



Sources of contemporary authority for mayors

Pinning down modern political authority in relation to executives' role orientation

dr. Niels Karsten MA
Sabine van Zuydam MSc

Paper for the Policy & Politics conference 2014
Panel 'What difference do elected mayors make? Session 3'
16-17 September 2014, Bristol (UK)

This is 'work in progress'
Please do not cite without the authors' prior permission

Contact address

dr. Niels Karsten MA
Assistant Professor
Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration, Tilburg University
Room M-737
P.O. Box 90153
5000 LE Tilburg, the Netherlands
n.karsten@uvt.nl
+31-134662128

Sources of contemporary authority for mayors

Pinning down modern political authority in relation to executives' role orientation

dr. Niels Karsten MA
Sabine van Zuydam MSc

11-08-2014

Abstract

Political leaders around the world face a general scepticism towards authority. In order to cope with this challenge, new political repertoires and forms of authority are called for. Yet, the sources of contemporary political authority remain underexplored. In this paper the comparative relevance of fourteen authority sources for mayors is studied. It presents the results of a mixed-method study that includes a representative survey of Dutch mayors as well as in-depth interviews and focus groups to relate mayors' perceptions of available sources of authority to their role orientations. The results show that principle-based and capacity-based authority sources are particularly important for Dutch mayors and challenge the widely shared assumption that the selection procedure is an important source of authority for political leaders. At the same time, other aspects of the mayor's statutory position, such as his institutional independence and formal responsibilities, have not lost their relevance. Further, our results indicate that the role orientations of mayors to some extent affect the authority sources that they rely upon.

1 Political authority under pressure

Political analysts around the world have signalled a loss of authority by political leaders (e.g. Hay, 2007). Due to the rise of a critical citizenry (Norris, 2011) the behaviours, actions and decisions of political leaders are nowadays open to constant debate and scrutiny (Hartley & Benington, 2011, pp. 207-208; also Keane, 2009). Decision-makers face a general scepticism towards traditional authority (Lidström, 2007, p. 506), especially the more formal types of political authority. In order to cope with this challenge, new political repertoires and contemporary forms of authority are called (e.g., Hajer, 2009, p. 3). Yet, the sources of political authority remain underexplored (Hartley & Benington, 2011, p. 208) and a positive conception of modern political authority is hard to come by. Consequently, what modern political authority entails is hard to pin down. What is lacking in particular is an understanding of how authority sources relate to how mayors perceive their role, that is which sources of authority are available to different types of mayors.

This study therefore analyses the contemporary sources of political authority through a study of Dutch mayors. The focal question of this paper is how mayors' perceptions of authority sources relate to their role orientations. Drawing on the work of Avant, Finnemore and Sell (2010) a five-part typology of sources of contemporary political authority is used to map the

comparative relevance of fourteen distinct authority sources for Dutch mayors in relation to society, which are subsequently related to their role orientation. The paper presents the results of a mixed-method study that includes a representative survey of Dutch mayors as well as in-depth interviews and focus groups.

The focus of this paper is on Dutch mayors because the Netherlands presents a ‘deviant case’ (Gerring, 2007, p. 89) that can provide valuable insights in the relation between a mayor’s statutory position, his role orientation and his authority sources. In contrast to most European mayors, who are either directly or indirectly elected, Dutch mayors are appointed by central government (Hendriks & Schaap, 2011). A widely shared assumption in the Netherlands is that the ‘Crown appointment’ provides Dutch mayors with a special and important source of authority (e.g., Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, 2009). Also, it has been shown that Dutch mayors’ role orientations differ substantially from those of their European colleagues: Dutch mayors lay a stronger emphasis on their non-political and nonpartisan role (Denters, 2006; Schaap, 2009). These facts lead many to believe that Dutch mayors draw from different sources of political authority than other European mayors (e.g., Staatscommissie Dualisme en Lokale Democratie, 2000). Recently, though, this view has been called into question by scholars who suggest that, parallel to similar developments outside the Netherlands, personal authority sources have become more important and that formal authority sources are no longer viable sources of authority for the Dutch mayor (Hajer, 2009; Karsten & Jansen, 2013; Prins, Cachet, van der Linde, Tadjman & Bekkers, 2013). In this article we investigate whether the authority sources of Dutch mayors are as special as their selection procedure and how they relate to their role orientations.

The results show that principle-based and capacity-based authority sources are particularly important for Dutch mayors and challenge the widely shared assumption that the selection procedure is a prime source of authority for political leaders. At the same time, other aspects of the Dutch mayor’s statutory position, such as his institutional independence and formal responsibilities, have not lost their relevance. Further, our results indicate that the orientations of mayors to some extent affect the authority sources they can successfully rely upon.

The next section discusses the current paper’s conception of authority. Section 3 elaborates on the typologies of sources of authority and role orientations, and the relation between the two concepts. Section 5 provides an empirical analysis of the comparative relevance of fourteen distinct authority sources for Dutch mayors in relation to society, the methodology for which is elaborated in Section 4. Section 6 discusses the theoretical implications of the results.

2 A relational conception of authority

‘Authority’ has been defined in a variety of ways by different scholars (Friedrich, 1972, pp. 45-65; Lincoln, 1994; Arendt, 2006). Reviewing the body of literature, a distinction can be made between two lines of thought as regards political that is, the authority of political decision-makers (for other forms of authority see, e.g., Harris, 1976, pp. 21-25; De George, 1985).

In the first line of thought authority is closely linked with (formal) institutions, with ‘authorities’ or ‘regimes’ (De George, 1985, p. 63ff). Authority is perceived here as something that finds its roots in external institutions such as the church, the state, or ‘the law’, which give authority an enduring and comprehensive nature. In the second line of thought, authority is something quite different, namely, it is perceived as something that can be established in social relationships between individuals (C. Miller, 2007, p. 8). Authority is internalised and privatised (Harris, 1976, p. 1). From this viewpoint, authority is not so much possessed by an individual or an object, but rather created in the interaction between individuals.

