

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Leadership for public value: Political astuteness as a conceptual link

Journal Item

How to cite:

Hartley, Jean; Sancino, Alessandro; Bennister, Mark and Resodihardjo, Sandra L. (2019). Leadership for public value: Political astuteness as a conceptual link. *Public Administration*, 97(2) pp. 239–249.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2019 John Wiley Sons Ltd



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

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/padm.12597>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Leadership for public value:

Political astuteness as a conceptual link

Jean Hartley¹, Alessandro Sancino¹, Mark Bennister², Sandra L. Resodihardjo³

¹ The Open University, UK

² University of Lincoln, UK

³ Radboud University, Netherlands.

Accepted for publication in *Public Administration* (4*)

To be cited as:

Hartley, J., Sancino, A., Bennister, M., Resodihardjo, S.L. (forthcoming) 'Leadership for Public Value – Political Astuteness as a Conceptual Link', *Public Administration*. DOI: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/padm.12597>

Abstract

Both leadership and public value are increasingly seen as concepts highly relevant to public administration, not only because of complex societal challenges but also as ways to address pluralistic interests in society. This article explores the varied conceptualisations of public value and of public leadership in detail. Furthermore, we argue that political astuteness provides an important conceptual linkage between leadership and public value, enabling actors to read, understand and foster coalitions around diverse and sometimes competing interests. In this introduction to the symposium, we analyse the different conceptualisations of public value, of leadership, and also show how the six articles explicitly or implicitly draw on the linking concept of political astuteness. The article assesses how the six articles of the symposium contribute to each of these three concepts.

1. Introduction

Profound societal, political and institutional changes driven by rapid technological and economic transformation are pushing scholars and practitioners of public administration to address new, complex, urgent and often wicked challenges (Head and Alford 2015). Public leadership has been advocated as a key element in addressing these challenges, potentially discerning, shaping, nurturing and facilitating public value (Bennister 2016; 't Hart 2014; Pedersen and Hartley 2008). Emerging ideas about 'polycentric', 'pluricentric' or decentred governance, based on interdependence, negotiation and trust have been welcome approaches in the field (see Bevir 2011; Sørensen and Torfing 2016) and contribute to the sense that it is timely to be examining the concepts of public value and of leadership.

With this particular context in mind – and with the call to expand our conceptual, empirical and place-based understanding of the role of public leadership – we, as editors, took the opportunity to reflect on the contemporary role of public leadership in the recognition, creation or destruction of public value. The 2017 PUPOL¹ (Public and Political Leadership Network) international conference brought together scholars to focus directly on that theme and this symposium represents the fruits of that exercise.

In this special issue, we reflect on key conceptual and empirical developments in the fields of public value and public leadership to set the scene for the symposium. We show how these two concepts are and can be linked. This introduction also brings in a third concept – political astuteness (that is, a set of capabilities also known as political awareness, 'nous' or political savvy) – as a way to connect public value and public leadership. This is because both public value and public leadership are premised on multiple and sometimes competing interests among stakeholders. Understanding and acting upon these varied interests is, we argue, part of a set of core capabilities that help public leaders to create public value. In this introduction to the symposium, we show how the symposium's contributors explicitly or implicitly refer

¹ The Public and Political Leadership (PUPOL) is an international academic network of over 100 scholars interested in and working on leadership in Public Administration & Management, Organization Studies, Political Science, Non-Profit Management & Civil Society Studies. More information is available at <https://www.pupolnetwork.com>

to the importance of political astuteness underlying public leadership and the creation of public value.

Each article in this symposium presents a particular case study, adding new perspectives to the field from a range of countries and, significantly, addressing a wide variety of societal challenges. The cases vary: from algorithmic challenges to public authorities; knowledge mobilisation for a congestion charge zone in Milan; soft meta-governance as leadership with the Bristol social enterprise; informal relationships between government officials and civil society organisation practitioners; addressing policy tensions about working with indigenous communities; and contest and conflict about policing. Together, they reveal how multiple actors and forms of public leadership can and do step forward or emerge to facilitate public value creation.

In this introduction to the symposium, the varied and common conceptual approaches to public value and leadership inherent in the articles are explored. In doing so, it became evident that public administration/management has entered an era of complex societal challenges in which multiple actors cooperate or compete together (co-governance) to create (or deplete) public value. Furthermore, we found that political astuteness formed an important conceptual linkage across the articles – either implicitly or explicitly.

