on collaborative policy innovation. The conclusion summarizes the key findings and suggests some avenues for further research on interactive political leadership.

2. Political leadership in the world of interactive governance

In relatively stable societies and policy sectors with a limited number of relatively small problems, political leadership mainly involves managerial adjustments of existing policies and strategies. In times of increasing turbulence and crisis, however, when wicked and unruly problems threaten the welfare and security of the population, political leaders are compelled to engage in policy innovation that aims to redefine policy problems, set new goals, and invent novel strategies, tools and solutions (Masciulli and Knight, 2009; Ansell, Boin and 't Hart, 2014; Ansell and Torfing, 2017). Policy innovation calls for a strong democratic political leadership that can design new, creative and bold policy solutions and secure popular and political support for their implementation. However, as argued above, the conditions for exercising the classical forms of sovereign political leadership are rapidly deteriorating due to the surge of interactive governance and the development of an active and assertive citizenry. As such, there is an urgent need for new guidance on how to strengthen democratic political leadership in ways that are more attuned to the rise of interactive forms of governance and the emergence of a new type of competent and critical followers.

Such guidance has been hindered by the fact that the established theories of political leadership and the new theories of governance and collaborative innovation have developed in splendid isolation from each other (Helms, 2012; Sørensen, 2017). Political scientists have mainly focused on the relation between voters, parties and governments and the relatively few studies of political leadership have either been biographical, psychological or institutional (see Helms, 2014; Post, 2014; Walter, 2014). Very few political scientists have analyzed how the urgent need for policy innovation (Polsby, 1984; Kingdon, 1984) and the surge of interactive governance and active citizenship (Sørensen, 2006; Sørensen and Torfing, 2016a) may challenge and transform the exercise of political leadership. Public administration researchers, on their part, have documented the need to find new solutions to wicked and unruly problems (Roberts, 2000; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004) and carefully analyzed how collaborative forms of governance can help to spur innovation (Ansell and Torfing, 2014; Torfing, 2016). However, few have studied the role of political leadership in the world of interactive and collaborative governance (Sørensen, 2006; Koppenjan, Kars and Voort, 2011; Klijn, 2014; Sørensen and Torfing, 2016). To fill this gap, we must seek to integrate political leadership and governance theory in order to explore how new ways of thinking and practicing political leadership in the world of governance can enhance the capacity of elected politicians to craft innovative solutions to the complex problems confronting European societies.

Recent developments in governance research and political leadership theory seem to take the first steps towards a rapprochement between the two separate theoretical fields. Let us first look at how governance

theory approaches the analysis of political leadership and then consider how political leadership theory approaches the rise of interactive governance and its foundation in an active and assertive citizenry.

Since the early 1990s, *governance theory* has been on the rise (Ansell and Torfing, 2016). Governance is defined as the process through which social and political actors formulate and achieve common goals (Torfing et al., 2012). Many governance researchers focus their attention on how effective public governance is produced and delivered in and through sustained interaction between interdependent actors in networks and partnerships that cut across organizations, sectors and levels (Marsh and Rhodes, 1992; Bache and Flinders, 2004; Marcussen and Torfing, 2007; Kohler-Koch and Larat, 2009). Since such networks are not emerging spontaneously when needed, may give rise to destructive conflicts, or spin out of control and produce undesirable outcomes, there has been a growing interest in how governance networks, partnerships and other arenas of collaborative governance are designed and managed (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004). The attempt to influence the process and outcomes of governance networks without reverting too much to hierarchical forms of command and control is referred to as metagovernance (Kooiman, 1993; Jessop, 2002; Sørensen and Torfing, 2009; Torfing et al., 2012). Research shows that politicians are playing a limited role in managing complex networks and that metagovernance is typically left to public managers (Sørensen, 2006), even when politicians are formally in charge (Koppenjan, Kars and Voort, 2011). Part of the reason why politicians play such a weak role in metagoverning governance networks is that metagovernance has been defined in managerial terms. As such, governance network researchers have failed to recognize that metagovernance involves political decisions that only elected politicians have sufficient legitimacy to make. New research solves the problem by distinguishing 'political metagovernance' from 'administrative metagovernance' (Sørensen and Torfing, 2016a). Political metagovernance not only makes it possible for politicians to lend democratic legitimacy to interactive forms of governance (Sørensen and Torfing, 2005), but also enables them to learn about policy problems, seek inspiration to the development of new solutions and generate support for their realization. As such, political metagovernance turns collaborative governance arenas into a 'new tool of government' (Salamon, 2002; Bell and Hindmoor, 2009) by insisting that they may support public policy making and may be subjected to some degree of democratic influence and control exercised by elected politicians.

Several researchers in the field of democratic governance have, at least indirectly, pondered the new conditions for political leadership and the need for change. According to Rosanvallon (2011), representative democracy is being replaced by an 'interactive democracy' in which citizens and civil society actors play a more active role. Better education, anti-authoritarian sentiments and positive experiences with new forms of citizens participation have enhanced the internal efficacy of the citizens in Europe who tend to demand more from democratic participation than voting in regular elections. Citizens increasingly expect political leaders to listen and respond to their experiences, ideas and demands and to justify their political decisions in the light of the input they get from active citizens and societal stakeholders. In the new interactive democracy, there is growing proximity between citizens and political leader that is not based on diminishing physical distance, but rather on mutual accessibility, openness and receptiveness. For citizens, this proximity means that they feel empowered to engage in and monitor public policy making, and for political leaders, it provides a valuable resource for governing society and the economy, especially if they can avoid being captured by particular advocacy groups. A key task for political leaders is, therefore, to build institutional arenas that facilitate the exchange of inputs from societal actors for political justification of policy decisions.

Keane (2009, 2011) captures a similar transformation in representative democracy with his notion of 'monitory democracy', which is characterized by the proliferation of power-scrutinizing mechanisms that are not only found within the domestic fields of public governance, mass media and civil society, but also at the supranational, international and global level. The power-scrutinizing mechanisms extend well beyond traditional political, administrative and judicial bodies and include a myriad of citizens' juries, expert councils, private think tanks, democratic audits, governance networks, etc. By constantly evaluating and judging the actions and inactions of politicians, political parties and governments, the monitory bodies complicate the lives of political leaders, questioning their authority and compelling them to modify their agendas and opinions (Keane, 2011: 213). Hence, political leadership depends on the continuous creation and management of relationships of support and opposition that involves interpreting problems, opportunities and solutions in ways that resonate with the ideas of core constituencies. In sum, the development of a monitory democracy forces political leaders to adopt a more collaborative and engaging leadership style.