We seek alliance to the second line of thought, as we perceive authority as being of a relational nature, guiding people’s behaviour in “in situations where men follow other men without being compelled to do so” (Friedrich, 1972, p. 48). We asked mayors what it means to means to ‘have authority’ rather than to ‘be in authority’. Such a conception of authority is particularly useful for this study because the aim was to identify the elements of modern political authority as it operates in the relations between mayors and citizens (see also C. Miller, 2007, p. 7; Hajer, 2009). Authority sources are perceived here as resources of legitimacy that foster voluntary compliance of the ruled because they ‘authorise’ the conduct of political leaders (see Weber, 1964; Hartley & Benington, 2011, p. 207).

3 Sources of political authority and mayoral role orientations

The relation between mayors’ understandings of the job and their perceptions of sources of political authority is the main interest of this paper, which starts from the postulate that executives’ role orientations affect the type of authority they choose to rely upon most (see Newell & Ammons, 1987; Felbinger, 1989; French & Folz, 2004). When handling concrete situations mayors have a certain amount of freedom in choosing to rely on different authority sources depending on their understanding of the job. A mayor may, for example, rely more than other mayors on his formal powers or on his capacity to convince others (see Svara, 1987; Greasley & Stoker, 2008). As such, we focus on the effects instead of origins of various role orientations (compare, e.g., Heinelt, 2013, p. 643). The current section presents the typologies of plausible sources of political authority and leadership roles that are used in this paper.

3.1 A typology of plausible sources of political authority

Several leadership scholars have tried to pinpoint the sources of authority of political leaders, the most influential being Max Weber (1964). The current study is not claiming that such attempts fail to provide insight into the nature of political authority, but rather that they provide little insight into the concrete sources contemporary political leaders use to attain authority (see also Hartley & Benington, 2011, p. 208). New forms of political authority have developed that cannot easily be pinpointed using existing, classic-modernist classifications of authority (Hajer, 2009, pp. 23-33). Further, empirical research into contemporary leadership resources often names authority as a resource as such, instead of distinguishing between different sources of authority (e.g., Sweeting, 2003, p. 476), or it uses rather crude distinctions like the one between ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ sources of authority (e.g., Svava, 1995; Greasley & Stoker, 2008), or focuses only on political-executives’ formal authority in relation to other political-executive actors. Consequently, political-executives’ authority ‘beyond city hall’ has remained unexplored (see also Sweeting, 2003).

For these reasons, a five-part typology that was originally developed by Avant, Finnemore and Sell (2010, pp. 11-14) in the field of international relations, was remodelled to categorize fourteen plausible authority sources for Dutch mayors in relation to society. The remainder of this subsection outlines the typology.

TABLE 1. Overview of plausible sources of mayoral authority

Bases of authority	Plausible sources of mayoral authority
Institution-based authority	My legal powers
	The responsibilities that belong to my portfolio
Delegation-based authority	Crown appointment
	Council recommendation
	My political party membership
Expertise-based authority	My expertise
	My experience
Principle-based	My position above and between political parties
	The way in which I execute my policies
Capacity-based authority	My personality
	My leadership style
	My capacity to convince others
	My personal recognisability in the local society
	Personal interactions

a) *Institution-based authority*

To start with, someone may derive authority “from holding office in some established organizational structure” (Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 11). In the case of political-executives this category mainly refers to their formal powers as public office holders, such as control over

budget or the power to appoint alderpersons or senior staff. Although they are rather limited, the formal powers of Dutch mayors most notably include their legal capabilities that stem from their responsibility for the police and public safety (see Schaap, 2009). Other plausible institution-based authority sources for Dutch mayors include their extra-legal responsibilities that are part of mayors' 'portfolios'. The two institution-based authority sources that are included here are, thus, 'My legal powers', and 'The responsibilities that belong to my portfolio'.

b) Delegation-based authority

Second, someone can attain authority "on the loan from some other set of authoritative actors" (Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 11). In the case of political-executives this category mainly refers to the formal authority they attain through being selected as an office holder. Directly elected mayors may, for example, gain authority through the ballot box as delegates of the people. Dutch mayors, however, are not elected by popular vote, but are appointed by central government (Hendriks & Schaap, 2011, p. 105). This 'Crown appointment' may provide Dutch mayors with the necessary authority on the loan from national government. At the same time, over the last decades, the representative municipal councils have gained considerable influence in the appointment procedure; nowadays the councils issue a very influential recommendations to central government (see also Karsten, Cachet & Schaap, 2013). This adaptation of the selection procedure has introduced a second plausible source of mayoral authority next to the Crown appointment: the 'Council recommendation'. The inclusion of these two authority sources in the typology reflects the widely shared assumption that the selection procedure is an important source of authority for political leaders (e.g. Borraz & John, 2004; Morrell & Hartley, 2006, p. 458). In addition, mayors possibly attain authority on the loan from their political party. Therefore, political party membership is included in the typology as the third delegation-based source of authority. Please note that only one percent of Dutch mayors is independent.

c) Expertise-based authority

A third type of authority sources is based on expertise and "derives from specialized knowledge" (Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 12). Although this type of authority is generally associated with technicians or scientists, it may also provide a plausible source of political authority because political-executives know more about the ins and outs of local politics than any other actor. Since mayors do not only derive their know-how of local politics from 'specialized knowledge' but also from professional experience (Guérin & Kerrouche, 2008), the category of expertise-based authority comprises both expertise and professional experience.

d) Principle-based

Fourth, authority can be "legitimated by service to some widely accepted set of principles, morals, or values" (Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 13), which can inhere in both actors and offices (Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 13).

The Dutch mayor is mainly associated with principle-based authority vested within the office itself. Most notably, the mayor's position above and between political parties, is believed to be an important source of authority since Dutch mayors are traditionally expected to play a neutral, non-partisan and non-political role (Schaap, 2009; Karsten *et al.*, 2013). The mayoral office is, therefore, traditionally associated with process values such as integrity, impartiality and procedural justice, which is believed to be an important base for the authority of its holders. The Dutch mayor, other than many of his European colleagues, is expected to act as a *pouvoir neutre* (Elzinga, 2014) who has very limited involvement in policy making.

