

1.2

Getimis, P. and Heinelt, H. (2004) *Leadership and community involvement in the European cities. Conditions of success and/or failure* (Greece and Germany) *

Prof. Dr. Panagiotis Getimis
Panteion University Athens
Institute of Urban Environment &
Human Resources
Athens (Greece)
pget@panteion.gr

Prof. Dr. Hubert Heinelt
Darmstadt University of Technology
Institute of Political Science
Darmstadt (Germany)
heinelt@pg.tu-darmstadt.de

**Leadership and Community involvement in European Cities.
Conditions of Success and/or Failure.**

Paper for the International Conference ‘City Future’
held in Chicago 8-9-10 July 2004

1. Introduction

The paper draws conclusion on results of an research project on ‘Participation, Leadership and Urban Sustainability’ (the so-called PLUS project) which covers 16 cities in eight European countries.¹

This project tries to bring together two strands of current urban debates – that on political leadership and that on citizen participation (community involvement). It is looking for conditions of a complementarity between leadership and community involvement by which the effectiveness as well as the legitimacy of urban governance (in the policy areas of economic competitiveness and social inclusion) can be increased or even stabilized.

The paper focuses on types and styles of urban leadership as well as on forms of community involvement by which such a complementarity and (more) effective and legitimate policy outcomes can be achieved.

After an outline of the theoretical consideration on which the work has been based (chapter 2) typologies of leadership and community involvement are clarified (chapter 3). Further on, criteria (or features) of good urban governance in the selected cities by particular interactive effects between urban leadership and community involvement are shortly highlighted (chapter 4). The paper continues with hypothesis to explain ‘success’ and ‘failure’ in urban

1 The project has covered the following European cities: Athens and Volos from Greece, Hanover and Heidelberg from Germany, Bristol and Stoke-on-Trent from the UK, Turino and Cinicello from Italy, Stockholm and Goeteborg from Sweden, Oslo and Bergen from Norway, Enschede and Roermond from the Netherlands, Poznan and Ostrow from Poland.

governance in the mentioned fields and clarifies. In the following main part of the paper (in chapter 5) answers to the following questions/issues are provided:

- What are favourable complementary leadership styles and forms of community involvement to achieve ‘good urban governance’ – or effective and legitimate policy outcomes – in the mentioned policy fields? To answer this question, characteristics of the achieved complementarities in different success cases will be identified (but also reasons for failure).
- Furthermore, the conditions of ‘good urban governance’ will be explained by assessing (i) institutional settings (i.e. local government systems), (ii) incentive structure provided by particular multi-level systems/programmes, (iii) peculiarities of the selected policy areas and (iv) different challenges related to stages of the policy process (problem definition/agenda setting, decision making, implementation).

2. Searching for complementarities between leadership and community involvement

Local Government in Europe has changed the last decades. These changes refer mainly to institutional reforms promoting the consolidation of executive leadership on the one hand and the rise of community involvement and citizen participation on the other. These two aspects of the reform of local government are often seen separately, in two distinctive strands of literature in current urban research and comparative local government: There is a literature, which stresses the need for effective leadership in urban government giving little awareness on public participation and a literature of community involvement focusing on the need to enhance citizen participation saying little or nothing on leadership.

The need to combine the two strands of argumentation, is behind the central hypothesis of the PLUS research project, which can be summarized in the following: can under certain conditions the interplay between urban leadership and community involvement, contribute decisively to overcome government and governance failures and lead to ‘good’ urban governance’.

The concept of “complementarity” – considered as an interactive relation between urban leadership and local communities – refers to both opportunities/strengths and risks/weaknesses of possible outcomes of urban leadership and community involvement in different stages of the policy process (i.e. (i) policy development in the sense of problem definition and agenda-setting, (ii) decision making and (iii) implementation).

Opportunities emerge for example when through the design of institutional arenas by urban leaders citizens' deliberation is enhanced, access to policy decision making to a broad range of social groups/interests is offered and effectiveness and legitimacy of policy implementation is increased through joint action with policy addressees.

Political leaders can also demonstrate good practice in comprehensive steering and capacity generation, and at the same time, based on their high political legitimacy (especially if elected directly), they could guarantee accountability of decisions based on the participation of stakeholders and citizens who usually are lacking accountability.

On the other hand, negative implication of political leadership (like uncontrolled power, authoritarian behaviour, city boss style) could be counterbalanced through the participation of local interests and public deliberation. In this case community involvement can compensate and moderate correctively negative impacts of strong leadership enactment. Furthermore community involvement can have a wide range of positive effects on leadership, like mobilising local resources, securing implementation of leaders' objectives and producing policy innovations and strengthen governability.

Thus, the interplay between community involvement and urban leadership can lead to mutual remedy of some of the shortcomings and dysfunctional implications, which are caused by each of these factors, taken separately.