The articles in this symposium take forward the understanding of public value in several ways. First, they add to the empirical research base about public value theory. This base has been surprisingly lacking, despite the philosophical, theoretical and policy interest in the concept (Hartley et al. 2017). The rich, empirical case studies here demonstrate how public value can illuminate a wide range of contexts and raise new and interesting questions. Second, this symposium highlights that public value theory can be deployed to analyse complex, contested issues, not only in organizations but also across dynamic networks and groups jostling for attention within society. Third, the articles show that ‘publics’ are varied and furthermore that contention, dispute, debate and dialogue shape public value and how leaders try to construct public value. Thus, leadership can be consensual, but also importantly it can be contestable. Lastly, the articles show the importance of certain capabilities (falling under the heading of political astuteness) for leaders when attempting to create public value.

2. Public Value

Public value theory is the outcome being analysed as well as the conceptual starting point and the common thread of the symposium. It is therefore helpful to set out some of the key strands in public value theory, while considering both the concept itself, and its constituent components of ‘public’ and ‘value’. Table 1, below, summarises the perspectives on public value theory taken by four key authors who have influenced the development of subsequent research and thinking.

The concept of public value was initiated by Moore (1995) in a seminal work which grappled with how to theorise and assess the public equivalent of private sector shareholder value. This required conceptualising not only what happened inside organizational boundaries, but outside them, in terms of outcomes which are seen as valuable to society. An offshoot of the original work utilises the strategic triangle as a tool for public managers to use.

Benington (2011, 2015) extended thinking about public value by theorising two dimensions of public value, and, crucially, setting this in the context of the public sphere. He argued that the creation of public value is a contested democratic practice (Benington 2015). He drew on the work of Habermas (1962) and others to define the public sphere as a democratic space that includes the “web of values, places, organizations, rules, knowledge, and other cultural resources held in common by people through their everyday commitments and behaviours and held in trust by government and public institutions” (Benington 2011, p. 43). The public sphere “provides a society with some sense of belonging, meaning, purpose and continuity, and which enables people to thrive and strive amid uncertainty” (Benington 2011, p. 43).

Bozeman (2007) and Meynhardt (2009) also conceptualised what is public value and how it is created in and for society, but these approaches are generally seen as originating from a different starting point than either Moore and Benington (who have themselves collaborated on public value theory and practice (Benington and Moore 2011)). Table 1 includes all four authors for completeness, but interestingly only the first two are deployed in the symposium articles.

Table 1 about here

Turning to the symposium articles, they show the diversity of thinking about public value, and they also illustrate an exciting variety of purposes to which public value theory and its

constituent frameworks can be put. They range from articles which deploy Moore's strategic triangle (Ayres 2018; Brown and Head 2018); use both Moore and Benington (Andrews 2018); use Benington (Hartley et al. 2018; Teasdale and Dey 2019) and one article which is less definite about its approach to public value, but which assumes that endeavours by public servants and civil society actors can create public value by reducing air pollution (Trivellato et al. 2018). These articles move the field forward, heeding the call of Hartley et al. (2017) for scholars to be clear about which strand of public value theory they are drawing on.

The symposium authors utilize public value in a variety of intellectual ways. Andrews (2018) uses Moore's analytical framework to diagnose actions taken by UK government to be 'governance-ready' for new wicked challenges. The use of public value helps to show where gaps exist in the regulatory and democratic approach to big data and algorithms and these provide clues about how the approach could be modified to benefit society. Ayres (2018) uses Moore's strategic triangle to interrogate how soft meta-governance (broadly, face-to-face relational leadership) is enacted by the leadership of a social enterprise interacting within a network of state, private and voluntary organizations. The use of the strategic triangle framework enables Ayres to disentangle strategic processes of considerable complexity over time. Brown and Head (2018) also deploy Moore's strategic triangle but use it to both analyse and evaluate how far public managers (the original set of actors in public value theory) are able to achieve new policy goals, when earlier institutional logics (Reay and Hinings 2009) are still in play. In both of these cases, public value is a theoretical tool applied to understand a complex and wicked societal challenge. Hartley et al. (2018) draw on Benington (2011) to focus on public value as the tension between what is valued by members of the public and what adds value to the public sphere. They test how far this approach to public value illuminates theory in relation to the role of the police in not only providing a service, but also working across a leadership constellation (Denis et al. 2001), where there are contested views among different stakeholders about what value is and how it could be created. Teasdale and Dey (2019), drawing on Benington (2015), frame public value as a contested democratic practice which changes over time and can be altered through debate, showing that there might be an ongoing tension between the public value constructed and argued for by different civil society groups, and the political objectives of government. Trivellato et al. (2018) deploy public value as the desirable outcome of complex leadership and knowledge mobilisation processes.