More substantive moral values like security, distributive justice and prosperity are not typically associated with the Dutch mayor because of his limited involvement in policy making. Nevertheless, Dutch mayors have gained a limited number of executive responsibilities in these areas, and therefore normative values may also provide a basis for mayoral authority. As citizens tend to evaluate mayoral conduct on ideological grounds, the way in which mayors execute their policies may help them to attain authority (A. H. Miller, 1974; McGraw, Timpone & Bruck, 1993). For this reason 'The way in which I execute my policies' is included in this study as a plausible principle-based authority source, in addition to 'My position above and between political parties'.

e) Capacity-based authority

A fifth type of authority is that "based on perceived competence". For political-executives this category of authority sources mostly relates to political skill (see also Ferris *et al.*, 2005). It is often linked to personal leadership styles and seeks close alignment with the postulates that the person behind the leader has become of utmost importance in local governance (Bennet & Entman, 2001; Steyvers *et al.*, 2008) and that authority is nowadays attained through personalised interactions (e.g., Hajer, 2009). The capacity-based authority sources included here are 'My personality', 'My leadership style', 'My capacity to convince others', 'My personal recognisability in the local society', and 'Personal interactions'.

3.2 Plausible role orientations

Mayors' role orientations were conceptualised in this study in terms of their perceptions of the leadership roles that come with holding the office, i.e. the functions a political leader is expected to perform given the context in which he operates (see also de Groot, Denters & Klok, 2010; French & Folz, 2004). Because of the unique, non-political nature of the Dutch mayoralty a tailor made typology of role orientations was developed that is based on existing typologies of mayoral leadership and earlier research on the Dutch mayoralty (see Karsten, Schaap & Verheul, 2010; and Svava, 1987; John & Cole, 1999; Leach & Wilson, 2002; French & Folz, 2004).

The typology applied distinguishes the following eight role orientations:

- **Advocate**, as when the mayor promotes and defends the interest of the municipality (see Svava, 1987).
- **Consensual facilitator**, *verbinder* in Dutch, as when the mayor acts as a facilitator who promotes positive interaction (see John & Cole, 1999, p. 102; Greasley & Stoker, 2008).
- **Enforcer**, as when the mayor acts as the guardian of public safety and local and national laws (Sackers, 2010).
- **First citizen**, *burgervader* in Dutch, as when the mayor acts as a quasi-monarchical, non-political focal point for the community (see Karsten *et al.*, 2013; Hendriks & Karsten, 2014).
- **Moral guide**, as when is the prime protagonist of good local governance (see Karssing, 2006).
- **Ombudsperson**, as when the mayor acts as an impartial intermediary between citizens and local government (e.g. Klinkers, Oosthoek, Hordijk & Buwalda, 1982)
- **Representative**, as when the mayor act as the spokesman of the local community (see Svava, 1987).
- **Visionary**, as when the mayor acts as a strong political leader with visionary ambition (see John & Cole, 1999, p. 102; Greasley & Stoker, 2008).

Mayors can of course combine several of these roles. That is why we have asked mayors to rank each of them, which gives a measure of their comparative relevance. The next section elaborates on the nature of our study into the relationship between mayors' role orientations and their authority sources.

4 Research strategy and methods

This paper presents the results of a mixed-method study that included a survey of Dutch mayors as well as in-depth interviews and focus groups as part of a larger study of the state of the Dutch mayoral office. Between September and November 2013 a web-based survey was conducted. The survey was sent out by e-mail to all 405 Dutch mayors by the Association of Dutch Mayors. In addition, in a letter sent out to all municipalities, the Minister of the Interior invited mayors to participate. Before all this, three cognitive interviews with city managers were conducted for improvement and corrections.

After three reminders, 243 Dutch mayors, or 60%, had completed the questionnaire. Twenty-six mayors indicated that they were not willing to participate and 136 mayors did not respond. The three main reasons of not taking part were: (a) a lack of time, (b) them being an acting mayor and believing that their answers were therefore not suitable and (c) the level of detail in the questions. A further analysis of the response shows that it is representative for the population of Dutch mayors in terms of sex, political party membership, municipal size and the

ratio of sitting mayors to acting mayors. Chi square goodness-of-fit tests indicated no deviations (sex: χ^2 (1, n=243) = 0,032, p=.86; political party membership: χ^2 (9, n=241) = 6,024, p=.74; municipal size: χ^2 (4, n=243) = 3,074, p=.55; acting mayors: χ^2 (1, n=243) = 2,732, p=.10). Because of the ordinal nature of the data obtained on the authority sources and on the role orientations of mayors, the relevant items were analysed by means of Kruskal-Wallis tests and Chi-square tests.

In addition to the survey, twelve semi-structured interviews with selected mayors were conducted (eleven with sitting mayors and acting mayors and one with a well-experienced former acting mayor). Further, the question of how to attain political authority was discussed in three focus groups in which 24 mayors participated in total. In these the preliminary results from the survey were discussed.

5 Results

The remainder of this paper discusses the results of the empirical analysis. It answers two distinct questions: (a) what are Dutch mayors' perceived sources of authority, and (b) how do mayors' perceptions of authority sources relate to their respective role orientations?

5.1 Descriptive analysis of authority sources of Dutch mayors and their perceptions of leadership roles

Sources of mayoral authority

Mayors were first asked to what extent the mayoralty in their experience comes with a 'natural authority'. Contrary to what the loss-of-authority thesis suggests, a large majority of Dutch mayors (90,1%) believed that the mayoralty still carries a natural authority (see Table 2).

TABLE 2. Natural authority of the mayoralty

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	No opinion
The mayoralty comes with a natural authority.	1,20%	7,40%	56,80%	33,30%	1,20%

The participants in the focus groups affirmed this finding. In their perception, the general scepticism towards authority does not entail that the mayoralty as such has lost its authority, but rather that authority is presently lost more quickly by individual mayors than it was two decades ago. Office holders, participants felt, are nowadays under constant scrutiny by the public.