Strong and more legitimised urban leadership is often seen as an important condition for increasing effectiveness and efficiency as well as for vitalising local democracy (increasing legitimacy). In this sense complementarity of leadership and community involvement is a positive answer to the "democratic dilemma" highlighted for example by Robert Dahl (1994) based on 'system effectiveness versus citizen participation' (see Dahl 1994 also 1989). "This democratic dilemma can be identified by the fact that governability in modern societies, and thereby 'system effectiveness' is secured through a wide range of bargaining systems – either at the cost of abandoning democracy in the sense of 'citizen participation' altogether, or by dramatically reducing it" (Heinelt 2002:97).

But does this relationship between 'system effectiveness' and 'citizen participation' is really a contradiction? Going further back to Charles Lindblom, in his contribution 'The Intelligence of Democracy' (1965) he argued that effective governance is generated through participation. Participation is effective in the realisation of policy objectives because it can help to overcome problems at implementation (Heinelt, 2002:98), by: 'a) the consideration of motives, b) fostering the conformity / compliance / adherence of policy addressees, as well as,

c) tracing mutually dependent effects of policy interventions through mobilisation of the knowledge of those affected (see Mayntz 1987).’

Furthermore participation contributes and stabilise legitimation (input-legitimation) because additionally to the ‘vote’ for representative bodies, enables interest articulation through ‘voice’ and civic engagement. ‘New forms of democratic civil participation in particular, represent opportunities for the application of binding regulations of social interaction that would not be possible to develop else where inside or outside the political system of a functionally differentiated society. Decisive in this respect is the fact that a binding code of problem definitions and patterns of action can be created through debate, i.e. an argumentative mode of interest intermediation’ (Heinelt 2002:99). In this context community involvement does not stand in contrast to ‘system effectiveness’, but is actually one of its conditions.

Similar arguments are developed by Jessop discussing market, state and governance failures, and proposing self-reflexive and participatory forms of governance. ‘In this sense self-reflexive and participatory forms of governance are performative [...] they also become a self – reflexive means of coping with the failures, contradictions, dilemmas and paradoxes that are an inevitable feature of life. In this sense participatory governance is a crucial means of defining the objectives as well as objects of governance as well as of facilitating the co-realisation of these objectives by reinforcing motivation and mobilising capacities for self-reflection, self-regulation and self-correction’ (Jessop 2005:55). This aspect of participatory modes of governance, as a condition for consent and self-reflexive learning is very crucial. It can be assumed that participation can counter balance failures of top down, hierarchical, authorization leadership.

“Leadership may solve some of the problems going along with community involvement by a participatory management of policy networks and by ensuring their public accountability. Community involvement on the other hand can bring dispersed knowledge and awareness of negative externalities in decision making and implementation processes and can shed public light on proceedings in representative and administrative bodies’ (Haus / Heinelt forthcoming).

Our approach sees complementarity as a complex interactive process in which two separate factors, urban leadership and community involvement, interplay and can lead under certain conditions to successful urban governance. It is important also to consider the linkages as well as separateness of urban leadership and community involvement. Furthermore the term

complementarity is helpful to clarify and to emphasise that we are looking for ‘positive sum games’ regarding the power of leaders and citizen – and not for ‘zero sum’ ones where one part loses power in favour of the other or ‘negative sum’ ones where all are disempowered’ (Haus / Heinelt forthcoming).

3. How to define differences of leadership styles and types as well as of community involvement?

There are different classifications in the scholarly debate on types and styles of urban leadership as well as on community involvement. These differences correspond to different focuses of the researchers but also to different notions and understandings of the above terms,

- By leadership types, we refer to the way the position of political leaders is institutionalised in the context of local government and the broader political systems.
- By leadership styles, we mean the enactment of leadership roles by those actors who are holders of a leadership position.
- By types of community involvement we refer to the societal actors taking part in policy making.
- By forms of community involvement, we refer (i) to the mode of participation in policy making (aggregative or deliberative) and (ii) the inclusiveness or selectivity of participation.

3.1. Leadership types

Leadership types in local government are related to vertical and horizontal political relations. The vertical dimension reflects the relationship between central and local government, the level of financial assistance from upper levels, the degree of decentralization of power, and the level of local autonomy (empowered and disempowered leadership). Concerning the horizontal dimension – which is at the core of our reflections here – we refer to the internal distribution of power among the mayor (or other political leaders), the council and the head(s) of the executive (see for more details Getimis /Grigoriadou forthcoming). Our considerations are mainly based on the typology developed by Mouritzen and Svava (2002) They distinguish four forms (ideal types) of municipal organisation with specific horizontal political structure in which different types of leadership are embedded:

1. The *strong-mayor form* is based on an elected mayor who controls the majority of the council and constitutes the central figure of the executive. The systems of local government in Greece and Italy as well as in Germany and Poland (to mention just the countries covered by the PLUS project) are close to this form of municipal organisation.
2. The *committee-leader form* is based upon the sharing of the executive powers between a central actor, who is clearly the political leader of the municipality, and several standing committees. The local government systems in Sweden and (traditionally) Great Britain can be more or less labelled as committee-leader form.
3. The *collective form* is based on the collective leadership by the executive committee of the council consisting of elected councillors and the mayor. Netherlands and Norway could be said to fall into this category.
4. The *council-manager form* features a city council and a city manager. The council is a relatively small body which has a “general authority over policy but it restricted from involvement in administrative matters (Moutitzen / Svava 2002:56). The city manager, appointed by the city council, is a professional administrator who is responsible for all executive functions. The local government system in the British city of Stoke on Trend shares to the characteristics of the council-manager form.