Fung and Wright (2003) claim that the traditional democratic institutions of government are ill suited to solving complex societal problems. The solution, however, is not to reduce democracy, but rather to deepen it by expanding the role of citizens and civil society in public governance. Democracy deepens when it is no longer only a matter of electing a government, but also a question of democratizing governance by connecting citizens and political leaders in and through processes of creative problem-solving. According to Fung and Wright (2003), there is gradual development of new forms of 'empowered participatory governance'. Governance is becoming participatory because it aims to involve ordinary people in reasoned debates about policy issues, and it is empowered because there is a growing capacity to act that emanates from the mobilization of active and responsible citizens. In empowered participatory governance, political leaders interact with citizens and civil society actors to produce the solutions that society needs. Hence, the ultimate goal of citizen participation is no longer to promote the self-governing of the people (Arnstein, 1969), but to involve citizens in collaborative governance in which political power and the responsibility for governing society are shared by citizens, stakeholders and government agencies.

Governance researchers were originally interested in how interactive forms of governance enhance the effectiveness and democratic quality of public governance (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997; Sørensen and Torfing, 2007), but recent developments in governance research have broadened the scope to include the question of how multi-actor collaboration can help to spur public innovation (Hartley, 2005; Bommert, 2010; Sørensen and Torfing, 2011). The pervasiveness of wicked policy problems, the competitive pressures from economic globalization, and the public budget constraints following in the wake of the fiscal crisis in 2007 seem to generate a strong and steadily growing interest in public innovation (Halvorsen et al., 2005; Kattel et al., 2014). The new research on public innovation has primarily focused on service innovation, but inspired by the seminal work of Polsby (1984) and Kingdon (1984) there has been a renewed focus on policy innovation (Krause, 2011) and how it can be spurred by trust-based collaboration in networks (Hartley, Sørensen and Torfing, 2013; Torfing, 2016). In the present economic, social and environmental crisis, political leaders must to come up with some innovative policy solutions in order to demonstrate their capacity to govern society and the economy and in the absence of divine interventions, they will benefit from engaging in collaborative arenas that can help them to diagnose the problems at hand and design innovative, yet feasible policy solutions (Ansell and Torfing, 2017).

In sum, the recent contributions to understanding how interactive governance can enhance effective, democratic and perhaps even innovative policy solutions all tend to downplay the role of government and elected officials in governing society and the economy, but have nevertheless become increasingly interested in how elected politicians can metagovern networks and partnerships and how their political leadership role and capacity for policy innovation can be strengthened by engaging in collaborative forms of governance.

Recent contributions to *political leadership research* suggest that politicians are seeking to strengthen their political leadership by interacting with their followers (Burns, 2003). A study based on 51 interviews with leading politicians in five Anglophone countries reveals that political leaders increasingly respond to their need for information, knowledge and ideas by seeking input from external actors (Lees-Marshment, 2015). What seems to be emerging out of the individual and somewhat sporadic contacts initiated by elected politicians is a new model of 'deliberative political leadership' through which politicians solicit inputs from actors inside and outside government, evaluate the quality of this input, and integrate new ideas into their deliberations about how to solve policy problems (Lees-Marshment, 2015). Empirical examples of this kind of deliberative political leadership are provided by Bingham, Nabatchi and O'Leary (2005), Sirianni (2009), Hendricks (2013) and Ercan (2014).

Other scholars suggest that in Western societies the 'hard political power' associated with Machiavellian-style political leadership is increasingly being supplemented with a 'soft political power' that fits better with the chaotic distribution of power in Western societies (Nye, 2008). Today, nobody is in charge, nobody is in control, and policy solutions can only be found through multi-actor collaboration, which requires that political leaders use soft power in order not to alienate the participants. Besides displaying their charisma, political leaders can exercise soft power by mobilizing and empowering their followers and ensuring their independence in order to provide the conditions for a critical and learning-based dialogue that permits the development and testing of new ideas. Hence, the old idea of 'passive followers' is replaced with a new notion of 'active, independent and critical followers' who can contribute to collaborative policy making and thus tend to support the development of interactive political leadership.

In a similar vein, Kane, Patapan and 't Hart (2009) refer to the development of 'dispersed democratic leadership'. In liberal democracies, public leadership is dispersed throughout society and found in different forms and measures in the political, administrative, judicial, social and economic spheres. The dispersion of public leadership, which is particularly evident in the European Union with its vertical and horizontal distribution of power, makes it difficult for elected politicians to respond to problems and opportunities because they do not possess all the authority that is required to make binding decisions. Political leadership is exercised amidst a multitude of critics and opponents with contradictory ideas and intentions that cannot easily be corralled. Hence, political leaders are forced to engage and collaborate with other public leaders including those that are found outside the formal political system (Kane, Patapan and 't Hart, 2009).

Helms (2012) explicitly addresses the question of how political leadership theory can learn from governance theory. There is a growing interest in studying bad leadership defined in terms of ineffective leadership where political leaders fail to formulate and achieve a clear set of political goals. However, instances of bad leadership tend to be explained solely by reference to the personal characteristics of political leaders who are described as incompetent, ignorant, rigid and intemperate. This diagnosis may overlook another important explanation of ineffective political leadership that is often cited in studies of

bad governance. Hence, public policies that lack sufficient political support and fail to solve the problems at hand are often a result of policy processes that violate democratic norms about transparency, inclusion, deliberation etc. As such, the study of good governance practices may help political leaders to do a better job when it comes to designing policies that work in practice.

In sum, although the majority of political leadership studies continue to study political leadership as a inherent feature of government and without any appreciation of the rise of interactive forms of governance, some recent contributions to governance research have taken on the daunting task of rethinking political leadership in the context of interactive governance.

