

## **6. Embracing social responsibilities through local leadership: comparing the experience of the mayors of Bristol and Liverpool**

Nasrul Ismail, University of Bristol, UK

### **Abstract**

This chapter analyses the extent to which the notion of social responsibility through leadership has been embraced by Bristol and Liverpool mayors, as the only elected mayors in England's core cities, operationalised through the broad framing principles of accountability, integrity, dependability, and authenticity. At the macro level, whilst the Localism Act 2011 enables the mayors to deliver authentic solutions during times of austerity, there is no sense of real devolution of powers from Whitehall, calibrated by the risk-averse provisions under the Public Sector (Social Value) Act 2012. At the meso level, the discussion pivots around the transformation of mayoral relationships with non-state actors, from co-production of the public services to co-determination of the local decision-making. At the micro level, socially responsible leadership has been theorised from the citizens' expectation viewpoint, such as paving the way, inspiring a shared vision, and challenging the *status quo*.

### **Introduction**

The concept of social responsibility in leadership has not been frequently articulated in the policy and politics debate. I argue such a concept emerges from, and entails notions of accountability (Cameron and Caza, 2005), integrity (Badaracco and Ellsworth, 1986), dependability (Meindl and Ehrlich, 1987), and authenticity (Freeman and Auster, 2011),

exercised within precise powers and boundaries, as ensured by supportive political networks and local communities.

Positioning the concept of social responsibilities in leadership back into the centre of the mainstream political debate, this chapter will evaluate the following question: To what extent have the Mayor of Bristol, George Ferguson, and the Mayor of Liverpool, Joe Anderson embraced socially responsible leadership within urban governance?

Mayor Ferguson and Mayor Anderson present a unique, dual case study on socially responsible leadership. Both Bristol and Liverpool are part of the English Core Cities forum, which comprises large second-tier English cities where for two decades, they have shared best practices in the political governance and have lobbied the national government on issues relating to economic development (Meegan *et al*, 2014). Yet, both leaders are different in their social leadership approaches. Their applications are context driven and locally contingent. As such, the comparative perspective that this chapter adds nuances how we theorise social responsibilities in leadership.

Using Hudson and Lowe's (2004) model of governance, the chapter will explore the convergence of the socially responsible leadership concept from three levels: the macro level (national level), meso level (city governance), and the micro level (city electorates). It will use several broad framing principles, such as accountability, integrity, dependability, and authenticity, to support the comparative analysis.

The chapter begins by mapping out the emergence of socially responsible leadership from the statutory framework at the macro level. It will highlight a tension in the legal structure

between, on the one hand, the Localism Act 2011 in addressing the prevailing fiscal austerity, and on the other hand, the battle against the real lack of power conferred from Whitehall and the risk-averse framework under the Public Sector (Social Value) Act 2012.

It then goes on to explore the relationship of the mayors with their political networks at the meso level, particularly with the non-state actors. Here, consideration will be given to how successful both Mayors Ferguson and Anderson have been in transforming the two-way relationship from a mere co-production of the local services to co-determination of the local decision-making with stakeholders.

In the final section, the discussion will shift towards local electorates' perception at the micro level. As such, both Mayor Ferguson and Mayor Anderson's leadership experiences will be benchmarked against the three traits of social leadership, namely paving the way, inspiring a shared vision, and challenging the *status quo* within the urban governance context.

The analysis within this chapter will draw upon publically available evidence, documents, and statements, to operationalise the public representations of the mayors from the external locus point of view. Whilst this may be viewed as a limitation of the study, it provides a fair depiction of the mayors in observing their social responsibilities in their local leadership, taking into account the distinct variations reflecting the political conditions and the individual aspirations of the mayors for their city.

## **Macro level: facing the reality of Localism**

At the macro level, social responsibility in leadership is enshrined through the statutory framework of Localism Act 2011, which devolves the central responsibilities back to the local realm in 2010, albeit bucking the trend of the UK constitutional landscape.