3.2. Leadership styles

Leadership styles depend on the leader political values referring to the political orientation in relation to the perceptions of social problems and ways to solve problems as well as attitudes to delegate powers. The personal enactment of the leadership role depends on individual orientation i.e. the way in which a leader envisages its role and his/her attitude towards the exercise of ‘power over’ or ‘power-to’) (Leach/Wilson 2000: 26-32).

Based on these dimensions we follow the categorisation of John’s four leadership styles, namely the ‘visionary’, the ‘consensual facilitator’, the ‘city boss’ and the ‘caretaker’ (see John 1997, John/Cole 1999 and Getimis / Grigoriadou, forthcoming).

- 1) The visionary combines elements of strong leadership with capacity generation. The visionary is the leader who is able to forge a powerful and effective coalition, bringing together different sides, establishing innovative policies and effective coordination, strategic and long-term objectives.

- 2) The consensual facilitator is adaptable since she/he generates capacity through persuasion and identifying the best in others. However, this type of leader finds it hard to develop a coherent and a strong decision-making as local policy is driven by the demands of powerful local actors and parties.
- 3) The city boss, does not adapt very well to the complexity of networks and the rapidity of policy change. She/he is a strong leader who does not anticipate capacity building in local actors but is characterized by strong determination. In addition, she/he promotes her/his policies by-passing conflicts and disagreements in the party network.
- 4) The caretaker is the weak political leader who is unable to manage complex coalitions and networks that have (to) emerged in local governance and she/he encounters difficulties in coping with policy changes. For this reason, she/he prefers to maintain the status quo.

It has to be taken into account that the leadership styles (i) can be mixed and (ii) are not fixed during the entire policy process, but they can change. Following the successive steps of the policy cycle (policy development, decision making, implementation) the changes of leadership styles will be assessed as a parameter of explaining conditions of 'success' and 'failure' of a complementarity between urban leadership and community involvement.

3.3. Community Involvement Types

Types of community involvement refer to the composition of the participatory scheme and the different types of actors involved. They can be either resourceful societal actors, where resources refer to control over sector specific contributions (the business community, trade unions, welfare organisations, universities etc.) or they can be the local public and its associations inhabiting a "civic space" in the locality (associations of civil society, neighbourhoods, clubs, single citizens etc; see Haus/Heinelt forthcoming). 'The crucial conditions for community involvement are:

- that the involved actors are "holders" (i) of certain resources necessary for solving a problem or resolving a conflict or (ii) of certain "qualities" where qualities refer e.g. to knowledge and "good arguments" as well as to rights and statuses to be heard which can question the legitimacy of specific solutions (see Schmitter 2002:62-63), and

- that they are on the one hand autonomous (i.e. able to withdraw and to hold back needed resources or free to argue publicly), but on the other hand they are dependent on each other (or on some of the other) to realise their own objectives or to satisfy their preferences' (Haus / Heinelt forthcoming).

In our research we refer to the following distinction between types of involved actors: 1) corporate actors (e.g. chambers, trade unions), 2) collective actors (composed actors with strong orientation / dependency to their members) 3) enterprises, 4) corporate and collective actors, 5) corporate, collective actors and enterprises, 6) collective actor and laypersons, 7) collective actors/laypersons and enterprises and 8) all categories present. The first two categories comprise composed actors, the third one covers enterprise as individual actors and the rest are combinations of broader coalitions of different actors of the above categories.

3.4. Community involvement forms

It is not always quite clear how involvement takes place. Nevertheless, some forms of involvement in taking political decisions are clearly aggregative, and some are deliberative, some lean towards aggregative, some lean to deliberative (see for this section Howard / Klausen / Sweeting forthcoming).

Aggregative involvement is linked to the 'liberal' model of democracy, and its hallmarks are:

- Participants advance a particular point of view.
- It is accepted that people have different, maybe irreconcilable points of view, and decisions must be made despite these differences.
- The views of participants are given equal weight (e.g. one person one vote).
- Options of actors have to be synthesized into one clear position (i.e. a vote), and decisions are taken by the aggregation of votes.
- They often aim to influence decisions made by representative bodies

Deliberative involvement is linked to discourses and the public space. Hallmarks of it are:

- Participants interact communicatively with each other.
- Participants try to reach consensus – aiming at a mutual adjustment of options so that no majoritarian decision is needed.