The brief overview of the scholarly contributions in the field of governance theory and political leadership research clearly demonstrates the growing interest in linking political leadership with interactive governance based on civic engagement, collaborative networks and democratic deliberation. The recurrent argument is: we are facing a growing number of complex policy problems that call for a stronger political leadership, but the political leadership capacity of elected politicians is challenged by societal developments and needs to be strengthened by the development an interactive political leadership that brings politicians into close and sustained interaction with other public leaders as well as with citizens and societal stakeholders. A growing number of scholars tend to agree about this critical diagnosis and about the future direction of studies of political leadership, but so far they have had little to offer in terms of theoretical and empirical analysis of interactive political leadership: how it might be exercised, what the political and institutional drivers and barriers are, and what it can accomplish.

3. Studying interactive political leadership in practice

Gentofte Municipality has 75,000 inhabitants and is situated north of the Danish capitol Copenhagen. It is an affluent, well-managed and innovative municipality led by the long-time, conservative mayor Hans Toft who commands an absolute majority, but rules on the basis of a broad coalition with social democratic, liberal and social liberal parties. After several years of experimentation with different forms of citizen engagement, the City Council discussed the need for institutional reform of the political working conditions in a seminar in March 2014. A year after, the mayor and the city manager called a meeting in the Economic Committee to discuss a concrete model for how to strengthen the political leadership of the local councilors through a closer interaction with citizens and local stakeholders. The new model was discussed, amended and finally approved by an overwhelming majority in the City Council meetings in May and June with effect from the 1st of August 2015.

The goal was to improve the knowledge basis of the local councilors and provide better opportunities for them to engage in policy development in close dialogue with local citizens and stakeholders (City Council, 2015). This goal should be achieved without increasing the time consumption of the councilors that have a limited time-budget spend since they are all spare-time politicians and the remuneration is modest.

The new institutional design transformed the operation of the City Council and its Standings Committees and introduced a new kind of open and thematic ad hoc committees called Task Committees. The City Council formed 8 Task Committees typically consisting of 5 councilors and 10 appointed citizens and assisted by 3-4 administrators that act as facilitators and knowledgeable resource persons. The mandate for

each Task Committee was discussed and approved by the City Council. It describes the political and socioeconomic background, the policy problem, the political premises for solving it (the overall objectives and the existing policies in the area), and the nature of expected delivery (a vision, policy, strategy, vision, action plan, etc.). It also determines the timeframe and defines 10 different 'competence profiles' in order to ensure input from a varied group of citizens (stakeholder organizations could participates as individual citizens with a special voice, but not as representatives of their organization). The mandate, including a call for participants matching the 10 competence profiles, was widely advertised in local newspapers and magazines, on public posters and on different websites. In the call for participants, citizens are urged to registers at the municipal website if they are interested in participating in one of the Task Committees. In a subsequent meeting the councilors matched the registered would-be citizen participants with the competence profiles. The citizens who were not appointed as participants in the Task Committees were, subsequently, offered to participate in sub-committees, workshops and public hearings. The City Council also decided which of the local councilors should participate in which Task Committee. The politicians were distributed on the basis of a mathematical model that ensures proportional representation across all Task Committees. The two small parties with only one seat in the City Council got to participate in several Task Committees and also nominated some of the citizen participants.

The Task Committees tend to meet for 2-3 hours at fixed dates over a number of months (typically 3-6 months but some works for a longer period). The meetings are led by a political chair assisted by a vice-chair. The chairmen are local councilors who open and conclude the meeting. The rest of meeting is facilitated by administrators who aim to get everybody involved in open-ended discussions about the problem or challenge at hand and the ways it can be dealt with or solved. The meetings are relatively informal, external guests are invited and a variety of deliberative techniques are applied to provide information, stimulate discussion and generate new ideas. At the end of the process, the Task Committee is invited to present its results to the City Council that then makes the final decision about whether to endorse, amend or reject the deliverance and eventually how to finance and implement it.

In order for the councilors to find time to participate in one, two or several Task Committees, the time spend on meetings in the Standing Committees is drastically reduced. The number of meetings is reduced from 11 to 4 per year and the task of the Standing Committees is no longer to do administrative case processing, but rather to strategically monitor the policy programs that they are responsible for in order to identify problems and challenges that either call for the development of a new set of political guidelines or for formation of a new Task Committee that can develop a new policy strategy. In order to facilitate this radical transformation of the Standing Committees, the direct responsibility for administrative operations is delegated to the City Council and the Economic Committee and to some extent also to the administration itself.

To facilitate communication and make sure that the elected councilors will have all the information they need in council meetings, Standing Committees and Task Committees, the City Council decided to create a new digital information platform. Last but not least, the political statutes governing the work of the City Council were redrafted to fit the new institutional design.

The new institutional design creates a new division of labor according to which the administrators call and facilitate the meetings in the Task Committees, the elected politicians focus on policy innovation, the citizens co-create public solutions together with the politicians, and there is a shared responsibility for

policy implementation. According to the city manager, the new division of labor 'corrects' an unfortunate development in many Danish municipalities where politicians and public administrators switch roles so that the politicians do administrative case processing and monitoring of policy implementation and the administrative managers develop the new policies that the elected politicians subsequently endorse without any real political discussions.

Back in 2014, we had been invited to inspire the City Council in Gentofte to reform its political working conditions. After having lost sight of the actual reform process, we were suddenly approached in the summer of 2015 and asked if we would be interested in evaluating the new institutional design and make some recommendations about how it could be improved. Our close contact with the municipality and professional interest in local political leadership reforms raises some research ethical questions about impartiality. However, it was agreed and put into a contract that although the overall research questions guiding the evaluation were to be discussed with the municipality and the final reports would be checked for factual errors, there would be no interference with our substantial conclusions and recommendations.

The commissioning of the evaluation offered a unique opportunity to conduct a design experiment (Stoker and John, 2009; Ansell and Bartenberger, 2016) where a joint diagnosis of the problem leads to an intervention in terms of a radical transformation of the political working conditions, the effect of which are then carefully analyzed in order to suggest a new round of intervention and impact study. This paper reports on our findings from the first iteration, but a new PhD-project has been set up to study the next couple of iterations.