Just as public value is deployed in different ways by the different articles, so the concept of the 'public' varies in these articles. Andrews' (2018) article has a strong sense of different stakeholders with different interests in big data (private companies, public services, citizens), with the role of the state in upholding important values for democratic societies. Ayres (2018) also deconstructs the varied interests of different stakeholders, not only across but also within sectors, and exposes a sense of a real struggle for the soul of the social enterprise which is the focal organization in the case study. Her reference to a tipping point recognises the dynamic nature of different interests – and also different societal values (for example democratic legitimacy vs. flexibility). Brown and Head (2018) largely seem to hold the view that there is a public interest (singular) though they do note that public value can be contested by different stakeholders. Teasdale and Dey (2019) use a Foucauldian governmentality perspective with the example of neoliberal governing through social enterprises to highlight how political philosophies and governmental technologies can foster a more sustainable public space. For Trivellato et al. (2018) there are also multiple interests which require particular leadership skills involving orchestration, mediation and negotiation. Hartley et al. (2018) present not only multiple stakeholders (who have interests, whether private or public), but also multiple publics. In their study of rural crime, different publics urged different solutions and leadership was exercised by a range of groups not only the police. Consequently, the police leadership had to bring people together to listen and to talk in the public sphere, before a degree of public value consensus could be reached. The article also examines who is excluded from the public sphere, so the assumption that contest and conflict necessarily give way to collaboration is inaccurate.

3. Leadership for Public Value

What is the role of leadership in creating or destroying public value? There is a growing literature on public leadership (e.g. Chapman et al. 2016; Crosby and Bryson 2018; Hartley 2018; Orr and Bennett 2017; Ospina 2017; Tummers and Knies 2016). However, few contributions explicitly link leadership with public value other than Benington and Turbitt (2007), Hartley (2018) and Morse (2010). This is somewhat surprising given the growth of academic and policy interest over the last two decades in each of the concepts of public leadership and public value. Therefore, this symposium provides an important opportunity to explore the varied relationships between leadership and public value, in both theoretical and

empirical terms. This is timely, as public leadership scholars have developed a distinctive approach to leadership which recognizes the importance of public context and purpose. Concurrently, political science has been re-assessing the salience of leadership in political processes (Bennister et al. 2017). It is also timely in that the concept of public value is now a more established concept, particularly in public management and administration studies. To bring both concepts together is an important contribution to the two literatures and to their inter-relationships.

The focus in the articles here is not only on leaders (within and outside public organizations) but also on leadership, taken here to be a set of relational processes of influence, mobilization and direction among different actors, groups, organizations and networks. These relational processes are embedded within society, shaped by context and circumstance. A focus on leadership as a set of relational processes (Uhl-Bien et al. 2007) suggests that leadership for public value is thus not only about personal skills but involves influence between actors and groups.

This symposium highlights that leadership for public value can be exhibited by citizens and social groups (Brown and Head 2018; Hartley et al. 2018), social enterprises, charities, and civil society organizations (Ayres 2018; Teasdale and Dey 2019), and also by private corporations (Andrews 2018) as well as by public organizations. Public leadership is not only about leadership from within public organizations but is about leadership which impacts on the public (Hartley 2018). Alford (2016), among others, points out that ‘public’ is best defined by who benefits rather than solely by who contributes. The public value literature has also emphasised multi-actor influence – away from a focus solely on those employed by the state (Bryson et al. 2017; Sancino et al. 2018).

Where leadership occurs is a matter of significance and the location can influence public value. Leadership processes may happen in informal spaces (Ayres 2018; Brown and Head 2018; Hartley et al. 2018); in liminal spaces across organisations (Trivellato et al. 2018); in symbolic spaces of loss and displacement of public value (Hartley et al. 2018); in hidden spaces “where public managers and civil society practitioners deviate from official mandates” (Teasdale and Dey 2019); and in grappling with public and private issues about big data and technological algorithms (Andrews et al. 2018).