- Interaction is based on reasoning, i.e. the attempt to convince others about the appropriateness (if not the truth) of a certain problem definition and a particular way to solve the problem at stake.

Where the advantage of a discursive or deliberative form of policy making (and of deliberative democracy in general) lies in the option to reach a high degree of acceptance and of support by those concerned (and thus legitimacy) as well as in the mobilisation of knowledge and other resources decisive for implementation (and thus the effectiveness of political interventions) there are shortcomings as well. Discursive or deliberative form of policy making can turn out as time-consuming because the interaction can be trapped by divergent interests. Furthermore, the 'good will' of some actors to reach a decision by consensus based on 'good reasons' can be exploited by selfishly oriented other. On the other hand, by aggregative forms of participatory policy making decisions can be taken quite quickly, however, overruled actors can withdraw, i.e. their resources and/or their willingness to follow/obey. This is a crucial problem in all cases where the binding character of a decision can not be secured by hierarchical sanctions.

Beyond this distinction between different forms of reaching a binding decision difference should be considered regarding the degree of inclusion or selectivity, i.e. the openness or closure, of participatory policy making.

Full inclusion is apparent where all who are or even feel concerned by the political intervention at stage are included, or all have the opportunity to be included. Elections are an example of full inclusion. Where all have the opportunity to participate, but only a few do, this still counts as full inclusion, even though a small minority of those able to actually participated. For example, a meeting open to all that only attracts a handful of people still counts as full inclusion.

For selective inclusion, participants are often involved on the basis of some criteria, e.g. young people, people from a certain geographical area, businesses with certain interests and economic resources or other stakeholder with particular resources (expertise) or interests. Where there is selective inclusion the question is crucial **who was/is involved why**. Furthermore, where participation is selective but participants seem to select themselves, this could be called 'self selecting'.

Inclusiveness may foster the legitimacy of political interventions but linked with deliberative forms of participatory policy making it can lead to a talking shop, and selectiveness may support quick and effective problem solving but linked with aggregative forms of taking

binding decision this can easily end up rumour and resistance of the not involved because the whole process is not perceived as legitimate form of democratic will-formation.

3.5. Legitimacy

Any democratic system needs to rest on some kind of ‘authentic’ participation. Authentic participation means the possibility of expressing consent or dissent with proposed policies and of influencing the discussion on these policy proposals, i.e. getting one’s voice heard and one’s vote counted. This can be called *input-legitimation through participation* (see for this section Haus/Heinelt forthcoming referring to Scharpf 1970).

Furthermore, the performance of any democratic system will be measured according to the degree it solves the problems that affect the fate of the community it claims to represent. The same apply for any democratic decision: Those who try to determine collectively their lives expect that this can be done effectively. If this expectations are met *output-legitimation (through effectiveness)* can be achieved..

Finally, any democratic system has to be judged according to the transparency of its institutions and processes. Citizens have to understand how measures are taken and who is responsible for them, in order to make actors accountable for what they have done and to understand what are the alternatives that have to be decided upon. Accountability can not only be seen as a precondition for the evaluation of political actors’ performance, but also for efficient decisions with respect to scarce resources like time and money. This can be called *throughput-legitimation through transparency*.

4. Features (variables) of ‘success’ and ‘failures’ of complementarity between leadership and community involvement (CULCI)

The notion of complementarity between leadership and community involvement (CULCI) refers to the interactive effects, caused by each of these two factors, taken separately.

Positive effects that leaders can have on community involvement and vis a versa, lead to higher degree of complementarity and good governance.

The qualitative assessment of CULCI in the 32 case studies (policy initiatives) of the PLUS project, (by the research teams) has been based on the estimation of the existence of the following variables of positive interactions:

A. Positive effects that leadership has on community involvement:

- 1) Design of institutional arenas for community involvement by leaders
- 2) Redesign and (re) interpretation of rules for community involvement by leaders
- 3) Strengthening of resource basis for specific groups by leaders
- 4) Linkage of arenas by leaders
- 5) Leaders securing implementation of policy object

B. Positive effects that community involvement has on leadership:

- 6) Securing implementation of leader's agenda through community involvement
- 7) Higher legitimacy for leadership agenda by community involvement
- 8) Policy innovations through community involvement contributing to the capacity of leadership (governability)
- 9) Resources (e.g. economic, knowledge) provided by involved actors strengthening "power to" of leaders

Against the empirical findings of the qualitative weighting the above variables in each case study CULCI was scored in four categories: **no** CULCI = 0-2 variables encountered, **low** = 3-4 variables encountered, **medium** = 5-6 variables encountered, **high** = 7-9 variables encountered.