The present study builds on mixed methods. Data were collected from September 2015 to May 2016. We collected relevant documents from the City Council (description of the new design, mandates for the Task Committees, minutes from council meetings in which the input from the task Committees are discussed), the Standing Committees (agendas and minutes from ordinary meetings) and the Task Committees (agendas and minutes from meetings and events). We observed meetings in the City Council, Standing Committees and Task Committees. We conducted interviews with 8 politicians and 6 public managers before and after the majority of the Task Committees had concluded their work and four citizens who had participated in different Task Committees. Finally, we conducted an online survey with all the politicians, public administrators and citizens/stakeholders that participated in all of the Task Committees. The response rates in the survey was 94 % for the politicians (total number of respondents = 18), 100 % for the administrators (total number of respondents = 27) and 80 % for the citizens (total number of respondents = 79).

All the data were coded and analyzed with a special emphasis on the formal and informal aspects of the institutional design, the high hopes to and worries about the new model, the drivers and barriers of collaborative policy innovation and the ultimate results in terms of the exercise of political leadership and the enhancement of the local governance capacity.

4. Empirical findings from the study of the Gentofte Model

The dependent variable that the institutional design of the Gentofte Model is supposed to affect is interactive political leadership defined as the ability of the elected politicians to better understand

problems, design innovative yet feasible solutions and secure their implementation in and through dialogical interaction with citizens and local stakeholders. In order to assess how interactive political leadership was strengthened by the new institutional design we first evaluated whether the high hopes and worries of the politicians and administrators came true and then evaluated the functioning and impact of each of the institutional arenas in the Gentofte model (the Task Committees, the Standing Committees and the City Council). While the first part of the evaluation took the expectation of the local actors as the point of departure, the second part of the evaluation was structured by our research interests in terms of the ability of institutional reform to spur interactive political leadership. We shall now take a closer look at the findings in the two parts of the evaluation.

Part one: High hopes and worries

After having carefully mapped all the different aspects of the Gentofte Model in our first evaluation report (Sørensen and Torfing, 2015a), we interviewed a handful of politicians and a handful of executive public administrations about their positive and negative expectations to the new institutional design. The positive expectations (high hopes) are discussed in our second evaluation report (Sørensen and Torfing, 2015b) and listed in table 1. The negative expectations (worries) are listed in table 2.

Table 1: List of positive expectations to the new political working conditions

- Possible to make faster and better decisions on a well-informed basis
- The elected politician will spend more time on policy development and thus strengthen their political leadership role
- The councilors will have closer contact with citizens and the citizens will get a better understanding of the complex political decisions about how to govern society and the economy
- The citizens will be involved in governance decisions earlier than in the traditional hearing and consultation procedures and that will qualify the debate and help to build ownership over the political decisions
- The citizens will gain political influence on the decisions of the municipality through an open and transparent procedure
- The involvement of the citizens will enhance innovation and help to consolidate the welfare state
- The back-benchers in the City Council and those from the opposition will have more political influence than before because they partake in the formulation of political decisions in the early phases
- There will be a broader and crosscutting focus on the different administratively defined policy areas in the municipalities (referred to as 'resort areas')

Table 2: List of negative expectations to the new political working conditions

City Council:
- The delegation of the direct administrative responsibility from the Standing Committees to the City Council with drastically increase the number of single issue items and budgetary questions
- The councilors might not be good enough to share knowledge from the distributed committee work and the council meetings will suffer from lack of common knowledge

---

Standing Committees:
- Problems with the administrative case flow when administrators have less frequent access to politicians
- Less time for good political discussions when the number of committee meeting decrease
- Politicians may loose more influence on case work than they win on influencing overall policy decisions
- Politicians might have difficulties shifting from case processing to strategic monitoring and administrators may have difficulties shifting from making recommendation to initiating strategic policy discussions
- May be difficult to find time for continuous evaluation of what goes on in the relevant Task Committees

Task Committees:
- Might not be possible to attract and commit a broad range of citizens to participate in the Task Committees and provide them with sufficient knowledge without drowning them
- Politicians might find it too difficult to engage in open-ended and ungovernable discussions with citizens and stakeholders
- The administrators might be too dominant and controlling and hamper co-creation between politicians and citizens
- Not all political issue might by suitable for collaborative policy making
- Participation in the new Task Committees might be too time demanding for the politicians
- It will be too difficult to ensure updated information about the Task Committees on the digital portal

---

To assess whether the high hopes came to fruition and the worries were warranted we conducted a new round of interviews after 10 months and drew on our observations and survey data. A detailed account of our findings is provided in our third evaluation report (Sørensen and Torfing, 2016b). In relation to the high hopes, the report concludes that the politicians, administrators and citizens all find that the new institutional design has been successful in facilitating an early involvement of citizens in public policy processes, creating a problem-focused dialogue between citizens and elected politicians and improving the conditions for making well-informed, innovative, effective and democratic decisions.

To illustrate, 54 % of the politicians agree that the Task Committees have fostered a constructive and crosscutting dialogue that they have learned a lot from participating in. 97 % of the citizens agree that both politicians and citizens have learned a lot about the policy problem and the possible solutions through their participation and 88 % agree that the dialogical interaction has led to the development of good and feasible solutions. 77 % of the administrators agree that the solutions in several ways break with common wisdom and established practice in the particular policy area. A politician claims that: 'For me it has been very rewarding to participate in the Task Committee for Youth Policy. It is more fun than the Standing Committee meetings because it gives more energy and inspiration. It provides a much better foundation for policy development'. Another politician says that 'It has been an extremely positive to work with people from outside who are really engaged and committed. (…) It is also surprising how easy it has been for all of us to agree on the new policy solutions'. Finally, a politician concludes that: 'for me it is an important democratization process. The only bad thing about is that the local press don't write about all the positive aspects'.

In one respect the actual experiences exceeded the high hopes. There were several cases of participating citizens becoming so enthusiastic that they either started to implement the new policies on their own or enquired about how they could help the municipality to implement the new co-created policies, or at least

follow the implementation process. Nobody had expected this development and the municipality is current contemplating how active citizens can become more involved in the implementation process.