When asked how they attained authority, interview partners often described particular situations in which they acted in a certain way that was appreciated by citizens. Key concepts in these descriptions were 'interaction' and 'being present', corroborating the postulate that contemporary authority is essentially relational. The following quote gives a clear illustration:

“It is darn tricky to regain authority. If you’re not there, you don’t attain authority. You can build authority only when there is interaction. No interaction. No authority.”¹

(Mayor)

Looking at mayors’ perceptions of the relevance of the different sources of authority as expressed in the survey, the picture becomes more composite.

In the survey, mayors were asked to select the five most important sources of authority out of the fourteen specified plausible sources and to rank the five sources they had selected according their comparative relevance. Table 3 shows that Dutch mayors regard their ‘position above and between political parties’ as their most important source of authority. More than two thirds of the office holders included this principle-based authority source in their top 5, and more than 20 percent selected it as the most important source of authority. This finding not only shows that Dutch mayors place great value on their impartiality and independence, as is confirmed by other survey results (e.g., Denters, 2006), but also that they believe that it is crucial for their authority.

TABLE 3. Relevance sources of authority of Dutch mayors

	Selected for the top five	1	2	3	4	5
My position above and between political parties	66,26%	20,16%	18,11%	11,93%	7,82%	8,23%
My personal recognisability in society	62,55%	10,70%	14,81%	11,11%	16,87%	9,05%
Personal interactions	55,97%	11,52%	8,64%	13,17%	10,70%	11,93%
My personality	49,79%	15,23%	12,35%	9,05%	5,76%	7,41%
My leadership style	45,27%	8,64%	10,29%	12,76%	9,05%	4,53%
My legal powers	39,51%	6,17%	4,94%	9,05%	8,23%	11,11%
My expertise	37,04%	2,06%	6,58%	7,00%	11,11%	10,29%
My capacity to convince others	34,57%	4,12%	4,53%	8,23%	9,05%	8,64%
The way in which I execute my policies	34,16%	9,88%	4,94%	7,00%	7,82%	4,53%
My experience	31,69%	4,53%	4,94%	5,35%	6,17%	10,70%
Crown appointment	15,64%	3,70%	4,94%	1,23%	2,88%	2,88%
Council recommendation	10,70%	2,06%	2,06%	2,47%	1,23%	2,88%
The responsibilities that belong to my portfolio	8,64%	0,41%	2,06%	1,23%	2,06%	2,88%
My political party membership	4,53%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,41%	4,12%

¹ “Het is verdraaid lastig gezag te herwinnen. Als je er niet bent, bouw je dat gezag ook niet op. Het zijn de enige momenten dat je gezag opbouwt als er interactie kan zijn. Geen interactie. Geen gezag.”

Although mayors' position above and between political parties is mainly a principle-based authority source, it has important institutional characteristics: the mayor's statutory position in local government is relatively autonomous, which enables him to operate at a distance from the political goings-on. At the same time, participants in the focus groups underline the importance of mayors' personal conduct in safeguarding their impartiality. In practice, the different types of authority sources are thus interrelated (see also Avant *et al.*, 2010, p. 14).

Judging by the survey results, citizens' feeling of identification with the mayor also provides him with a substantial level of political authority since it is regarded as the second most important authority source. 'Personal interactions' completes the top three, which again corroborates the claim that contemporary authority is essentially relational.

After the mayors' impartiality, which qualifies as a principle-based authority source, capacity-based authority sources are regarded most important in relation to society. This finding is supported by the fact that two other capacity-based authority sources end up high in the ranking: personality and leadership style. The mayor's legal powers, with which authority is often equated under traditional conceptions of authority, end up only in sixth place; no more than 6,17% of mayors names these as their most important source of authority. Institutional authority is thus of limited relevance to Dutch mayors, at least in relation to society. At the same time the mayor's statutory position cannot be said to be completely irrelevant because no less than 39,51% of Dutch mayors selects their legal powers for their top five.

The comparative relevance of delegation-based authority sources is very limited. Contrary to what is commonly held (e.g., Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, 2009, p. 4), Dutch mayors did not regard the way in which they are selected for office as an important source of authority. The Crown appointment and the council recommendation are selected for the top five by only 15,64% and 10,70% of mayors respectively. This finding corroborates existing doubts about the relevance of the selection procedure for mayors' capacity to act (e.g., Svava, 1995; Schaap, Daemen & Ringeling, 2009).

Dutch mayors consider their political party membership to be the least important authority source: only 4,53% of mayors include it in their top five and then only as the third or fourth most important.

In conclusion, the principle-based authority source of the mayor's position above and between political parties and a selection of capacity-based authority sources are the most important sources of authority for Dutch mayors.

Dutch mayors' role orientations

In the survey, mayors were also asked to rank the eight specified role orientations in terms of their comparative relevance for operating as a mayor. Table 4 presents the results.

TABLE 4. Mayors' role orientation

	Average rank	Median
First citizen	2,28	2
Consensual facilitator	2,68	2
Representative	2,95	3
Advocate	4,95	5
Moral guide	5,18	5
Enforcer	5,74	6
Visionary	5,83	6
Ombudsperson	6,40	7

The results show that Dutch mayors identify most with the roles of 'first citizen, 'consensual facilitators' and 'representatives'. Ninety percent of the mayors who participated in this study selected one of these three roles as their primary role orientation. If we also include mayors' secondary role orientation this figure rises to ninety-eight percent. In contrast, the visionary role is assigned low importance (see also Denters, 2006). These answers reflect the persuasion that Dutch mayors should play a mainly non-partisan and non-political role in local governance.

