P03 / Political Leadership in Interactive Governance

Topic : POLICY FORMULATION, ADMINISTRATION AND POLICYMAKERS

Chair : Eva Sørensen (Roskilde University)

Second Chair : Sarah Ayres (University of Bristol)

Third Chair : Tina Øllgaard Bentzen (Roskilde University)

GENERAL OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND SCIENTIFIC RELEVANCE

As three decades of governance research has demonstrated, the context in which elected politicians perform political leadership is changing. We see a mushrooming of interactive forms of governance such as quasi-markets, partnerships, and networks that bring together political and social actors in a shared attempt to formulate, design and implement public policy and governance (Kooiman, 1993; Rhodes, 1997; Agranoff and McGuire, 2003; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004; Torfing et al, 2012; Agger et al, 2015). Pluralist and corporatist political theory and research show that it is not a new thing for public authorities to involve relevant and affected actors at different stages in the policy process (Dahl, 1961; Echstein, 1969; Schmitter, 1974; Heclo, 1978; Kingdon, 1984). What is new is, first, that interaction between public and private actors increasingly takes the form of interactive governance rather than lobbyism and interest groups pressure and, second, that interactive forms of governance have become a systematic, required and prescribed activity for public authorities. Hence, interactive forms of governance are key ingredients in most of the governance reforms of last decades although researchers have used a variety of names to describe this phenomenon. Among the most prominent names are New Public Management (Hood, 1991; Osborne and Gaebler, 1993), Network Governance (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997), Joint Up Government (Perri 6, 2004; Hodges, 2012); Collaborative Governance (Agranoff and Mc Guire, 2003), New Public Governance (Osborne, 2010), Multi-level Governance (Bache and Flinders, 2004), and finally Interactive Governance (Torfing et al, 2012).

The surge of interactive forms of governances is path breaking because it changes the context in which politicians perform political leadership representative democracies. Hence, as illuminated in several studies, interactive governance tends to recast citizens and stakeholders from objects of government to active participants in policy-making and governance (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000; Edelenbos, 2005; Sørensen, 2007). Very few studies have analysed the implications of interactive governance for the political leadership of elected politicians (Edelenbos, Klok, and Tatenhove, 2009; Agger and Sørensen, 2014; Ansell and Torfing, 2017; Hertting and Kugelberg, 2018). The metagovernance term developed by governance researchers to signify the role of public authorities in interactive governance holds some promise when it comes to characterizing emerging forms of public administration and governance (Kooiman, 1993; 2003; Jessop, 1998, 2002; Sørensen and Torfing, 2007). Meta-governance refers to leadership as a strategic effort to involve and guide relevant and affected members of society in processes of self-governance (Sørensen and Torfing, 2009). Governance researchers have almost exclusively discussed metagovernance from a managerial perspective, while paying scant attention to the implications of interactive governance for the performance of political leadership among elected politicians. Therefore, we lack a conceptual framework and language for categorizing and analysing the kinds of political leadership that emerge in a context of interactive governance, as well as empirical knowledge about how elected politicians perform political leadership in the age of interactive governance.

The scant attention to the role and function of political leadership in interactive governance research is among other things a result of a regretful disconnect between those who study public administration and governance and those who study political leadership. It is a specific purpose and goal of this panel to bring together researchers from these two disconnected research fields. Recent theories of political leadership can not only help to identify key generic features of political leadership (Burns, 2003; Nye, 2008; Kane, Patapan and ‘t Hart, 2009; Helms, 2012, 2016; Rosanvallon, 2011). They also provide important inspiration when it comes to classifying emerging forms of political leadership and current changes in party politics and role perceptions among citizens and politicians (Mair, 2013; Dalton and Welzel, 2014).

The panel aims to bring the question of the role of politicians in interactive governance onto the research agenda, and bring together papers that shed theoretical and/or empirical light on the conditions for exercising political leadership in the age of interactive governance. What barriers and dilemmas do politicians operating at different levels of governance face in their performance of political leadership? What leadership styles emerge in the context of interactive governance, and how does interactive governance

influence the way politicians operate and communicate with citizens and other societal actors? How do emerging political leadership styles affect the legitimacy and effectiveness of representative democracy, and to what extent and how do these political leadership styles affect the stability and robustness of representative democracy?

References:

Agger, A., Damgaard, B., Krogh, A.H. and Sørensen, E. (Eds) (2015), Collaborative governance and Public Innovation in Northern Europe, London: Bentham Press.