Leadership for public value raises the question of what leadership is aiming to bring about. Somewhat surprisingly, there is less literature about the purposes of leadership than might be

expected (Kempster et al. 2011). In this respect, a focus on leadership for public value shows a relentless interest in strategic goals and value being achieved, not solely social processes. Consequently, collaboration and partnership might be a means not an end in many situations. Leadership for public value also involves engaging in implicit or explicit decision making about what has public value, who is included and who is excluded (Ayres 2018; Hartley et al. 2018; Teasdale and Dey 2019). Leadership for public value is also involved in establishing how decisions are made (Andrews 2018) and how to change practices and ways of working (Brown and Head 2018). Leadership for public value can be based on command and control or it can be based on participation and collaboration, or some hybrid, and it may entail contestation and even conflict as much as collaboration, because there are different interests, goals and aspirations among varied stakeholders.

Finally, this symposium does not assume that leadership is necessarily benign or that public value is always created. Some leadership may negatively affect or deplete public value. Some situations call for leadership, but different actors are impervious to mobilization attempts or indeed may actively oppose such efforts. Leadership in these symposium articles often involves a continual struggle over how public value might be created, enhanced and subsequently sustained, in the context of other interests. Such impediments may be the interests represented by traditional public administration (Brown and Head 2018); criminals and potential vigilantes (Hartley et al. 2018); political and economic interests to build an ideal model of citizenship and enterprise (Teasdale and Dey 2019); different views about how to achieve congestion charging (Trivellato et al. 2018); how to manage big data in the public interest and not solely private corporation capture (Andrews 2018) or degrees of support, indifference or hostility to a social innovation (Ayres 2018). This highlights that contest and conflict are often endemic, and sometimes even beneficial, to the exercise of public leadership.

Thus, the symposium sheds a light on the informal politics (in the sense of addressing diverse interests) and on the politics of public value creation as a contested democratic practice (Benington, 2011). Some articles (Ayres 2018; Brown and Head 2018; Hartley et al. 2018) illustrate that there can be multiple publics with diverse and competing values, interests and expectations (Busoic and Lodge 2017). This brings to the fore the challenge of how to lead for public value in situations where there are diverse interests and contested views, values and aspirations.

4. Political Astuteness

We suggest, on the basis of this symposium and other literature, that actors are aided in their public leadership roles to create public value by having certain capabilities which together are conceptualised as political astuteness. Political astuteness enhances value creation through improving the capability of actors to understand, manage, and coordinate various of the interests at stake. Though political astuteness is only referred to explicitly in two of the articles in this symposium, the importance of this concept is implied and illustrated in the other articles, where authors sketch out some leadership qualities for public value creation. There is, therefore, an argument to be made that political astuteness is an important missing ingredient linking leadership and public value in many contexts.

Astuteness can be understood as being concerned with discernment, and is often associated with being clever, keen, ingenious or shrewd. Being astute is “having or showing an ability to accurately assess situations or people and turn this to one’s advantage” (Oxford English Dictionary). So where does politics fit in? For a long while, politics was seen as either an illegitimate or dysfunctional activity in both general management theory and in public administration (Hartley et al. 2015; Alford et al. 2017). But that situation is rapidly changing, with a greater recognition of the potentially constructive role of politics in management (Buchanan 2008; Vigoda-Gadot and Drory 2017), including in public management/administration (Baddeley and James, 1987; Hartley 2017). Leadership with political astuteness (also known as political savvy, nous, having political antennae) has been defined as “deploying political skills in situations involving diverse and sometimes competing interests and stakeholders, in order to achieve sufficient alignment of interests and/or consent in order to achieve outcomes” (Hartley et al. 2013, p. 24).

Politics has been a strand in organization and management theory from its early history (March and Simon 1958). They argued that rationality in decision-making only takes place under very constrained circumstances, and that most decisions contain a political angle. However, these insights were confined to the background for an extended period as Taylorism and its progeny gained dominance in management theory, such that politics was seen to be the antithesis of technical, fair and rational management. The eschewing of politics was seen as particularly necessary for public servants who additionally were expected to

avoid the domain of politics, in the famous ‘politics-administration dichotomy’ (Svara 2001), with its mythic idea of a clear line between politicians and public servants.

The problem was that these attempts to push politics to the margins of the work of managers, public or otherwise, were not successful, as is now recognised. Furthermore, politics and political astuteness are being rediscovered as sometimes having a constructive role in and between organizations. As theorists came to view organizations, partnerships and networks in pluralist ways, with diverse and sometimes competing interests and goals, then social processes (including leadership) had to grapple with that complexity (Vangen and Huxham 2011).