With a median of five, the roles of 'advocate' and 'moral guide' form a middle category, where a sizeable minority of mayors recognized the importance of these roles, the majority did not. And although Dutch mayors have substantial formal powers in the field of public safety, mayors did also not strongly emphasise their role of enforcer, other than scholars such as Sackers (2010) fear. Further, contrary to what was expected, mayors did scarcely recognize themselves in the role of ombudsman, whereas this role is traditionally affiliated with the Dutch mayoralty (e.g., Klinkers *et al.*, 1982). The participants in the focus groups explained this by saying that an ombudsman often forms a judgement, whereas a mayor should remain impartial at all times.

5.2 Authority sources in relation to mayors' role orientations

The current section analyses the relationship between mayors' role orientation and the sources of authority they rely upon. It first looks at whether different types of mayors select different authority sources for their top 5 and then looks at how different types of mayors think about the comparative importance authority sources within their top 5. After that, the third subsection asks whether we can conclude beyond doubt that there is a relationship between mayors' role orientations and authority sources. The analysis focuses on those mayors that have selected a particular role as the number 1 role in their top 5 because this measure shows the most variation among Dutch mayors. For that reason it ignores the role of ombudsperson since no of the Dutch mayors primarily sees himself as one. This measure also implies that, even though the average score the moral guide role is lower, the moral guide is put before the advocate in the ranking, because more Dutch mayors see moral guide as their primary role orientation.

5.2.1 Selection of authority sources for the top 5

At first sight, there seems to be little variation in the selection of authority sources for the top 5. Regardless of the role orientations, mayors seem to strongly rely on the same authority sources. Principle-based and delegation-based authority sources in particular do not show much variation. When we look at each of the role orientations in Table 5, for example, between 60% and 71% of each type of mayors selects their ‘position above and between political parties’ for their top 5. In contrast, delegation-based sources of authority are selected by between only 0% and 33% of mayors in each of the subgroups.

TABLE 5. Authority sources in relation to mayors’ role orientations

		First citizen	Consensual facilitator	Representative	Moral guide	Advocate	Enforcer	Visionary
Institution based authority	Legal powers	37%	35%	41%	53%	67%	100%	0%
	Responsibilities that belong to my portfolio	7%	2%	12%	20%	0%	33%	33%
Delegation based authority	Crown appointment	17%	14%	15%	20%	0%	33%	0%
	Council recommendation	10%	12%	10%	7%	0%	33%	33%
	Political party membership	5%	2%	4%	7%	33%	0%	0%
Expertise-based authority	My expertise	37%	37%	38%	33%	33%	0%	67%
	My experience	29%	28%	43%	13%	67%	0%	33%
Principle based authority	The way I execute my policies	38%	33%	29%	33%	33%	33%	33%
	Position above and between political parties	71%	60%	66%	60%	67%	67%	67%
Capacity based authority	My leadership style	34%	63%	43%	47%	67%	67%	67%
	My personal recognisability in the local society	63%	63%	63%	67%	33%	67%	33%
	My personality	54%	51%	44%	53%	33%	33%	33%
	My capacity to convince others	34%	35%	35%	27%	67%	0%	67%
	Personal interactions	57%	61%	53%	60%	0%	33%	33%

On closer inspection, differences between mayors with different role orientations do exist. An interesting observation is that mayors with the role orientations ‘moral guide’, ‘advocate’, and ‘enforcer’ place relatively high value on legal powers. It seems that the more mayors identify

with a particular role, the less important are legal powers to those mayors. The fact that legal powers are named by Dutch mayors as the sixth important authority source out of fourteen plausible authority sources can thus be explained by the existence of a sizeable minority of mayors that have deviant role orientations.

For the other types of authority sources the variation in relation to role orientation is more complex. Still, there is variation. Institution-based authority sources, for example, show marked differences according to role orientation. Mayors who chose ‘enforcer’ or ‘advocate’ as their primary role orientation consider legal powers to be more part of their top 5 more often than other types of mayors (67%-100% as compared to 0%-35%). Expertise-based authority-sources, in turn, tend to be more important for advocates and visionaries.

Also, different types of mayors rely on different types of capacity-based authority sources. Whereas between 63 and 67 percent of the visionaries, advocates, enforcers and consensual facilitators select their leadership style for their top 5, only enforcers and consensual facilitators emphasize their personal recognisability in the local society. In contrast, advocates and visionaries emphasize their capacity to convince others besides their leadership style.

5.2.2 Comparative importance of authority sources within the top 5

Zooming in on the composition of the top 5 of mayoral authority sources in relation to role orientations, a slightly different pattern is produced. The differences can be explained by the fact that the sources of authority that mayors most often included in the top 5, were not necessarily the sources to which mayors assigned the highest rank *within* the top 5.

Table 6 lists the average importance assigned to each of the authority sources by mayors with a particular role orientation as it measured on a five point scale. For each role orientation it is also indicated whether a source ended up in the top half of the ranking (1-7 out of fourteen – dark grey) or in the bottom half (8-14 out of fourteen –light gray).

TABLE 6. Importance of authority sources within the top 5 of most important sources for each primary role orientation

		First citizen	Consensual facilitator	Represen tative	Moral guide	Advo cate	Enfo rcer	Visio nary
Institution- based authority	Legal powers	3,5	3,75	3,27	4,43	2,5	2	.
	Responsibilities that belong to my portfolio	3,4	5	4,29	2	.	4	2
Delegation- based authority	Council recommendation	3,6	2,5	2,33	5	.	2	5
	Crown appointment	2,8	2,67	2,29	3	.	1	.
	Political party membership	4,8	5	5	5	5	.	.

Expertise-based authority	My expertise	4	3,44	3,77	2,33	1	.	4
	My experience	3,77	3,43	3,55	3,5	3	.	5
Principle-based authority	The way I execute my policies	2,79	3,45	2,44	1,6	3	5	1
	Position above and between political parties	1,98	2,33	2,45	3,17	2,5	2	3
Capacity-based authority	My leadership style	2,76	2,8	3	1,8	2,5	4,5	1,5
	My personal recognisability in the local society	3	3,06	3	2,8	5	3,5	2
	My personality	2,57	1,89	2,17	2,5	2	2	3
	My capacity to convince others	3,67	3,45	3,18	4,33	4	.	3,5
	Personal interactions	2,78	3,38	3	3,8	.	5	3

Again, these results show that Dutch mayors consider capacity-based and principle-based authority sources as the most important ones, but that there are subtle variations according to the role orientation of mayors. Whereas all types of mayors rank ‘my personality’ among the most important authority sources, ‘leadership style’ is not ranked among the most important authority sources by enforcers. Instead, rather than capacity-based and principle-based authority sources, delegation-based and institution-based authority sources are most important to enforcers. This finding suggests that enforcers tend to rely more strongly on formal authority sources than on capacity-based authority sources.