The government opined:

[W]e share a conviction that the days of big government are over; that centralisation and top-down control have proved a failure. We believe that the time has come to disperse power more widely in Britain today; to recognise that we will only make progress if we help people come together to make life better. In short, it is our ambition to distribute power and opportunity to people rather than hoarding authority within government (HM Government, 2010 7).

In effect, the 2011 Act codifies the notion of socially responsible leadership, whereby such a concept no longer enjoys a normative, non-binding, and soft power status. Section 1(1) of the 2011 Act mandates a ‘general power of competence’, where directly elected mayors are given more freedom to work with their political networks, to deliver creativity, authenticity, and innovation to meet local people’s needs.

The autonomy to act is key. Rather conveniently, this apparatus was established at the critical time when, following a ‘baptism of fire’, both Ferguson and Anderson faced an uphill struggle in mitigating the impact of urban austerity across Bristol and Liverpool. Consequent to the central government’s proposal of a £5.5 billion reduction in the budget for local government (HM Treasury, 2010), the budget cuts were set at £83 million in Bristol, after

accounting for greater tax revenues and changes to government funding (BBC: 2014). The cuts in Liverpool were almost double that of Bristol, where Mayor Anderson was tasked to find a further £156 million of savings by March 2018 (Liverpool Echo, 2015).

As a response, Mayors Ferguson and Anderson may exercise the mandated general power of competence by delegating the service delivery functions of the councils to the non-state actors. Section 81(1) of the same Act can be triggered by the non-state actors to acquire the right to express an interest in taking over the running of a local authority service, where the local authority must consider and respond to this challenge; and where it accepts it, and runs a procurement exercise for the service in which the challenging organisation can bid. Here, there is a movement towards co-production, which ensures greater collaboration in urban governance, claimed to become ‘a hegemonic discourse’ (Skelcher and Sullivan, 2008: 41), with the use of partnerships as the mechanism of choice when it comes to implementing most public initiatives (Turrini *et al*, 2010). Some scholars argue that integrated service delivery increases the capacity to respond to local challenges and thus should be the way forward in the local urban governance. Hambleton and Howard (2012) are even optimistic that if public services can be co-delivered by state and voluntary and community sector organisations working in partnership more effectively, there is no reason for the alliances not being able to grow the resources available to improve the quality of life in an area, even a time of fiscal austerity.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that the 2011 Act’s provisions remain too aspirational, and run the risk of being yet another political rhetoric of the Coalition government. None of these statutory provisions has been formally activated by any mayors across England, nor by non-state actors since receiving a royal assent on 15th November 2011. Perhaps they are too

ambitious for the mayors and other network actors to implement. Furthermore, along with provisions in the Cities and Local Government Devolution Act 2016 which introduces directly-elected mayors to combined local authorities in England and Wales, it can also be viewed as a tool of convenience for the Coalition to delegate the neoliberal politics of austerity, rather than a genuine apparatus that can be used by both mayors to further embrace the cause for social responsibilities and make the real differences to the local areas.

The failure of the Localism agenda in this context is two-fold. Perhaps tellingly, the over-centralised state remains deeply entrenched within the local government, without a major increase in local power for the mayors to exercise. This has, to a certain extent, hindered the implementation of localism rhetoric, not only in Bristol and Liverpool, but across the areas of urban governance. Hambleton and Sweeting (2004) once entered a caveat that whilst we seem to notice the lift and shift of the US-style local leadership and decision-making model into the UK political landscape, the central government still dictates the majority of the local decision-making. This then leaves very little room for the mayors to maneuver which resonates with the University of Liverpool's study: English directly-elected mayors still lack the taxation and spending powers to make a real difference, compared to their transatlantic friends such as New York Mayor, Bill de Blasio, where 69% of the city income is generated through the local regeneration of funding (Harding *et al*, 2013).