With regard to the negative expectations we find that most of the worries have been either unwarranted or appear to be negligible. However, five worries seem to stick. First, it is clear that those Task Committees that dealt with implementation issues rather than policy development have been less successful as the citizen participants found it difficult to contribute. Second, it has not been possible to prevent the politicians' time consumption from increasing, at least not for those politicians who participate in 2 or more Task Committees. The time consumption for the other politicians seem to be fine. Third, it appears to be difficult to ensure a high participation rate for the citizens all the way through. In most meetings about 3-4 citizens were absent. Fourth, some of the politicians complain about what they see as administrative over-facilitation of the meetings. Although the politicians generally think that the administrative facilitators do a good job, there is a tendency for them to take up too much time with 'process' rather than 'content'. Last but not least, the politicians sometimes finds it difficult to maneuver in the new Task Committees. They have not had problems suppressing internal political conflicts, but they continue to be uncertain about whether they are expected to listen, ask questions or flag their own opinions in the meetings. Several of them claim that it is difficult to find the right balance between holding back so that the citizens can voice their opinions and expressing their political views and ideas so that the citizens can comment on those. The survey shows that the citizens feel that the politicians in the Task Committees should be more outspoken.

Part two: The functioning and impact of the institutional arenas

The second part of our evaluation reported in our fourth and final evaluation report (Sørensen and Torfing, 2016c) evaluates the functioning and impact of each of the constituent elements of the Gentofte Model in order to identify the drivers and barriers for interactive political leadership.

After the reform the elected politicians have shifted about 2/3 of the time they used to spend on the work in the Standing Committees to the *Task Committees* that are the primary arenas for collaboration and dialogue with local citizens and stakeholders. The politicians have great difficulties identifying negative aspects of the work in the new Task Committees, but some find that the process sometimes is a bit slow and unimaginative leading to solutions characterized as the least common denominator. However, the politicians seem to agree that: 'we cannot get all the new ideas ourselves from inside the City Hall'. It seems to work well with the mandate and the appointment and distribution of the members of the Task Committees. Although some politicians find it 'irritating that the administrative facilitators run the meetings', most of them tend to agree that 'it is good to have one to drive the process forward who is not politically implicated'. A good deal of the Task Committees have organized camps, excursions, public hearings and special events and most of them established internal working groups and sub-committees with external participation. The citizens generally feel welcome and well-informed. 90 % of them find the politicians to be responsive to the points that they raise and 85 % agree that they had good opportunities to give the politicians critical response on their ideas. 92 % of the citizen find it exciting to participate and are willing to do it again. Also the politicians have a positive evaluation of the outcome of the Task Committees: 60 % of them agree that the Task Committees have given them a better understanding of the problems and challenges at hand. 53 % of them agree that participation has given them new inputs and

ideas and 48 % agree that the Task Committees have contributed to the development of new and better solutions that would neither have been developed in the Standing Committees nor in the City Council meetings. In this sense we can conclude that the Task Committees have helped to spur interactive political leadership.

With regard to the wider impact on the local governance capacity, an executive public manager summaries his account of in the following way:

> 'I hear both politicians and citizens saying that the quality of the political solutions has improved and that there is now a shorter distance from idea to action. For example, the politicians claim that they could never have developed the new Youth Policy without the close interaction they had with the youngsters. The result also looks different. It is a short and accessible brochure rather than a 50 pages long policy report that nobody will read'.

However, there seems to be a limit to the innovativeness of the new solutions. Hence, another leading administrator states: 'I think that we could easily have made most of policies that are developed in the Task Committees in the administration. Nevertheless, it gives a much higher legitimacy when they are developed in the Task Committees and sometimes the policies are actually rather innovative'. Hence, judging from these accounts, it is the combination of innovativeness and legitimacy that is the fundamental contribution of the interactive political leadership that is exercised in and through the Task Committees.

The Task Committees work relatively well, but what about the *Standing Committees* that were transformed from case-processing administrative oversight committees to arenas for strategic monitoring and policy development in order to create time and space for the Task Committees? Our analysis reveals considerable variation between the Standing Committees, but the general impression is that the shift from case processing to strategic monitoring has been difficult and that the fewer meetings makes it difficult to find time for good political discussions with room for passion and disagreement. Political discussions are important because there are essential to the new strategic role of the Standing Committees and the fact that there is little time for such discussion indicates that the transition from case processing to strategic monitoring has not been completed. The need for further adjustment of the Standing Committees is confirmed by the survey that shows that 60 % of the politicians disagree with the statement that the Standing Committees are functioning well with their current focus and number of meetings. In addition to more time for political discussion, the councilors would like to spend more time on giving feedback to the reports they receive from the Task Committees. It is crucial for the councilors to influence the direction of the policy deliberations in the Task Committees before the policy proposal is set in stone and becomes too difficult to change, even for the City Council.

The meetings in the *City Council* have not changed a lot. They are still marred by antagonistic clashes between the conservative mayor and one particular left-wing council member and there have only been a few more single-issue cases and a little more budgetary discussions than previously. Generally, the collective knowledge base for making policy decisions in the city council has been improved. However, it is challenging for the council to find a good way of discussing the proposals that are developed and presented by the Task Committees. Most of the proposals have already been politically vetted in the process of multi-actor collaboration and it is difficult for those politicians who might be critical of the proposal to speak

against it in front of the citizens. Hence, there is a risk that the politicians are taken hostage by the Task Committees if they have not had sufficiently sway over the policy process in the Task Committees.

In sum, the Task Committees seem to work well and contribute to strengthening the political leadership of the elected councilors by providing valuable input to understanding policy problems, generating new ideas and stimulating mutual learning in the solutions phase, building joint ownership to new and bold solutions and accelerating implementation. Only minor adjustments are called for. The Standing Committees have not yet found their feet and seem to be in the middle of a learning process where the traditional focus on administrative case processing wrestle with the new strategic monitoring role. Last but not least, The City Council needs to find a new and collective way of evaluating and influencing the policy process in the Task Committees either directly by providing political feedback to mid-term reports or indirectly through the councilors who are members of the different Task Committees.

5. Discussion

The Gentofte Model provides a remarkable example of how local councilors can enhance their political leadership through institutional reform of their political working conditions that aims to strengthen their focus on policy development and dialogical interaction with local citizens and stakeholders. The relatively successful political experiment in Gentofte has not only resulted in a consolidation and extension of the new model with the decision to create 13 new Task Committees, but also generated considerable interest in other municipalities. As such, there are several examples of diffusion through adoption, adaptation and reinvention of the Gentofte Model in other municipalities in both Denmark and Norway.