The increasingly polycentric nature of governance, in a shared-power world (Crosby and Bryson 2005) also means that informal, not only formal, politics is woven through the texture of governance, management and workplace relations. Jim Bulpitt’s (1983, 1986) statecraft theory is particularly relevant here, whereby statecraft is a basic focus on the art of governing and practical politics. More contemporary, decentred analysis of the nature of governance has seen a revision of Bulpitt’s approach, as it identifies context-dependent regularities, in for instance centre-periphery arrangements (Ayres et al. 2018) and the influence and scope of ‘creative’ agency in governance (James 2016).

Empirical research has found that managers use politics for constructive organizational and social purposes (e.g. Buchanan 2008; Perrewé et al. 2007; Primomo and Björling 2013), including creating and discerning public value (Hartley et al. 2015). Public managers often have to cross the line so that the politics/administration dichotomy is not a line but a zone in some contexts (Svara 2001; Alford et al. 2017). Public managers say they are more effective in working with elected/appointed politicians when they are politically astute (e.g. Manzie and Hartley 2013; Alford et al. 2017; Svara 2001; Primomo and Björling 2013).

These cognitive, affective and behavioural qualities go well beyond skill to include judgement and knowledge, so the language of capabilities is more suitable, though skill is sometimes a useful shorthand to describe capabilities. The capabilities include judgement (Hartley 2017) and the work of Vickers (1995) is relevant here as is that of Rhodes (2015) who discusses political nous as a form of judgement. The capabilities of political astuteness are deployed in different ways in different contexts and with different interests to mobilise and provide direction through leadership. So, what does this symposium add to our theorising about political astuteness and what further research agenda is suggested by these articles?

Ayres (2018) and Hartley et al. (2018) are the two articles which draw explicitly on the concept of political astuteness. They both utilise the model of political astuteness of Hartley et al. (2015) with its five inter-linked dimensions of capability, from personal skills through interpersonal skills, reading people and situations, building alignment and alliances, through to strategic direction and scanning. They both analyse politically astute leadership in informal political arenas by actors who are not formal politicians. In the Ayres case, this is by a social enterprise and in the Hartley et al. case this is by a public service. In both cases, leadership is exercised by a range of actors, movements and organizations, with divergent interests.

Recognising the constructive social and organizational purposes of political astuteness, Ayres argues that soft or face-to-face metagoverning draws on political astuteness to help navigate spaces where multiple interests are at play, within and across sectors. Particularly important, in her case study, is the reading of people and situations, so that the activists group at the centre of the case study are aware of their own interactions and the need to foster trust so that they are not seen to be aligned too much – but neither aligned too little – with influential state institutions.

Ayres (2018) introduces the idea of a tipping point between flexibility and democratic legitimacy which she claims is only navigated through acute political astuteness. This addresses a key issue at the heart of political astuteness – the extent to which political astuteness reflects and works within proper organizational procedures and the extent to which outcomes are achieved through flexible, but sometimes illegitimate (or perceived to be illegitimate) means. The tipping point (see also James 2016) captures this, sometimes fine, balancing act between legitimacy and illegitimacy; transparency and obscurity, even secrecy.

Hartley et al. (2018) draw on the five dimensional framework of political astuteness in examining police leadership. The police had to take account of many and varied stakeholders, some exercising their own leadership, such that leadership by the police could not solely concern themselves with upholding the law and prosecuting law-breakers. It required not only effective personal and interpersonal skills to build trust, demonstrate active listening and linking action to discussion, but also careful reading of the people and the situations the police and the rural communities had created and whether and when to co-produce with rural communities. Without political astuteness, leadership of a complex and contested situation could have moved to an informal group of disaffected rural residents, so the police acted with integrity and political astuteness to re-assert influence and calm the situation down. This involved building alignment and alliances, while keeping a sense of strategic direction. This

is not cosy collaboration, but rather involved some tough decisions about which stakeholders to include and which to exclude. It involved thinking through the potential public value outcomes so that other pressures on police time and resources did not overtake the needs of the rural communities.