Both medium and high levels of CULCI (where more than 5 variables are encountered) lead to significant achievements of good urban governance ("**success**" CULCI). On the other hand in the cases of low level or no CULCI (where less than 4 variables are encountered) features of "**failure**" of complementarity can be identified (although even here in certain arenas or policy stages positive outcomes emerge).

5. How to explain "success" and "failure" of CULCI

To explain these features we start from the following hypothesis derived from the theoretical considerations and typologies presented earlier (in chapters 2 and 3) in this paper:

1. **Leadership styles matter!** These styles are those of the visionary and consensus facilitating leadership which allow for

- flexibility according to specific as well as changing situations,

- openness of policy-making towards particular forms of participation,
- capacity generation by empowering actors, as well as,
- increased accountability by linking the arenas of public deliberation and representative democracy.

However, also the style of a city boss can be important in the phase of implementation.

2. At the same time, particular types and forms of ***community involvement matter!*** Selective forms of participation (deliberative or aggregative) are more vulnerable to resistance while inclusive forms can lead to higher legitimacy and successful governance (higher level of CULCI). Through involving the community, effectiveness as well as legitimacy concerns in local governance arrangements can be secured or enhanced by

- taking concerns seriously,
- inviting publicity and transparency into policy-making,
- securing willingness to follow and
- mobilising resources (including knowledge) relevant for defining and implementing policy objectives

3. Leadership styles, as behavioural aspects, can be developed more easily under particular contextual (structural) conditions. This refers not at least to certain ***leadership types*** depending on the form of local government.

4. Furthermore, ***institutional design (rules)***, e.g. those imposed by programmes set up by upper-level government as well as by supra-national organisations (for instance the partnership principle of EU programmes) can prove important in promoting a ***complementarity of leadership and a broadened form of community involvement***. This applies particularly in efforts aiming at the avoidance of a concentration on corporate actors and single enterprises.

5. ***Peculiarities of policy areas*** can be decisive because -depending on the problems to be solved and the objectives to be reached- certain leadership characteristics as well as certain types and forms of community involvement can prove more important and suitable than others. However, in the case that only a limited and selected number of (resourceful) actors are or have to be involved, there is a strong need to bring

transparency, publicity and accountability into such arrangement by enacting the leadership of political actors.

6. Legitimacy (input, throughput, output) in the different policy stages plays an important role on CULCI. The higher the legitimacy (all types) across any / all policy stages, the more probable is the attainment of successful governance (CULCI).

6. What have we found?

Empirically, the following results can be drawn out of the 32 initiatives analysed by the PLUS project.

Out of the 32 analysed initiatives 22 demonstrate more or less the above mentioned features of success (9 high level and 13 medium level of complementarity). This high number /percentage is not astonishing because at its outset the project purposefully selected ‘promising’ cases aiming therein to detect complementarities between leadership and community involvement, their results as well as their conditions.

Amongst the remaining ten cases, nine indicate low levels of complementarity and in one case no CULCI is encountered.

We will present the main findings of the research in relation to the above hypothesis, in two sections, one referring to the “non-success” or “failure” cases (10) and the other referring to the “success” cases of CULCI (22).

6.1. NON SUCCESSFUL CULCI

What can be taken as a first result – and related to the first hypothesis – is that under the whole group of these ten cases which failed to reach a medium or high level of complementarity between leadership and community involvement the group of leaders who acted as city bosses or caretakers is proportionally over-represented.

Highlighting the role of leadership style in the 10 cases, and taking also the three different stages of the policy process into consideration (policy development, decision making and implementation), the following results may be drawn:

In the stage of policy development, out of four cases where a city boss style has been observed three failed.

The relation was even worse in cases where in this stage the crucial political local leader performed as a caretaker: here three out of three failed, indicating a full-scale failure. In the policy decision-making phase, the situation was similar or even worse: here, seven urban leaders behaved as city bosses and four as caretakers and in four of these cases no success could be detected. In the phase of policy implementation we are faced with a slightly different picture: out of six cases with caretakers, five non-success stories are reported. But only one out of six cases with a leader enacting the city boss style has not been successful, indicating that in policy implementation stage the style of a city boss can be appropriate. However, also in the implementation stage cases with a visionary or consensus facilitator leader or a mixture of these two leadership styles performed better: here only three out of eighteen cases were unsuccessful.

Concerning the policy field, from the 10 “non-success” cases five come from the field of economic competitiveness and five come from the field of social inclusion.

Referring to the **second hypothesis** addressing the community involvement types and forms (composition of actors and forms of involvement), the following results can be drawn: in the five “failure” cases in the field of economic competitiveness, a dominant involvement of either corporate actors or single enterprises across all phases of the policy process is observed, especially in the phase of the development of the initiative (problem definition and agenda setting) and its implementation. This is related also with the dominance in all five cases of **selective** forms of community involvement (deliberative or aggregative) and the absence of full inclusion forms across all policy stages.