Another authority source that is of interest is the Crown appointment. Although only 15,64 percent of mayors select the Crown appointment for their top 5, those who do place comparatively high value on it as a source of political authority. Except for advocates and visionaries, who have not listed the Crown appointment as a top 5 authority source, all types of mayors place it in the top half of their ranking. To enforcers it is even the most important authority source. This implies that those mayors who believe the Crown appointment grants them authority rely on it more strongly than other types of mayors. The ‘council recommendation’ produces a similar picture: while being comparatively important to enforcers, consensual facilitators and representatives it matters less to advocates, visionaries, moral guides, and first citizens.

Also of interest is the fact that moral guides and visionaries share the similarity that they both value ‘responsibilities that belong to my portfolio’ – which are granted to them by the Board of mayor and aldermen - as a comparatively important source of authority, even though it has been selected by a small minority of mayors (8,64%). This can be explained by the fact that as compared to the other mayoral roles, both these roles are to a large extent shaped by local circumstances. Moral guides and visionaries need a stronger political-administrative backing than other types of mayors (Karsten, Schaap, Hendriks, van Zuydam & Leenknecht, 2014). Also, these two types of mayors place comparatively high value on their leadership style, their

expertise and the way in which they execute their policies. It thus seems that of the seven types of mayors discussed here, visionaries and the moral guides depend most strongly on the room for manoeuvre that is granted to them and on way they personally execute mayoral leadership. In contrast, first citizens, who are the most common among Dutch mayors, rely most strongly upon their position above and between political parties, which is of a highly institutionalized nature.

5.2.3 Strength of the relationship between authority sources and mayors' role orientations

The above results suggest that although there is no close relationship between role orientations and sources of authority, some patterns can be distinguished. The question is, however, whether the differences that were revealed are big enough to conclude that a null hypothesis suggesting that there is no difference in the authority sources relied upon by different kinds of mayors should be rejected. As such, this hypothesis can be applied to both the sources that mayors select for their top and to the ranking of authority sources within the top 5.

Selection of authority sources in the top 5

Unfortunately, the population of Dutch mayors is quite small and shows relatively little variation in role orientations. Even though we obtained a response rate of 60%, this meant that some of the primary role orientations had a small N. None of the mayors selected 'ombudsman' as their primary role orientation, only nine mayors considered themselves enforcers (n=3), visionaries (n=3) or advocates (n=3), and only 15 mayors thought they were primarily moral guides. As such, we ran into trouble when conducting a Chi-square test for independence to test whether various role orientations include different sources of authority in their top 5. In our case more than 20% of the cells had an expected cell frequency of less than 5. We therefore decided to continue our analysis with only the three most important role orientations, that is the group of consensual facilitators (n=57), representatives (n=68) and first citizen' (n=94).

The results show that there is indeed a relationship between authority sources and mayors' role orientations because the Chi-square test for independence indicated that there was a significant difference between 'consensual facilitators', 'representatives', and 'first citizens' with regard to the authority source 'leadership style', $\chi^2(2, n=219)=12.30, p=.002, Cramer's V=.237$. This is a medium-sized effect. Closer inspection revealed that the differences were primarily between the consensual facilitators (63%) on the one hand and the first citizens (34%) and representatives (42.6%) on the other. Consensual facilitators included their leadership style more often in their top 5 of authority sources than the other two types of mayors. This result indicates that mayors who wish to promote positive interaction rely on their personal leadership style than other types of mayors. This calls on mayors' abilities to develop a facilitative leadership style (Greasley & Stoker, 2008). Yet, for the other authority sources no significant differences were found.

TABLE 7. Differences between consensual facilitators (n=57), representatives (n=68), and first citizens (n=94) in the selection of authority sources for their top 5.

	Consensual facilitator		Representative		First citizen		χ^2	p	
	n	%	n	%	n	%			
Institution based authority	Legal powers	20	35,1%	28	41,2%	35	37,2%	,52	,771
	Responsibilities that belong to my portfolio	1	1,8%	8	11,8%	7	7,4%	4,59	,101
Delegation based authority	Crown appointment	8	14,0%	10	14,7%	16	17,0%	,29	,864
	Council recommendation	7	12,3%	7	10,3%	9	9,6%	,28	,869
	Political party membership	1	1,8%	3	4,4%	5	5,3%	1,17	,558
Expertise-based authority	My expertise	21	36,8%	26	38,2%	35	37,2%	,03	,986
	My experience	16	28,1%	29	42,6%	27	28,7%	4,27	,118
Principle based authority	The way I execute my policies	19	33,3%	20	29,4%	36	38,3%	1,41	,494
	Position above and between political parties	34	59,6%	45	66,2%	67	71,3%	2,17	,338
Capacity based authority	My leadership style	36	63,2%	29	42,6%	32	34,0%	12,30	,002
	My personal recognisability in the local society	36	63,2%	43	63,2%	59	62,8%	,00	,998
	My personality	29	50,9%	30	44,1%	51	54,3%	1,64	,442
	My capacity to convince others	20	35,1%	24	35,3%	32	34,0%	,03	,984
	Personal interactions	35	61,4%	36	52,9%	54	57,4%	,92	,633

Comparative importance of authority sources within the top 5

Next, we compared the ranking of the sources of authority within the top 5 for each of the primary role orientations by means of a Kruskal-Wallis test. In this case, we were able to test for all primary role orientations with exception of ‘ombudsman’, which was never a primary role orientation. The Kruskal-Wallis test, however, revealed no statistical significant differences between the ranking of sources of authority within the top 5 of most important sources by mayors with different primary role orientations (see Table 8).