Interestingly, the other symposium articles do not explicitly address political astuteness but their work implies such capabilities in some ways. For example, Brown and Head (2018), in analysing the public value created or constrained in the enactment of new approaches to engagement with aboriginal communities, note that coproducing public value involves understanding the different actors, sectors and logics in the policy space and the conflict and ambiguities this creates. Navigating such conflicts and ambiguities requires, they argue, new approaches to training public managers so that they can engage effectively with such challenges. What is this if not a call for programmes to develop political astuteness capabilities, including as they do, ‘reading’ different interests? For Teasdale and Dey (2019), civil society organization practitioners have to be politically astute to read the contexts and situations and to deviate or mimic behaviours depending on the positions (intended here both in terms of values and power) of government officials. Trivellato et al. (2018) discuss the role of the orchestrator in complex and contested change. This type of leadership has to consider stakeholder interests and be able to imagine and enact decisions which reflect and perhaps balance different interests. Andrews (2018) examines the conflicting aspirations of state and market in relation to big data and algorithms. There is a strong sense in this article of the sometimes divergent and sometimes aligned interests of private firms, the state and citizens. Andrews makes a clear argument for greater attention to be paid by state actors to analysing these interests and then taking action to protect public value. Andrews did not make the explicit case, but his analysis can be extended by implication to arguing for political astuteness skills to read the contexts and the interests of each company, each organization and each sector if public value is to be protected.

This symposium also sheds a light on the links between political astuteness and discourses and narratives. Political astuteness may help leaders to position themselves in a debate or in the framing of a problem or in the key leadership role of sense-making (Bennister et al. 2017; ‘t Hart 2014). Political astuteness may be valuable, for example, to ascertain who is monopolizing the debate and whether that is problematic (Andrews 2018); to ensure that the language in policy documents is congruent with policy vision (Brown and Head 2018); to ensure that actions, language and cultural symbols are congruent with service plans (Hartley

et al. 2018); to build support for an initiative through consistent messaging (Ayres 2018); and to connect to an existing discourse (Teasdale and Dey 2019).

However, while political astuteness as a concept and as a framework of capabilities is valuable in showing the links between leadership and public value, there is a danger that it is used as a post hoc concept in case studies. It may be useful to explain actions, but can it be used to predict? Do others beyond the case study authors recognise political astuteness? What evidence is sufficient to frame leadership as being politically astute?

5. Conclusions

Our review and characterisation of the symposium articles initially focused on the twin concepts of public leadership and public value, and their relationship. Public value theory proved to be particularly useful to understand public management and public administration in an era of complex and wicked societal challenges with multiple actors exercising leadership in ways which was associated with public value creation and/or destruction. The articles reveal many publics, many values and many interests. Part of the growing development of the literature about public leadership is its recognition of plural rather than singular interests in the exercise of leadership. Importantly the articles hone in on the value of creative agents in their reading of context, driving change and seeking solutions across divergent interests to societal problems. Similarly, while there may be some situations where public value can be measured in a consensual way, in many situations that value to the public and to the public sphere may be contested among and across stakeholder groups in society.

The articles singly and together shed light on the multiple actors and forms of public leadership and on the politics of leadership for public value, both in terms of informal and formal aspects of politics – the workplace or social arena as much as formal political systems. Political astuteness, we argue, is the conceptual link to understand leadership capability for public value.

In terms of research methodologies, examining societal challenges as units of analysis and recognising the often subjective, affective and symbolic dimensions of public value as well as the multi-actor nature of modern governance and management is valuable. This symposium illustrates the contribution of interpretative approaches to public administration (e.g. Bevir 2011) and calls for transdisciplinary and more co-produced research between academics,

practitioners and other stakeholders (Richardson, Durose and Perry 2018; Benington and Hartley 2004).

In terms of practice, while we have highlighted the conceptual link of political astuteness between leadership and public value, this introduction does not address the ethical issues of public value, leadership and political astuteness. Yet ethics is important to consider as research attempts to uncover more about whether, when, how and why political astuteness helps actors in public leadership roles to create public value.