In the Danish context the institutional reforms in Gentofte stand out. A few municipalities have aimed to strengthen executive political leadership, for example, by aiming to turn the Economic Committee into an Executive Committee comprising the chairmen of the Standing Committees. Other municipalities have aimed to create more room for political discussions and policy development in the council meetings or constructed new forums for open, political debate across the Standing Committees. Many municipalities have taken initiative to strengthen the political communication with the local citizens and to enhance the use of traditional forms of citizen participation through consultations, hearings and town-hall meeting. About half of the Danish municipalities have established one or more so-called § 17.4 Committees that are thematic ad hoc committees similar to the Task Committees. However, it is only Gentofte Municipality that has aspired to make the use of ad hoc committees with citizen participation an integral part of its political governance model. Hence, in a Danish context it constitutes 'best practice' when it comes to strengthening interactive political leadership.

The Gentofte Model with its formalized procedures for collaborative policy innovation may also stand out in an international context. Co-creation of public policy with citizens and local stakeholders is not merely a tool that public managers use in order to mobilize local resources in the field of service production, but also provide a tool for elected councilors that can help them to develop new policy solutions and thus lead the local community in times where problems with integration of refugees, traffic congestion, loneliness among elderly people, young drug abusers, etc. are piling up. Politicians seem eager to engage local citizens and

stakeholders more actively, but it rarely happens in such a systematic and permanent way as we see it Gentofte.

The significance of the Gentofte Model begs the question of the scope conditions for the strengthening of interactive political leadership. There is no way to hide the highly favorable conditions for the emergence of the Gentofte Model. First, there are three important country specific conditions. In Denmark the unique combination of a strong and well-functioning state with a low level of corruption and a strong and well-organized civil society with plenty of social capital has generated a longstanding tradition for public-private collaboration in formalized corporatist systems at the national level and in more informal forms of co-creation at the local level. There is also very high degree of devolution of public tasks to the local municipalities who dispose of two thirds of the total public budget. As such, the Danish municipalities deliver most of the welfare services and social transfer payments to the citizens and they also provide local infrastructures, regulation and support for culture, business and leisure activities, partly financed my municipal taxes. As such, they both have formal competences and economic resources to affect the lives of local citizens and stakeholders and that makes it both important and worthwhile for citizens to participate in local decision-making arenas and try to influence the decisions of local government. Last but not least, there is a long tradition for co-created responses to crises that goes back to the cooperative movement that helped Danish farmers to make the shift from crops to livestock farming when the new railroads brought cheap wheat from Russia to Europe in the 1870s. Later, the cooperative movement enabled the workers movement to mitigate the dislocating effects of the rapid industrialization from the 1890s onwards. The idea of collaborating to overcome crisis and dislocation has since been a central part of the Danish DNA.

Second, there also seem to be a number of conducive factors at the local level. The fact that Gentofte Municipality is economically well-consolidated and well-managed is important as it creates a room for risk-taking reforms that might not have seen the light of day in a municipality with deep economic and managerial problems. In addition, an above-average educational and income level in the local population with many academics that have experience with collective problem-solving from their work in public and private firms and organizations tend to facilitate empowered participation in collaborative policy innovation. A third factor is the densely populated urban area that makes up the Gentofte Municipality. The social geography of Gentofte means that it easy for everybody to come and participate in meetings in in the city hall. Travel time for anybody will not exceed 15 minutes. The final factor is the presence of a stable political majority that means that the mayor controls all the decisions in City Council. However, while the stable majority clearly mitigates the political risks of co-created policy making, it also begs the question of why the mayor wants to share his power with the other councilors and the local citizens and stakeholders. The answer might lie in the fact that interactive political leadership tends to enhance the overall political governing capacity, and through that the power of the mayor. The mobilization of local resources and the creation of a higher degree of input and output legitimacy enables the municipality to do things it could not otherwise have done and the political leaders stand to benefit from that.

The Gentofte Model transforms the political leadership of the elected councilors who in the age of New Public management were casted as corporate leaders on the municipal administration and now are being re-casted as political leaders of the local municipality. At the same time, their sovereign political leadership

is replaced with a more interactive political leadership. These changes have profound consequences for the way that we think about democracy. Three important implications can be detected.

The first consequence is that we need to rethink what it means to receive a 'democratic mandate' when you elected in a general election. The standard conception is that a democratic mandate gives elected politicians the right to govern on behalf of the people until the next Election Day where he or she will be held to account and may risk being ousted from office if the voters are dissatisfied with the political performance. The development of a more interactive political leadership change the conception of the democratic mandate since the elected politicians are no longer supposed to govern on behalf of the people but in and through an ongoing dialogue with the citizens. This assertion brings us close to the Tocquevillian ideas about the self-government of the people.

The second implication is that traditional idea about 'citizen participation' is challenged. Since citizen participation in urban planning, environmental regulation etc. became fashionable in the 1970s we have seen citizen participation as a good thing in itself. It helps to give the intensely affected citizens democratic influence on political decisions and that is good for democracy. With the development of an interactive political leadership citizen participation is no longer good merely because it enhances the political influence of affected citizens, but is instead seen as a precondition for strengthening political leadership. Input from and constructive and learning-based interaction with different kinds of citizens help local politicians to lead the local community in hard times.

The final implication concerns the way that democracy is conceived and practiced at the local level. As hinted above, there has been a strong tendency to develop a local 'counter-democracy' in which citizens can criticize and oppose local plans in public hearings, express their dissatisfaction with public schools and other public service facilities through participation in elected user boards and the exercise of their free choice of service provider, reject new policy proposals via electronic citizen panels, and trash the local politicians in local or social media. Citizens have been casted in the role of irresponsible veto actors with a license of criticize without seeing themselves as a part of the public solutions. The cultivation of an interactive political leadership may change that by creating an 'interactive democracy' (Rosanvallon, 2011) in which citizens and local stakeholders actively participates in designing and implementing innovative policy solutions to complex problems. Hence, the new Task Committees in Gentofte are not only bringing politics out to the citizens, but also bring the citizens into politics (Stoker, 2006).