The other five cases in the field of social inclusion that did not perform successfully, demonstrate a dominant involvement of **collective actors only** or collective actors in combination with laypersons (only in one case in Poznan, the dominant actors are “experts”). It’s worth mentioning that in almost all these cases (with the single exception of Bristol), at the policy decision-making stage there was no community involvement at all. Concerning the forms of community involvement there is no clear dominant features in these cases.

Concerning the **final hypothesis on the role of the legitimacy on CULCI**, the empirical findings clearly highlight the low levels of legitimacy (input, throughput, output) encountered in different policy stages as a dominant feature of the non “success” cases of CULCI.

More precisely, out of the 10 “failure” cases of CULCI, in the policy development stage the majority produced low or no input legitimacy (8 cases). The same scores applied for

throughput legitimacy (8 cases), while output legitimacy performed similarly with a score of 7 out of 10 cases in this same policy stage.

Similar results have further been detected in the other policy stages, namely the policy decision-making and the implementation phases.

6.2. “SUCCESS CULCI”

On the other hand we can underline strong indications of ‘good governance’ in twenty two initiatives, i.e. in cases demonstrating medium and high CULCI where more than five variables of interactive positive effects were encountered. In these cases we clearly can observe leaders with a visionary and/or consensus facilitating leadership style in the different stages of the policy process (policy development, i.e. problem definition and agenda setting, decision making and implementation first hypothesis). However, in five out of these twenty two “success” cases, the style of a city boss either in the policy development or the decision making and implementation phase has also been observed. This can be related to specific conditions of an initiative – be it in the case of

- the social inclusion initiative of Volos where a clear and strong leadership was needed in the *decision making phase*,
- the social inclusion initiative in Heidelberg where the same is required during the *implementation* so as to ensure that the deliberatively developed district planning is actually adopted,
- both initiatives in Hanover where a strong leadership was needed in the implementation phase in order to ensure effectiveness,
- the social inclusion initiative of Cinisello-Balsamo where an urban leader with the style of a city boss was decisive during *policy development* so as to draw lessons learnt from former experiences and to insert respectively redirected policy objectives and participatory forms of policy making in the agenda², and,
- The economic competitiveness initiative in Ostrow, where a strong leadership is performed in the phase of implementation.

² The urban leader (the mayor) in Cinicello-Balsamo changed the leadership style of a city boss in the policy development stage to a visionary leadership style in decision making and implementation not least due to the strong resistance she was faced with by local people.

Analytically the dominance of a leader with a visionary and/or consensual facilitating style is expressed in the following statistical findings:

From the 22 success cases of medium and high complementarity between leadership and community involvement, we encountered 21 leaders with a visionary (8) or consensual facilitating (8) or a mixture involving both of these styles (5) in the policy development stage. Similar high scores are observed in the policy decision making stage (19 cases out of 22); here, however, an increased number of leaders acting as city boss is also detected (3 cases in the decision making stage, 5 cases in the implementation stage).

These figures confirm in several cases the importance of a changing (a flexible/adjusting) leadership style (from visionary and/or consensus facilitating to a city boss style) adopted by the same person according to the needs and objectives of the policy initiative across the different stages (e.g. Cinisello Balsamo, Volos, e.a).

Focusing more precisely on the nine (9) “best practices” of successful governance demonstrating a high complementarity of leadership and community involvement, the dominance of the visionary and/or consensual facilitating style is similar (8 cases in policy development, 9 cases in decision-making, 6 cases in implementation). However, also in these 9 “best practices”, the leaders in three cases enact a city boss style in the implementation phase.

Referring to the second hypothesis on community involvement (actors and forms), the following results may be drawn:

The dominance of leaders with a visionary and/or consensus facilitating style is complemented by forms of community involvement of collective actors – be it by collective actors alone (in four cases) or by collective actors together with corporate actors (in five cases) but also together with corporate actors and enterprises (in five cases).

This is the case especially in the policy development stage, but similar trends are encountered in the other policy stages as well.

Focusing on the two policy fields (economic competitiveness and social inclusion) as a variable of comparative analysis, there emerge slightly different results as regards the second hypothesis on the community involvement types and forms.

In the 13 “success” cases in the field of economic competitiveness there is a slight majority of combinations across the following types: corporate and collective actors and/or enterprises in all policy stages. In the other 13 “success” cases in the field of social inclusion there is a clear

dominance of combinations of collective actors with laypersons and / or enterprises or collective actors only. It is worth mentioning that these different patterns in the composition of actor's participation correspond to the different needs of partnership in the two distinctive policy sectors.

Comparing these results with the results of community involvement types encountered in the “non success” cases, one reaches an interesting outcome, namely that in the success cases, across both policy fields, more extended and broader partnerships and coalitions of stakeholders emerge, than single actor-led involvement (enterprises, or corporate or collective actors).