TABLE 8. Differences between different types of mayors in their top 5 ranking of authority sources

		X²	df	p
Institution based authority	Legal powers	9,26	5	0,099
	Responsibilities that belong to my portfolio	7,58	5	0,181
Delegation based authority	Crown appointment	2,46	4	0,652
	Council recommendation	5,49	5	0,359
	Political party membership	1,2	4	0,878
Expertise-based authority	My expertise	8,88	5	0,114
	My experience	1,98	5	0,851
Principle based authority	The way I execute my policies	10,26	6	0,114
	Position above and between political parties	3,81	6	0,702
Capacity based authority	My leadership style	9,21	6	0,162
	My personal recognisability in the local society	3,29	6	0,772
	My personality	1,85	6	0,933
	My capacity to convince others	2,54	5	0,77
	Personal interactions	5,32	5	0,378

6 Discussion

In conclusion, the previous sections have produced the following results:

- The most important authority sources for Dutch mayors are principle-based and capacity-based rather than institution-based, delegation based, or expertise-based. Their position above and between political parties is the most important authority source of all. The least important authority source for Dutch mayors is their political party membership.
- In contrast to what is commonly believed, the selection procedure is not an important source of authority for Dutch mayors.
- Dutch mayors most strongly identify with the roles of first citizen, consensual facilitator and representative. Although there is a sizeable minority of mayors with deviant role orientations, the Dutch mayoralty is a fairly homogeneous group that shows little variation in role emphasis.
- Although there is no close relationship between role orientations and sources of authority, some patterns can be distinguished. First of all, mayors who identify with a minority role assign comparatively high importance to legal powers. Second, enforcers tend to rely on delegation-based and institution-based authority sources rather than principle-based and capacity-based authority sources. Third, moral guides and visionaries rely on different authority sources than most other Dutch mayors since they place higher value on the way in which they personally execute mayoral leadership.

- The role orientation of Dutch mayors affects their reliance on leadership style as an authority source, with consensual facilitators placing higher value on leadership style than first citizens and representatives.

These results suggest that the authority of Dutch mayors is closely linked to their non-political and nonpartisan role in local governance, and that it to a large extent depends on their statutory position above and between political parties that safeguards their independence from political actors. At the same time, capacity-based authority sources are also very important for Dutch mayors. In contrast, formal authority sources such as their legal powers are of limited importance. Notably, whereas the unique Crown appointment of Dutch mayors is often believed to provide them a special kind of authority that other European mayors lack, the selection procedure is not an important source of authority for Dutch mayors at all. This result challenges the widely shared assumption that the selection procedure is an important source of authority for political leaders. Modern political authority, it seems, is capacity-based rather than institution- or delegation-based.

Since the sources of contemporary political authority remain underexplored, further research could analyse how this profile of the Dutch mayor relates to that of mayors abroad. It is plausible, for example, that a position above and between political parties is a much less important authority source for non-Dutch mayors. For them, political party membership is likely to be more important because the party significance for mayors is much higher in other European countries than it is in the Netherlands (see Fallend, Ignits & Swianiewicz, 2006, p. 254). Also, it would be relevant to see whether the direct election of mayors, as it exists in many countries other than the Netherlands, in contrast to the Crown appointment, is a source of authority (see Morrell & Hartley, 2006, p. 485). It would also be interesting to see how having more extensive legal powers affects mayoral authority because possession of a wider range of formal powers is seen to not necessarily build authority (Lowndes & Leach, 2004, p. 573) and is even seen to sometimes harm an executives' authority (Sackers, 2010).

Unfortunately, the population of Dutch mayors shows too little variation in role orientations to conduct a more comprehensive study on the relationship between role orientations and authority sources. This situation calls for further, international comparative research into this relationship. At the same time, our results already show that there is indeed such a relationship as regards leadership style. In particular, they point to the importance of adopting a facilitative leadership style when a mayor wants to act as an authoritative consensual facilitator. Our findings also indicate that the authority sources of enforcers, moral guides and visionaries are different from those of other mayors. Gaining a full understanding of modern political authority requires an understanding of whether these hypotheses find support outside and in comparison with the Netherlands.