At the same time, the wide power for the mayors under section 1(1) of the 2011 Act is hampered by the introduction of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012, just 68 days after the 2011 Act was enacted. The 2012 Act chiefly confines the interpretation of the socio-economic impact of the local mayors' decision's impact on the matters pertaining to commissioning and procurement of local services only. Furthermore, the 2012 Act

encourages the mayors to be risk-averse, by requiring them to conduct impact assessments of their commissioning decisions on the local community. It was therefore not surprising when a survey found that 83% of English local authorities did not quantify social value within procurement practices (Dobson, 2012), which resembles lack of coherence in embodying the social value virtues under the 2012 Act, reinforcing the rhetoric of the Localism agenda at the macro level of governance.

Without a real sense of devolution of powers to the mayors, and constriction of innovation under the 2012 Act, it is impossible to see the applicability of the Localism concept as advanced under the 2011 Act in mayoral governance, especially in Bristol and Liverpool. In this respect, it is highly questionable whether the provisions under the 2011 Act, which was once seen to be capable of ‘delivering a radically different form of local governance’ (Lowndes and Pratchett, 2012, 22), can aid the mayors in embracing socially responsible leadership in their urban governance context.

### **Meso level: making the leap of faith from co-production and co-determination**

Compared to the macro level, the concept of socially responsible leadership moves more organically and arguably, more effectively at the meso level through the evolution from ‘co-production’ of local services to the ‘co-determination’ of local decision-making.

Such a movement is catalysed by the steering from Whitehall, through the visionary idea of ‘Big Society’ by central government, caricatured around social action, public sector reform, community enablement, direct financial aid from the central government to charities, and removing the roadblocks that hinder the implementation of local initiatives (Cabinet Office:

2010). Such an aspiration inevitably renews the shift in paradigm from ‘local government’ to ‘local governance’, and emerges through the reduction of the functions for local authorities, which is axiomatic of the growth of other bodies at the local level (Stoker, 1998). Here, we seem to witness the increasing trend of the voluntary and community sector organisations in acting extra-politically to deliver local services.

Mayors Ferguson and Anderson have fully embraced co-production of the public services with the non-state actors, which runs parallel to the principal-agent relationship discourse (Buse *et al*, 2012). With this model in mind, particularly during a time of prevailing austerity, partnerships inevitably have to ‘engage in difficult conversations, about what is going on in local communities, what a shared response could entail, how creativity can overcome defensiveness, and what truly collaborative city leadership might look like’ (Lowndes and Squires, 2012: 408).

Here, Bristol chooses a conventional mode of governance: co-production of local services through the pooled budgets with strategic partners and delivery of services through the voluntary and community sector organisations. In contrast, the movement in Liverpool is even bolder. Mayor Anderson established the Mayoral Development Corporation that unites partners from the private, voluntary, and other public sectors to drive growth and development in the city (Liverpool Vision: 2013), which signifies the transformation from co-production to co-determination of the local decision-making process.

Distinguishing Bristol and Liverpool mayors’ experience illuminates an underlying struggle that requires the decision-makers to embrace ‘a paradigm shift...to ensure that the non-state actors can take part in the co-determination of the decision-making process’ (Pugh, 2011:

14). At the same time, there is a question whether the non-state actors are capable of submitting themselves to the Big Society challenges. The leap of faith in question perhaps stems from what Hayman (2011) proposes: there are still doubts about whether social enterprises are capable of delivering the public services on a scale that the government wishes, which requires a change in the mindset of the mayors. Trust and confidence are key to the success of the relationship to transform from a mere co-production to co-determination, with the mayors still maintaining the chain of accountability of the local governance, as witnessed in the Liverpool context.

We also witness the emergence of the voluntary and community sector organisations as the new pathway of social consciousness by local people, to translate the individual interests into collective and public issues, whose relationship to rights is most precarious. These organisations act as a ‘sounding board’ for a specific cause that seeks to influence the public policy design and operation (Grant, 1989).

This can be seen from the analysis of the media content by the extent to which the voluntary and community sector organisations have been successful in articulating the impacts of fiscal austerity to both mayors. Based on the national and local news collection between May 2012 and December 2015, there were 39 news items in Bristol portraying the voluntary and community sector organisations representing the extent to which the financial cuts impacted their users. For example, a Bristol-based domestic abuse charity, Missing Link, launched aggressive media campaigns against the funding cut proposals on the services for homeless vulnerable women with mental health and complex health needs through local newspapers, e-petition, and Twitter (Missing Link, 2014). Overwhelmed by negative responses on the proposals, Mayor Ferguson overturned his initial decision (Missing Link, 2014), which

reflects the notion of dependability of the mayor during austerity. In contrast, there were only 21 new items in Liverpool on the same subject, with unknown visible impact of such a campaign compared to Bristol.