7. Conclusions

The basic message emerging from the presented research project is that a complementarity or interactive effects between urban leadership and community involvement lead to or secure the legitimacy of policy interventions. This is crucial because the analysed initiatives are all based in fields where socially binding decisions are no longer exclusively developed and adopted at the heart of local government, i.e. by the municipal administration and the council as the core representative body. Instead, all analysed initiatives are examples of local governance, in that the policy making process has been opened up to the local society and political decisions have been reached by or at least together with private or social actors. These actors are (or seem to be) on the one hand decisive for securing effectiveness in the selected policy interventions yet, on the other hand, do not stand to gain per se legitimacy or political power by becoming directly involved in socially binding decisions.

As preconditions for such interactive effects between urban leadership and community involvement, on the one hand, are regarded certain features of urban leadership. Political leaders are important actors who secure accountability of policy-making processes opened up to society, i.e. not resting solely on the relatively clear structures of representative democracy and public administration. Furthermore, particular leadership styles have demonstrated a capacity of addressing the challenges of (i) complexity management and redistribution, (ii) securing the broad involvement of affected (or concerned) communities through exercising the necessary political commitment over their involvement and (iii) guaranteeing the stability but also the flexibility of the newly created governance arrangements.

On the other hand, these governance arrangements have to be truly participatory in the sense that they are not (or even not be perceived as) selective. Or to put it again precisely:

community involvement has to be institutionalised in the form of participatory governance arrangements. This is – by and large – easier to achieve in the field of social inclusion than in the field of economic competitiveness. In the latter, the involvement can be strictly limited to a community of resourceful economic actors (individual enterprises or corporate actors like chambers, trade unions etc.) essential for achieving the objective of turning the local economy (more) competitive. This can lead to a closed ‘urban regime’ or a form of local (neo-) corporatism. Although this phenomenon can also surface in the field of social inclusion, such a danger in this specific policy field is usually not so pronounced because the objective of inclusion makes it harder to justify (and to realise) the exclusion of actors interested in participation.

There are contextual variables favouring certain leadership styles and forms of community involvement; however, they are not clearly determined. Contextual variables – and especially institutional structures – are placing constraints and highlighting options for political actions but it is up to the local actors to make use of the available ‘feasible set’, i.e. to exploit locally given options and to reshape existing constraints. This has been demonstrated by the analysed initiatives, where some cases demonstrated a certain ‘under-performance’ in respect to a respective ‘favourable’ context and others equally ‘over-performed’ vis-à-vis a respective ‘unfavourable’ contextual background (see Bäck forthcoming).

Literature:

Dahl, R.A., 1989: *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven/Conn.: Yale University Press.

Dahl, R.A., 1994: A democratic dilemma: system effectiveness versus citizen participation. *Political Science Quarterly* 1994 (1): 23-34.

Getimis P., Grigoriadou D. forthcoming “Changes in Urban Political Leadership: Leadership Types and Styles in the Era of Urban Governance”.

Heinelt, H., 2000: Civic Perspectives on a Democratic Transformation of the EU, in: Grote/Gbikpi (eds.): *Participatory Governance. Political and Societal Implications*, Opladen 2002, 97-120.

Haus M, Heinelt H. forthcoming “How to Achieve Governability at the Local Level? Theoretical and conceptual considerations on a Complementarity of Urban Leadership and Community Involvement”.

Howard, J., Klausen, J-B., Sweeting, D. forthcoming “Community Involvement, legitimation and CULCI in urban governance: an empirical analysis”.

Jessop, B. 2002 “Governance and Metagovernance: On Reflexivity, Requisite Variety and Requisite Irony” in Getimis P., Heinelt H., Kafkalas G. and Smith R. (eds.), *Participatory Governance in a Multi-Level Context: Concepts and Experience*, Opladen: Leske+Budrich.

John, P. & Cole, A. (1999), “Political leadership in the new urban governance: Britain and France compared” *Local Government Studies*, vol 25:4, pp 98-115

John P. (1997), “Political Leadership in the New Urban Governance: Britain and France compared”, Paper presented to the International Seminar on Governing Cities , Brussels, September

Leach, S. & Wilson, D. 2000 *Local Political Leadership*, Bristol: Policy Press

Lindblom, C.E., 1965: *The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making through Mutual Adjustment*, New York et al.

Mayntz, R., 1993: *Policy-Netzwerke und die Logik von Verhandlungssystemen*. In: Heritier, Adrienne (ed.): *Policy-Analyse. Kritik und Neuorientierung*, Opladen: 39-56.