Agger, A., and Sørensen, E. (2014), "Designing collaborative policy innovation: Lessons from a Danish municipality", in C. Ansell and J. Torfing (Eds), Public Innovation through Collaboration and Design, New York: Routledge, pp.188-208.

Agranoff, R., and McGuire, M. (2003), "Inside the matrix: Integrating the paradigms of intergovernmental and network management", International Journal of Public Administration, 26(12), pp. 1401-1422.

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

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

Burns, J.M. (2003), Transformative leadership, New York: Harper and Row.

Dahl, R.A. (1961), Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City, New Haven: Yale University Press.

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

Echstein, H. (1969), "Pressure Group Politics", Journal of Medical Education, 35(11), pp. 1069-1082.

Edelenbos, J. (2005), "Institutional Implications of Interactive Governance: Insights from Dutch Practice", Governance, 18(1), pp. 111-134.

Edelenbos, J., Klok, P. J., and van Tatenhove, J. (2009), "The Institutional Embedding of Interactive Policy-making: Insights from a Comparative Research based on Eight Interactive Projects in the Netherlands", The American Review of Public Administration, 39(2), pp. 125-148.

Heclo, H. (1978), "Issue networks and the executive establishment", in A. King (Ed.), The New American Political System, Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, pp. 87-124.

Helms, L. (2012), "Conclusion", in L. Helms (Ed), Poor Leadership and Bad Governance, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 195-204.

Helms, L. (2016), "Democracy and innovation: from institutions to agency and leadership", Democratization, 23(3), pp. 459-477.

Hertting, N., and Kugelberg, C. (Eds) (2018), Local Participatory Governance and Representative Democracy. Institutional Dilemmas in European Cities, London: Routledge.

Hodges, R. (2012), "Joined-Up Government and the Challenges to Accounting and Accountability Researchers". Financial Accountability & Management, 28, pp. 26–51.

Hood, C. (1991), "A public administration for all seasons?", Public Administration, 69(1), pp. 1-19.

Jessop, B. (1998), The Rise of Governance and the Risk of Failure: The Case of Economic Development, UNESCO no.155, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

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

Kane, J., Patapan, H. and ' Hart, P. (Eds) (2009), Dispersed Democratic Leadership. Origins, Dynamics and Implications, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kingdon, J.W. (1984), Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, Boston: Little Brown.

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

Kooiman, J. (1993), Modern Governance: New Government Society Interactions, London: Sage.

Kooiman, J. (2003), Governing as Governance, London: Sage.

Klijn, E. H., and Koppenjan, J. (2000), "Interactive decision making and representative democracy", in Van Heffen, O., Kickert, W.J.M. and Thomassen, J.J.A. (Eds), Governance in Modern Society, Dordrecht: Kluwer pp. 109-134.

Koppenjan, J., and E.H. Klijn (2004), Managing Uncertainties in Networks, New York: Routledge.

Mair, P. (2013), Ruling the Void. The Hollowing of Western Democracy, London: Verso.

Nye, J. (2008), The Powers to Lead, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osborne, D., and Gaebler, T. (1993), Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is

Transforming the Public Sector, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Osborne, S. (2010), The New Public Governance?, New York: Routledge.

Perri 6 (2004), “Joined-Up Government in the Western World in Comparative Perspective: A Preliminary Literature Review and Exploration”, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 14 (1), pp. 103-138.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (1997), Understanding Governance, Buckingham: Open University Press.

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

Schmitter, P.C. (1974), Still the Century of Corporatism?, The Review of Politics, 36 (1), pp. 85-131.

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

Sørensen, E. (2007), “Public management as metagovernance”, in G. Gjelstrup and E. Sørensen (Eds), Public Administration in Transition, Copenhagen: DJOEF Publishers, pp.83-106.

Sørensen, E., and Torfing, J. (2009), “Enhancing Effective and Democratic Network Governance through Metagovernance”, Public Administration, 87(2), pp. 234-258.