6. Conclusion and ways ahead

This paper has identified an unfortunate mismatch between the urgent need for a stronger democratic political leadership in the face of the complex problems confronting European societies and some rather unfavorable conditions for exercising political leadership. The way out of this impasse is to exploit the recent development of interactive forms of governance and a more active, empowered and assertive citizenry to develop an interactive political leadership in which citizens and relevant stakeholders becomes a resource for elected politicians who needs inputs in terms of knowledge, ideas, support and resources in order to define the most pressing policy problems and design and implement new and innovative policy solutions.

Theoretically, the paper argues that the conceptual and practical development of an interactive political leadership has been prevented by the fact that political leadership theory and the new research on interactive and collaborative governance have developed in splendid isolation from each other. However, as shown above, there is evidence of a tentative rapprochement between the two bodies of theory that provides an initial foundation for theorizing and studying interactive political leadership.

There are few studies indicating what interactive political leadership might look like in practice and how it can be institutionalized. The empirical analysis of the Gentofte Model aims to compensate this lack. The case study reveals an ambitious and relative successful attempt to transform the working conditions for the elected councilors in a mid-size Danish municipality that now serves as a beacon for other Danish and also some Norwegian municipalities. What is particularly remarkable about the Gentofte Model is the way that it combines political agenda setting and accountability on the part of the City Council with a flexible use of institutional arenas for collaborative policy making. Hence, the model begins and ends with the elected politicians, although these spend most of their limited time-budget as spare-time politicians in processes of collaborative problem-solving that allow citizens and local stakeholders to provide inputs to the policy process while in return building ownership over joint solutions and restoring their trust.

The concept of interactive political leadership is a new one and its conceptual status remain unclear. Is it a normative concept providing recipe for restoring trust by linking elected government with interactive forms of governance, or is it an analytical concept that permit us to identify a new practice that we can enlarge if it proves to deliver desirable results and outcomes? More research is required to settle that important question. Empirical research of other similar cases of interactive political leadership is needed in order to establish its generic form at a constitutional, institutional and practical level and perhaps also begin to catalogue and categorize different subspecies. Comparative studies will also be helpful in developing a general understanding of the scope conditions for interactive political leadership to emerge and thrive. Finally but not unimportantly, there seems to be an urgent need for studying the changing role perceptions of elected politicians, public administrators and citizens that are involved in interactive political leadership. The old roles and the traditional division of labor are problematized by the new practices and it is not clear what the new roles and forms of interaction entail.

References

Ansell, C. K., Boin, A. and 't Hart, P. (2014), 'Political Leadership in times of crisis', in Rhodes, R. A. W. and 't Hart, P. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook on Political Leadership*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 418-438.

Ansell, C. K. and Bartenberger, M. (2016), 'Varieties of experimentalism', *Ecological Economics*, 130: 64-73.

Ansell, C. K. and Torfing, J. (Eds) (2014), *Public Innovation through Collaboration and Design*, London: Routledge.

Ansell, C. K. and Torfing, J. (Eds) (2016), *Handbook on Theories of Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ansell, C. K. and Torfing, J. (2017), 'Strengthening political leadership and policy innovation through the expansion of collaborative forms of governance', *Public Management Review,* 19(1): 37-54.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969), 'A ladder of citizen participation', *Journal of American Institute of Planners,* 35(4): 216-224.

Bache, I. and Flinders, M. (Eds) (2004), *Multi-Level Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bang, H. and Sørensen, E. (1999), 'The Everyday Maker: a New Challenge to Democratic Governance', *Administrative Theory & Praxis,* 21(3): 325-342.

Bell, S. and Hindmoor, A. (2009), *Rethinking Governance: The Centrality of the State in Modern Society*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T. and O' Leary, R. (2005), 'The new governance: Practices and processes for stakeholder and citizen participation in the work of government', *Public Administration Review*, 65(5): 547-558.

Bommert, B. (2010), 'Collaborative innovation in the public sector'*, International Public Management Review*, 11(1): 15-33.

Burns, J. M. (2003), *Transformative Leadership*, New York, NY: Grove Press.

City Hall, (2015), *Ny Politisk Arbejdsform Tættere på Borgerne*, Gentofte: Gentofte Municipality.

Dalton, R. J. (2014), *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*, London: Sage.

Dalton, R. J. and Welzel, C. (Eds) (2014), *The Civic Culture Transformed: From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edelman (2012), *Edelman Trust Barometer*, http://www.edelman.com/insights/intellectual-property/2012-edelman-trust-barometer/about-trust/global-results/

Ercan, S. A. (2014), 'Same problem, different solutions: The Case of 'Honor killing' in Germany and Britain', in A. K. Gill, C. Strange and K. Roberts (Eds), *Honor Killing and Violence: Theory, Policy and Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 199-217.

Fung, A. and Wright, E. O. (Eds) (2003), *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*, London: Verso.

Gray, B. (1989), *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Halvorsen, T., Haugnes, J., Miles, I, and Røste, R. (2005), 'On the differences between public and private sector innovation', Publin *Report*, D9.

Hamilton, A., Madison, J., Jay, J., and Fairfield, R. P. (1966 [1787]). *The Federalist papers: A collection of Essays Written in Support of the Constitution of the United States,* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hartley, J. (2005), 'Innovation in governance and public service: Past and present', *Public Money and Management*, 25(1): 27-34.

Hartley, J., Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2013), 'Collaborative innovation: A viable alternative to market competition and organizational entrepreneurship', *Public Administration Review*, 73(6): 821-830.

Helms, L. (Ed.) (2012), *Poor Leadership and Bad Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward: Elgar.

Hendriks, C. M. (2013), *Research Report: Elected Representatives and Democratic Innovation*, Canberra: Crawford School of Public Policy.

Hood, C. (2011), *The Blame Game: Spin, Bureaucracy, and self-preservation in Government*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Hoodge, L. and Marks, G. (2002), *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Inglehart, R. (1977), *The Silent Revolution*, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Jessop, B. (2002), *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

John, P. and Stoker, G. (2009), 'Design experiments: Engaging policy makers in the search for evidence about what works', *Political Studies*, 57(2): 356–373.