Mouritzen, E. & Svava, J. 2002, *Leadership at the apex*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

ANNEX I

GRID

ANNEX 1 – GRID (page -1)

CITY	INITIATIVE	UPPER-LEVEL PROGRAMME (1)	LEADERSHIP TYPE (2)	LEADERSHIP STYLE (3)			COMMUNITY INVOLMENT COMPOSITION (4)		
				PD	PDM	PI	COMINPD	COMINPDM	COMINPI
ATHENS	social inclusion	1	1	1	3	1	4	4	4
	economic competitiveness	1	1	1	3	4	1	0	1
VOLOS	social inclusion	2	1	5	3	5	2	0	2
	economic competitiveness	1	1	5	3	2	4	4	4
HANOVER	social inclusion	0	1	2	2	3	0	7	7
	economic competitiveness	0	1	2	2	3	3	3	3
HEIDELBERG	social inclusion	0	1	1	2	3	5	4	4
	economic competitiveness	0	1	1	2	3	3	3	3
BRISTOL	social inclusion	2	2	3	4	4	6	6	6
	economic competitiveness	0	2	2	2	4	7	7	3
STOKE on TRENT	social inclusion	0	4	1	1	2	6	6	6
	economic competitiveness	1	4	2	2		6	6	
TORINO	social inclusion	1	1	2	1	1	7	5	5
	economic competitiveness	0	1	1	2	2	5	5	5
CINISELLO BALSAMO	social inclusion	2	1	3	1	1	7	7	7
	economic competitiveness	0	1	4	3	3	3	3	3
STOCKHOLM	social inclusion	2	2	4	4	4	2	0	2
	economic competitiveness	0	2	1	2	2	3	0	3
GOETEBORG	social inclusion	2	2	1	4	4	2	0	2
	economic competitiveness	0	2	1	1	1	3	3	3
OLSO	social inclusion	2	3	1	1	1	2	0	2
	economic competitiveness	2	3	4	4	4	1	0	1
BERGEN	social inclusion	0	3	2	2	2	2	0	2
	economic competitiveness	0	3	1	1	1	4	0	4
ENCHEDE	social inclusion	0	3	5	5	5	8	0	5
	economic competitiveness	0	3	5	5	5	8	0	0
ROERMOND	social inclusion	3	3	1	1	2	4	0	4
	economic competitiveness	3	3	5	5	5	4	0	5
POZNAN	social inclusion	0	1	3	3		0	0	3
	economic competitiveness	0	1	2	2	2	4	4	5
OSTROW	social inclusion	0	3	3	3	1	0	0	2
	economic competitiveness	0	3	2	2	3	6	0	6

ANNEX 1 – GRID (page -2)

INITIATIVE	COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FORMS (5)			LEGITIMACY (6)									CULGI (7)
	PD	PDM	PI	POLICY DEVELOPMENT			POLICY DECISION-MAKING			POLICY IMPLEMENTATION			
				INPUT	THROUGHPUT	OUTPUT	INPUT	THROUGHPUT	OUTPUT	INPUT	THROUGHPUT	OUTPUT	
SI	4	2	4	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	2
EC	4	0	4	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
SI	4	0	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2
EC	2	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
SI	0	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
EC	4	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2
SI	4	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
EC	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
SI	3	4	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
EC	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	0	2
SI	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	3
EC	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	2
SI	4	4	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	3
EC	2	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	3
SI	4	3	3	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
EC	1	4	0	2	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1
SI	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
EC	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
SI	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
EC	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
SI	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2
EC	4	0	4	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	1
SI	1	0	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	1	1	2
EC	4	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	2
SI	3	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	3
EC	3	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
SI	4	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
EC	4	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2
SI	0	0	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	0
EC	2	4	4	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
SI	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1
EC	4	0	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2

ANNEX II

EXPLANATORY NOTES

ON THE GRID

ANNEX II

EXPLANATORY NOTES TO THE GRID

- 1 Programmes requiring/fostering partnership: EU structural funds = 1, national programmes/initiative = 2, EU & national = 3, none = 0.
- 2 strong mayor type = 1, committee leader type = 2, collective type = 3, council manager type = 4.
- 3 visionary = 1, consensus facilitator = 2, city boss = 3, caretaker = 4, visionary / consensual facilitator mix = 5, visionary / caretaker mix = 6
- 4 no community involvement = 0 ; corporate actors (e.g. chambers, trade unions) = 1, collective actors (composed actors with strong orientation/dependency to their members) = 2; enterprises = 3; corporate and collective actors = 4; corporate, collective actors & enterprises = 5; collective actors & laypersons = 6 ; collective actors/laypersons & enterprises = 7 ; all categories present = 8. Experts (in the case of the Polish case-study) are to be considered under “enterprises”.
- 5 no community involvement = 0, aggregative/full involvement = 1, aggregative/selective involvement = 2, deliberative/full involvement = 3, deliberative/selective involvement = 4
- 6 blank = 0 (unable to assess legitimacy due to development stage of initiative, no implementation), low = 1, high = 2
- 7 Qualitative Assessment of CULCI
no = 0-2 variables encountered, low = 3 -4 variables encountered, medium = 5-6 variables established, high = 7-9 variables encountered
where no = 0, low = 1, medium = 2, high = 3