References

- Arendt, H. (2006). *Between past and future: eight exercises in political thought*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Avant, D. D., Finnemore, M., & Sell, S. K. (2010). *Who governs the globe?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennet, W. L., & Entman, R. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Mediated politics: communication in the future of democracy*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Borraz, O., & John, P. (2004). The transformation of urban executive leadership in Western Europe. *Urban and Regional Research*, 28(1), 107-120.
- De George, R. T. (1985). *The nature and limits of authority*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- de Groot, M., Denters, S. A. H., & Klok, P.-J. (2010). Strengthening the councillor as a representative and scrutiniser: the effects of institutional change on councillors' role orientations in the Netherlands. *Local Government Studies*, 36(3), 401-423.
- Denters, B. (2006). De aanstellingswijze van de burgemeester: een Nederlandse discussie in internationaal perspectief. *Bestuurswetenschappen*, 60(3), 210-227.
- Elzinga, D. J. (2014, 17-01-2014). Burgemeester als 'pouvoir neutre' onder druk, *Binnenlands Bestuur*. Retrieved from <http://www.binnenlandsbestuur.nl/columns/2014/01/burgemeester-als-pouvoir-neutre-onder-druk.9193976.lynkx>
- Fallend, F., Ignits, G., & Swianiewicz, P. (2006). Divided loyalties? Mayors between party representation and local community interests. In H. Bäck, H. Heinelt & A. Magnier (Eds.), *The European mayor: political leaders in the changing context of local democracy* (pp. 245-270). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Felbinger, C. L. (1989). Effective Local Government Management: Role Emphases of Public Works Directors. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 19(2), 119-132.
- Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., et al. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management*, 31(1), 126-152.
- French, P. E., & Folz, D. H. (2004). Executive behavior and decision making in small US cities. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 34(1), 52-66.
- Friedrich, C. J. (1972). *Tradition and authority*. London: Pall Mall.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: principles and practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greasley, S., & Stoker, G. (2008). Mayors and urban governance: developing a facilitative leadership style. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 722-730.
- Guérin, É., & Kerrouche, É. (2008). From amateurs to professionals: The changing face of local elected representatives in Europe. *Local Government Studies*, 34(2), 179-201.
- Hajer, M. A. (2009). *Authoritative governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, R. B. (1976). *Authority: a philosophical analysis*. University: Alabama.
- Hartley, J., & Benington, J. (2011). Political leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, M. Uhl-Bien & B. Jackson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 201-212). London: Sage.
- Hay, C. (2007). *Why we hate politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Heinelt, H. (2013). Introduction: The Role Perception and Behaviour of Municipal Councillors in the Changing Context of Local Democracy. *Local Government Studies*, 39(5), 633-639.
- Hendriks, F., & Karsten, N. (2014). Theory of democratic leadership. In P. 't Hart & R. Rhodes (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of political leadership* (pp. 41-56). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hendriks, F., & Schaap, L. (2011). The Netherlands: subnational democracy and the reinvention of tradition. In J. Loughlin, F. Hendriks & A. Lidström (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of local and regional democracy in Europe* (pp. 96-119). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- John, P., & Cole, A. (1999). Political leadership in the new urban governance: Britain and France compared. *Local Government Studies*, 25(4), 98 - 115.
- Karssing, E. (2006). Burgemeesters, leiderschap en integriteit. In K. Becking & G. Rensen (Eds.), *Meesterlijk besturen: de burgemeester als leider*, . Den Haag: Sdu.
- Karsten, N., Cachet, A., & Schaap, L. (2013). The Dutch anomaly: appointed mayors; can appointed mayors cope with role changes and societal demands? *Lex Localis*, 11(2), 177 - 192.
- Karsten, N., & Jansen, T. (2013). Veranderend lokaal gezag: de gezagsbronnen van burgemeesters en wethouders verkend. *Beleid en Maatschappij*, 40(4), 378-400.
- Karsten, N., Schaap, L., Hendriks, F., van Zuydam, S., & Leenknecht, G.-J. (2014). *Majesteitelijk en magistratelijk: de Nederlandse burgemeester en de staat van het ambt*. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Karsten, N., Schaap, L., & Verheul, W. J. (2010). Stijlen van lokaal leiderschap: over burgemeesters, roloppvattingen en -verwachtingen. *Justitiële Verkenningen*, 36(3), 31-44.
- Keane, J. (2009). *The life and death of democracy*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Klinkers, L. E. M., Oosthoek, J. K., Hordijk, A., & Buwalda, H. W. J. (1982). *Burgemeesters wegen hun ambt*. Amsterdam: Kobra.
- Leach, S., & Wilson, D. (2002). Rethinking local political leadership. *Public Administration*, 80(4), 655-690.
- Lidström, A. (2007). Territorial governance in transition. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 17(4), 499-508.
- Lincoln, B. (1994). *Authority: construction and corrosion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lowndes, V., & Leach, S. (2004). Understanding local political leadership: constitutions, contexts and capabilities. *Local Government Studies*, 30(4), 557-575.
- McGraw, K. M., Timpone, R., & Bruck, G. (1993). Justifying controversial political decisions: home style in the laboratory. *Political Behaviour*, 15(3), 289-308.
- Miller, A. H. (1974). Rejoinder to "comment" by Jack Citrin: political discontent or ritualism? *American Political Science Review*, 68(3), 989-1001.
- Miller, C. (2007). Authority. In A. Marturano & J. Gosling (Eds.), *Leadership: The key concepts* (pp. 7-11). New York: Routledge.
- Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations. (2009). *Burgemeester & veiligheid*. The Hague.
- Morrell, K., & Hartley, J. (2006). A model of political leadership. *Human Relations*, 59(4), 483-504.
- Newell, C., & Ammons, D. N. (1987). Role emphases of city managers and other municipal executives. *Public Administration Review*, 246-253.
- Norris, P. (2011). *Democratic deficit: critical citizens revisited*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prins, R., Cachet, A., van der Linde, C., Tuijthof, T., & Bekkers, V. J. J. M. (2013). *Nationale wetten versus lokale besluiten: een spanningsveld voor burgemeesters*. Rotterdam.
- Sackers, H. J. B. (2010). *Herder, hoeder en handhaver: de burgemeester en het bestuurlijk sanctierecht [inaugural address]* Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Schaap, L. (2009). 'De burgemeester': Netherlands' mayoral leadership in consensual democracy and collegial policymaking? In H. Reynaert, K. Steyvers, P. Delwit & J.-B. Pilet (Eds.), *Local political leadership in Europe: town chief, city boss or loco president?* (pp. 149-169). Brugge: Nomos / Vanden Broele.
- Schaap, L., Daemen, H., & Ringeling, A. (2009). Mayors in seven European countries: Part II - performance and analysis. *Local Government Studies*, 35(2), 235-249.
- Staatscommissie Dualisme en Lokale Democratie. (2000). *Dualisme en lokale democratie: advies aan de regering*. Alphen a/d Rijn: Samson.
- Steyvers, K., Bergström, T., Bäck, H., Boogers, M., Ruano de la Fuente, J. M., & Schaap, L. (2008). From princeps to president? comparing local executive leadership transformation. *Local Government Studies*, 34(2), 131-146.

- Svara, J. H. (1987). Mayoral leadership in council-manager cities: preconditions versus preconceptions. *The Journal of Politics*, 49(1), 207-227.
- Svara, J. H. (1995). Institutional powers and mayoral leadership. *State & Local Government Review*, 71-83.
- Sweeting, D. (2003). How strong is the Mayor of London? *Policy & Politics*, 31(4), 465-478.
- Weber, M. (1964). *The theory of social and economic organization* [edited by T. Parsons]. New York: Free Press.