In this instance, the use of the voluntary and community sector organisations as the social consciousness mechanism demands the mayors be accountable towards their decisions, and in turn, equalises the bargaining power between the mayors and the local residents. It also summons them to address the strategic leadership challenge facing the locality, as well as empowers them to make tough decisions that call upon their dependability and integrity. On the other hand, this apparatus is generally a passive mechanism that must be activated by citizens; it requires a commitment of time and resources. People may feel intimidated using them unless they are widely institutionalised (Danet, 1981). They may have little interest in participating in the democratic debate, which outweighs the benefits (Osmani, 2007). Perhaps, the social consciousness concept is still at its infancy with some continual growth witnessed in Bristol and Liverpool. It will require time to see if the area develops further in the future, along with its impact on the urban governance.

### **Micro level: theorising electorate expectations**

At the micro level, it is contended that the social responsibilities in leadership arise from the local electorate expectations. Borrowing from Kouzes and Posner (2002), both Mayor Ferguson and Mayor Anderson will be benchmarked against three universal keys of social leadership traits: paving the way; inspiring a shared vision; and challenging the process. These traits indicate a thicket of good governance indicators for mayoral leadership, which

may reassure some ardent critics that there is enough evidence of the positive benefits of elected mayors on the local residents (Marsh, 2012; Fenwick, 2013).

### *Paving the way*

Paving the way refers to the expectation of the local residents that the mayors will make things happen in their cities. This can be seen from Bristol and Liverpool's regeneration plan, demonstrating their authenticity and creativity in managing the cities' resources.

For instance, recognising the financial hardship landscape in Bristol, Mayor Ferguson made a courageous decision by selling the freehold interest of the council in the docks and surrounding areas at Avonmouth, in exchange for a £10 million profit (Bristol Post: 2014b). Similarly, in Liverpool, Mayor Anderson formulated a long-term £1.5 billion regeneration plan for Kings Dock and Lime Street in the city centre, which includes an Olympic standard ice rink, an extreme sports complex, as well as restaurants and domestic properties (Liverpool Echo: 2014). Within this context, both Mayors Ferguson and Anderson have been observed to lead their areas into new, uncharted territories and make things happen in their cities through an authentic local regeneration plan, in an attempt to safeguard the cities from the brunt of financial cuts. Whilst both Mayors Ferguson and Anderson have been successful in their local regeneration plans, they have also been unsuccessful in lobbying financial support from the central government, evidenced through their failure in persuading the central government to consider the funding for a high-speed railway scheme in both cities (Liverpool Express: 2014; Bristol Post: 2014a).

Upon reflection, the unwillingness of the central government to listen to these mayors' quests for the high-speed rail is remarkably specious. Despite the political endorsement in the roles

of mayoral leadership at the macro level, the lack of courage to support these local leaders indicates the reluctance of the central government in listening to the local areas, which shows the lack of real sense of devolution of powers from Whitehall to both Bristol and Liverpool. In fact, there should be a scope for a bargain between the mayors and the central government, which requires more persuasion and mature discussion at the national level in order to sustain the longevity of the mayoral governance in the local areas. Without political support and appropriate incentives for these mayors, conducive and sufficient conditions for effective observation of socially responsible leadership are not provided at the micro level, and it will be difficult for the central government to maintain its position considering the public endorsement of the mayoral prefecture in the urban governance.

### *Inspiring a shared vision*

Inspiring a shared vision involves aligning the local residents and strategic partners to support the mayoral visions for the local areas. Hambleton and Bullock (1996: 8-9) assert that a good leader is able to express a clear vision for the area, by setting out an agenda of what the future of the area should be, by formulating a strategic policy direction, and by listening to local people and leadership.