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

CALL FOR PAPERS

As three decades of governance research has demonstrated, the context in which elected politicians perform political leadership is changing. We see a mushrooming of interactive forms of governance such as quasi-markets, partnerships, and networks that bring together political and social actors in a shared attempt to formulate, design and implement public policy and governance (Kooiman, 1993; Rhodes, 1997; Agranoff and McGuire, 2003; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004; Torfing et al, 2012; Agger et al, 2015). Pluralist and corporatist political theory and research show that it is not a new thing for public authorities to involve relevant and affected actors at different stages in the policy process (Dahl, 1961; Echstein, 1969; Schmitter, 1974; Heclo, 1978; Kingdon, 1984). What is new is, first, that interaction between public and private actors increasingly takes the form of interactive governance rather than lobbyism and interest groups pressure and, second, that interactive forms of governance have become a systematic, required and prescribed activity for public authorities. Hence, interactive forms of governance are key ingredients in most of the governance reforms of last decades although researchers have used a variety of names to describe this phenomenon. Among the most prominent names are New Public Management (Hood, 1991; Osborne and Gaebler, 1993), Network Governance (Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan, 1997), Joint Up Government (Perri 6, 2004; Hodges, 2012); Collaborative Governance (Agranoff and Mc Guire, 2003), New Public Governance (Osborne, 2010), Multi-level Governance (Bache and Flinders, 2004), and finally Interactive Governance (Torfing et al, 2012).

The surge of interactive forms of governances is path breaking because it changes the context in which politicians perform political leadership representative democracies. Hence, as illuminated in several studies, interactive governance tends to recast citizens and stakeholders from objects of government to active participants in policy-making and governance (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2000; Edelenbos, 2005; Sørensen, 2007). Very few studies have analysed the implications of interactive governance for the political leadership of elected politicians (Edelenbos, Klok, and Tatenhove, 2009; Agger and Sørensen, 2014; Ansell and Torfing, 2017; Hertting and Kugelberg, 2018). The metagovernance term developed by governance researchers to signify the role of public authorities in interactive governance holds some promise when it comes to characterizing emerging forms of public administration and governance (Kooiman, 1993; 2003; Jessop, 1998, 2002; Sørensen and Torfing, 2007). Meta-governance refers to leadership as a strategic effort to involve and guide relevant and affected members of society in processes of self-governance (Sørensen and Torfing, 2009). Governance researchers have almost exclusively discussed metagovernance from a managerial perspective, while paying scant attention to the implications of interactive governance for the performance of political leadership among elected politicians. Therefore, we lack a conceptual framework and language for categorizing and analysing the kinds of political leadership that emerge in a context of interactive governance, as well as empirical knowledge about how elected politicians perform political leadership in the age of interactive governance.

The scant attention to the role and function of political leadership in interactive governance research is among other things a result of a regretful disconnect between those who study public administration and governance and those who study political leadership. It is a specific purpose and goal of this panel to bring together researchers from these two disconnected research fields. Recent theories of political leadership can not only help to identify key generic features of political leadership (Burns, 2003; Nye, 2008; Kane,

Patapan and ‘t Hart, 2009; Helms, 2012, 2016; Rosanvallon, 2011). They also provide important inspiration when it comes to classifying emerging forms of political leadership and current changes in party politics and role perceptions among citizens and politicians (Mair, 2013; Dalton and Welzel, 2014).

The panel aims to bring together papers that shed theoretical and/or empirical light on the conditions for exercising political leadership in the age of interactive governance. What barriers and dilemmas do politicians operating at different levels of governance face in their performance of political leadership? What leadership styles emerge in the context of interactive governance, and how does interactive governance influence the way politicians operate and communicate with citizens and other societal actors? How do emerging political leadership styles affect the legitimacy and effectiveness of representative democracy and to what extent and how do these political leadership styles affect the stability and robustness of democratic governance systems?

P03 / Political Leadership in Interactive Governance

Chair : Eva Sørensen (Roskilde University)

Second Chair : Sarah Ayres (University of Bristol)

Third Chair : Tina Øllgaard Bentzen (Roskilde University)

Session 1

Wednesday, June 26th 16:30 to 18:30 (MB S2.455)

Discussants

Tina Øllgaard Bentzen (Roskilde University)

Sarah Ayres (University of Bristol)

Bridging the gap between politicians and professions? A meta-governance perspective on the involvement of healthcare professionals in collaborative processes

Martin Qvist (Stockholm University)

Livia Johannesson (Stockholm University)

The dynamics of devolution – Political leadership and policy making in UK policing governance

Francesca Gains (University of Manchester)

Vivien Lowndes (University of Birmingham)

A decentred assessment of the impact of ‘informal governance’ on democratic legitimacy

Sarah Ayres (University of Bristol)

Improving public service production, administrative problem solving, and political leadership through co-creation?

Eva Sørensen (Roskilde University)

Jacob Torfing (Roskilde University)

Tina Øllgaard Bentzen (Roskilde University)

Eva Sørensen (Roskilde University)