References

- Alford, J. (2016). Co-production, interdependence and publicness: Extending public service-dominant logic. *Public Management Review*, 18(5), 673-691.
- Alford J., Hartley J., Yates S., & Hughes O. (2017). Into the purple zone: Deconstructing the politics/administration dichotomy. *American Review of Public Administration*, 47(7), 752-763.
- Andrews L. (2018). Public administration, public leadership and the construction of public value in the age of the algorithm and 'big data'. *Public Administration*, 1-15. Accepted Author Manuscript. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12534>
- Ayres, S. (2018). How can network leaders promote public value through soft metagovernance? *Public Administration*, 1-17. Accepted Author Manuscript. doi:10.1111/padm.12555
- Ayres, S., Flinders, M., & Sandford M. (2018) Territory, power and statecraft: understanding English devolution, *Regional Studies*, 52(6), 853-864.
- Baddeley, S., & James, K. (1987). Owl, fox, donkey or sheep: Political skills for managers. *Management Education and Development*, 18(1), 3-19.
- Benington, J. (2011). From private choice to public value? In J. Benington & M. Moore (Eds.), *Public value: Theory and practice* (pp. 3151). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Benington, J. (2015). Public value as a contested democratic practice. In J. M. Bryson, B. C. Crosby, & L. Bloomberg (Eds.), *Creating public value in practice: Advancing the common good in a multi-sector, shared-power, no-one-wholly-in-charge world* (pp. 29-48). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group.
- Benington J, & Hartley J (2004). Co-research: insider/outsider teams for organizational research. In C., Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *An essential guide to qualitative research methods in organizations* (pp. 361-371). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

- Benington, J., & Moore, M. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Public value: Theory and practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Benington, J., & Turbitt, I. (2007). Policing the Drumcree demonstrations in Northern Ireland: Testing leadership theory in practice. *Leadership*, 3(4), 371–395.
- Bennister, M. (2016). Editorial: New approaches to political leadership. *Politics and Governance*, 4(2), 1-4.
- Bennister, M., Worthy, B., & 't Hart, P. (Eds.) (2017). *The leadership capital index: New perspectives on political leadership*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bevir, M. (2011). Public administration as storytelling. *Public Administration*, 89(1), 183-195.
- Bozeman, B. (2007). *Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Brown, P.R., & Head, B.W. (2018). Navigating tensions in co-production: A missing link in leadership for public value. *Public Administration*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12394>
- Bryson, J., Sancino, A., Benington, J., & Sørensen, E. (2017). Towards a multi-actor theory of public value co-creation. *Public Management Review*, 19(5), 640-654.
- Buchanan, D. A. (2008). You stab my back, I'll stab yours: Management experience and perceptions of organization political behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 19(1), 49-64.
- Bulpitt, J., (1983) *Territory and power in the United Kingdom: An interpretation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bulpitt, J., (1986) The discipline of the new democracy: Mrs Thatcher's domestic statecraft. *Political Studies*, 34(1), 19-39.
- Busuioc M., & Lodge, M. (2017). Reputation and accountability relationships: Managing accountability expectations through reputation. *Public Administration Review*, 17(1), 91-100.
- Chapman, C., Getha-Taylor, H., Holmes, M. H., Jacobson, W. S., Morse, R. S., & Sowa, J. E. (2016). How public service leadership is studied: An examination of a quarter century of scholarship. *Public Administration*, 94(1), 111-128.
- Crosby, B., & Bryson, J. (2005). *Leadership for the Common Good*. New York: Wiley.
- Crosby, B., & Bryson, J. (2018) Why leadership of public leadership research matters: and what to do about it. *Public Management Review*, 20(9), 1265-1286.
- Denis, J-L, Lamothe, L., & Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44 (4), 809-837.

- Habermas, J. (1962, trans 1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hartley, J. (2017). Politics and political astuteness in leadership. In J. Storey, J. Hartley, J.-L. Denis, P. 't Hart, & D. Ulrich (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to leadership* (pp.197-208). New York: Routledge.
- Hartley, J. (2018). Ten propositions about public leadership. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 14 (4), 202-217.
- Hartley, J., Alford, J., Hughes, O., & Yates, S. (2013). *Leading with political astuteness: A study of public managers in Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom*. Australia and New Zealand School of Government and the Chartered Management Institute, UK.
- Hartley, J., Alford, J., Hughes, O., & Yates, S. (2015). Public value and political astuteness in the work of public managers: The art of the possible. *Public Administration*, 93(1), 195-211.
- Hartley, J., Alford, J., Knies, E., & Douglas, S. (2017). Towards an empirical research agenda for public value theory. *Public Management Review*, 19(5), 670-685.
- Hartley, J., Parker, S., & Beashel, J. (2018). Leading and recognizing public value. *Public Administration*. Accepted Author Manuscript. doi:10.1111/padm.12563
- Head, B., & Alford, J. (2015). Wicked problems: Implications for public policy and management. *Administration & Society*, 47(6), 711-739.
- James, T. (2016). 'Neo-statecraft theory, historical institutionalism and institutional change. *Government and Opposition*, 51(1), 84-110.
- Kempster, S., Jackson, B., & Conroy, M. (2011). Leadership as purpose: Exploring the role of purpose in leadership practice. *Leadership*, 7(3), 317-334.
- March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Manzie, S., & Hartley, J. (2013). *Dancing on Ice: Leadership with political astuteness by senior public servants in the UK*. Milton Keynes: Open University
- Meynhardt, T. (2009). Public value inside: What is public value creation? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 32(3-4), 192-219.
- Moore, M.H. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M.H. (2013). *Recognizing public value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morse, R. S. (2010). Integrative public leadership: Catalyzing collaboration to create public value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 231-245.
- Orr, K., & Bennett, M. (2017). Relational leadership, storytelling, and narratives: Practices of local government chief executives. *Public Administration Review*, 77(4), 515-527.