Kane, J., Papatan, H. and 't Hart, P. (2009), 'Dispersed Democratic Leadership Revisited', in Kane, J., H. Patapan, H. and 't Hart, P. (Eds), *Dispersed Democratic Leadership: Orgins, Dynamics, and Implications*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 299-321.

Kattel. R., Cepilovs, A., Drechsler, W., Kalvet, T., Lember, V. and Tonurist, P. (2014), 'Can we measure public sector innovation? A literature review', *LIPSE Working Paper Series*, 3.

Katz, R.S. and Mair, P. (1995), 'Changing models of party organization and party democracy: The emergence of the cartel party', *Party Politics*, 1(1): 5-28.

Keane, J. (2009), *The Life and Death of Democracy*, London: Simon and Schuster.

Keane, J. (2011), 'Monitory democracy', in Alonso, S., Keane, J. and Merkel, W. (Eds), *The Future of Representative Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 212-235.

Kickert, W., Klijn, E. H. and Koppenjan, J. (Eds) (1997), *Managing Complex Networks*, London: Sage.

Klijn, E.-H. (2014), 'Political leadership in networks', in Rhodes, R.A.W. and 't Hart, P. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Leadership*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 403-418.

Kohler-Koch, B. and Larat, F. (Eds) (2009), *European Multi-level Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kooiman, J. (Ed.) (1993), *Modern Governance*, London: Sage.

Koppenjan, J., Kars, M. and Voort, H. van der. (2011), 'Politicians as metagovernors: Can metagovernance reconcile representative democracy and network in reality?', in Torfing, J. and Triantafillou, P. (Eds), *Interactive Policy Making, Metagovernance and Democracy,* Colchester: ECPR Press, pp. 129–148.

Koppenjan, J., and E.H. Klijn (2004), *Managing Uncertainties in Complex Networks,* London: Routledge.

Krause, R. M. (2011), 'Policy innovation, intergovernmental relations, and the adoption of climate protection initiatives by US cities', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 33(1): 45-60.

Lees-Marshment, J. (2015), *The Ministry of Public Input: Integrating Citizen Views Into Political Leadership*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Light, P. C. (2015), 'Vision + action = faithful execution', *Issue Paper*, https://www.volckeralliance.org/sites/default/files/attachments/Vision%20%2B%20Action%20-%20The%20Volcker%20Alliance.pdf., Retrieved on August 28, 2016.

Lijphart, A. (1999), *Patterns of Democracy. Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marcussen, M., and Torfing, J. (Eds) (2007), *Democratic Network Governance in Europe,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (Eds) (1992), *Policy Networks in British Government*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Masciulli, J. and Knight, W.A. (2009), "Conceptions of Global leadership for contextually intelligent, innovatively adaptive political leaders", in J. Masciulli, M.A. Molchanov, W.A. Knight, (Eds), *The Ashgate Research Companion to Political Leadership,* London: Ashgate, pp. 89-121.

Mouritzen, P. E. and Svara, J. (2002), *Leadership at the Apex: Politicians and Administrators in Western Local Governments*, Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh University Press.

Norris, P. (2011), *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nye, J. S. (2008), *The Power to Lead*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OECD (2013), *Government at a Glance 2013*, OECD: OECD Publishing.

Olsen, J. P. (1978), 'Folkestyre, byråkrati og korporatisme', in Olsen, J. P. (Ed.), *Politisk organisering,* Oslo: Oslo University Press, pp. 15-114.

Page, E. C. (2012), *Policy without Politicians: Bureaucratic Influence in European Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, J. (2000), 'Government, interest groups and policy change', *Political Studies,* 48(5): 1006–1025.

Roberts, N. C. (2000), 'Wicked problems and network approaches to resolution', *International Public Management Review*, 1(1):1-19.

Rosanvallon, P. (2011), *Democratic Legitimacy. Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Salamon, L. M. (Ed.) (2002), *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Schumpeter, 2008 [1942], *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Stoker, G. (2006), *Why Politics Matter: Making Democracy Work*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Strøm, K. (1998), 'Parliamentary Committees in European Democracies', *Journal of Legislative Studies,* 4(1): 21-59.

Sørensen, E. (2006), 'Metagovernance: The Changing Role of Politicians in Processes of Democratic Governance', *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1): 98-114.

Sørensen, E. (2017), 'Political innovations: Innovations in political institutions, processes and outputs', *Public Management Review*, 19(1): 1-19.

Sørensen, E. (2018), *Interactive Political Leadership: The Role of Politicians in the Age of Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Forthcoming.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (Eds) (2007), *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sørensen and Torfing, 2009, 'Enhancing effective and democratic network governance through metagovernance', *Public Administration,* 87(2): 234-258

Sørensen and Torfing, 2011, 'Enhancing Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector', *Administration and Society,* 43(8): 842-868.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2015a), 'Beskrivelse af formål med og indhold af den nye politiske arbejds- og organisatiosform', *Delrapport 1*, Gentofte: Gentofte Municipality, 2nd of December 2015.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2015b) 'Forhåbninger og Bekymringer i forhold til den nye politiske arbejdsform i Gentofte kommune', *Delrapport 2*, Gentofte: Gentofte Municipality, 3rd of December 2015

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2016a), 'Political leadership in the age of interactive governance: Reflections on the political aspects of metagovernance', in J. Edelenbos and Meerkerk, I. F. (Eds), *Critical Reflections on Interactive Governance*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 444-466.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2016b), 'Forløbsundersøgelse af erfaringer med arbejdet i de nye opgaveudvalg i Gentofte Kommune', *Delrapport 3*, Gentofte: Gentofte Municipality, 23nd of October 2016.

Sørensen, E. and Torfing, J. (2016c), 'Samlet evaluering af den nye politiske arbejdsform i Gentofte kommune', *Delrapport 4*, Gentofte; Gentofte Municipality, 22nd of November 2016.

Togeby, L. (1993), 'Grass roots participation in the Nordic countries', *European Journal of Political Research*, *24*(2): 159-175.

Torfing, J. (2016), *Collaborative Innovation in the Public Sector*, Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Torfing, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J. and Sørensen, E. (2012), *Interactive Governance: Advancing the Paradigm*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Warren, M. E. (2002), 'What can democratic participation mean today?', *Political Theory*, 30(5): 677-701.