- Ospina, S. M. (2017). Collective leadership and context in public administration: Bridging public leadership research and leadership studies. *Public Administration Review*, 77(2), 275-287.
- Pedersen, D., & Hartley, J. (2008). The changing context of public leadership and management: Implications for roles and dynamics. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 21(4), 327-339.
- Perrewé P.L., Ferris G.R., Stoner, J.S., & Brouer, R.L. (2007). The positive role of political skill in organizations. In D.L. Nelson & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Positive organizational behavior* (pp. 117-128). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Primomo, J., & Björling, E.A. (2013). Changes in political astuteness following nurse legislative day. *Policy, Politics, & Nursing Practice*, 14(2), 97-108.
- Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization Studies*, 30(6), 629–652.
- Richardson, L., Durose, C., & Perry, B. (2019). Moving towards hybridity in causal explanation: The example of citizen participation. *Social Policy & Administration*, 53(2), 265-278.
- Rhodes, R (2015) Recovering the 'craft' ... of public administration in network governance. *Public Administration Today*, 41, Jan-Mar. 42-45.
- Sancino, A., Rees, J., & Schindele, I. (2018). Cross-sector collaboration for public value co-creation: a critical analysis. In M. Stout (Ed.), *From austerity to abundance? Creative Approaches to Coordinating the Common Good* (pp. 59-73). Bradford: Emerald.
- Sørensen E and Torfing J (2016) *Theories of Democratic Network Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Svara, J.H. (2001). The myth of the dichotomy: Complementarity of politics and administration in the past and future of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61(2), 176-183.
- 't Hart, P. (2014). *Understanding public leadership*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Teasdale, S., & Dey, P. (2019). Neoliberal governing through social enterprise: Exploring the neglected roles of deviance and ignorance in public value creation. *Public Administration*, Accepted Author Manuscript <https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12588>
- Trivellato, B., Mariani, L., Martini, M., & Cavenago, D. (2018). Leading knowledge mobilization for public value: The case of the congestion charge zone (Area C) in Milan. *Public Administration*, Accepted Author Manuscript. doi:10.1111/padm.12559

- Tummers, L., & Knies, E. (2016). Measuring public leadership: Developing scales for four key public leadership roles. *Public Administration*, 94(2), 433-451.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The leadership quarterly*, 18(4), 298-318.
- Vangen, S., & Huxham, C. (2011). The tangled web: Unraveling the principle of common goals in collaborations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(4), 731-760.
- Vickers G (1995). *The art of judgement*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., & Drory, A. (2017). *Handbook of Organizational Politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Table 1 – Key strands in public value theory

Key perspectives on public value theory	Moore	Benington	Bozeman	Meynhardt
Illustrative publications	1995; 2013	2011; 2015	2007	2009
Public Value	<p>The activities which add value, created by public managers through public organizations</p> <p>The strategic triangle as a tool to help managers discern and create public value</p>	Public value as a contested democratic practice consisting of two dimensions: what the public value and what adds value to the public sphere	Public values in the plural (normative consensus about key values in society).	Public value is valuing relationships between a subject (individual, group) and an unknowable social entity.
Public	Multiple stakeholders including citizens, taxpayers and users of services.	Multiple publics	An entity broadly equivalent to a society	Individual understanding of the collective (the common good)
Value	Outcomes which are seen as valuable to society	What is valued by the public and what adds value to the public sphere	The range of values which are held to be important for a functioning society; normative values, based on rights and obligations in society.	Value is based on individual psychological needs