Mayor Ferguson is seen to be more creative in engaging with the local electorates compared to his Liverpool counterpart. An interactive, two way collaborative approach between Mayor Ferguson and the local residents transpired when the former launched Ideas Lab in 2013, which generated more than 300 innovative ideas from the residents for the city (Bristol City Council: 2013b). The mayor empowered the local residents to come up with innovative ideas in the hope of informing the Mayor's Vision for Bristol, a plan that sets out his priorities to

make Bristol better for its citizens: a healthier city, with improved transport, better connected neighbourhoods, a stronger focus on education and training, more jobs and homes, more involved citizens, and more power to make decisions locally (Bristol City Council: 2013a; Bristol City Council: 2013c). Such an authentic move at the micro level is also congruent with Stoker's contextualisation of soft power in inspiring a vision, which is 'the power to get other people to share your ideas and vision via framing, influencing, bargaining and diplomacy' (Stoker, 1998: 27-8).

Mayor Anderson, on the other hand, follows the conventional top-down approach in which he formed a local regeneration plan, along with the establishment of a number of commissions to examine specific local issues, including health, education, and fairness (Liverpool City Council: 2012b).

Despite differing approaches, both of the mayors have managed to inspire a shared vision for the local area, albeit for different audiences. Both methodical approaches have proven to be fruitful when they were both nominated and shortlisted for the World Mayor Award in 2014, among 26 other mayors internationally (World Mayor, 2014a). They did not win; nevertheless, the following submissions were testimony of their public engagement and support, which entails the sense of understanding and acceptability of the local electorates towards the mayors' vision.

For Bristol's Mayor:

[George Ferguson] has really energised the city and more people are aware of and take an interest in our local democracy. As with any leader or decision maker, not

everyone agrees with everything George does but they have definitely heard of him (World Mayor, 2014b).

For Liverpool's Mayor:

Joe Anderson is an inspiration... because of his commitment to the people of Liverpool...he has time for everyone, and building of new housing, schools and supporting health provision for everyone in our City despite swingeing cuts by Government. [This] is admirable beyond belief (World Mayor, 2014c).

### *Challenging the Process*

Finally, challenging the process refers to the capability of the local mayors in challenging the *status quo* of the political archetype. Challenging the *status quo* is particularly pertinent to Mayor Ferguson, who stands in as an independent candidate, compared to Mayor Anderson who stands as a Labour party candidate. Freedom from group discipline provides 'a basis for a stronger, more proactive and individualised style of leadership than over models of local government leadership' (Leach *et al*, 2005), despite the fact that partisanship politics is a crucial characteristic of English local government (Mouritzen and Svara, 2002) and that scholars have insisted that it remain a dominant feature (Leach *et al*, 2005).

Here, Mayor Ferguson uses his independence as a strategy to convince the public that the citizens are at the heart of the decision-making process rather than implementing self-serving activities that may resemble loyalty to the governing parties, which is notably in line with the notion of integrity and accountability.

However, whilst being free from the need to form tactical coalitions to stay in power and be able to provide clear and decisive leadership, the problem also presents itself when a candidate is party-neutral. Evidenced through his struggle in forming a 'rainbow cabinet' post the mayoral election, Mayor Ferguson was met with initial rejection from the Labour party, when they refused to be part of his leadership team, by insisting that it would provide a healthy political environment as a self-elected scrutiny group (Bristol Post, 2012).

Benjamin's (1998) theory on self-identity will be operationalised to contextualise Ferguson's experience:

In trying to establish itself as an independent entity, the self must yet recognise the other as a subject like itself in order to be recognised by the other...In its encounter with the other, the self-wishes to affirm its absolute independence even though its need for the other and the other's similar wish to undercut that affirmation (1998: 32).

In this context, Mayor Ferguson has a challenge in mediating between the acceptability of his political network of his freedom from political affiliation, whilst being able to use his departure from the party line to challenge the *status quo* in the governance of urban polity, something that is not an issue to Mayor Anderson. Hambleton and Sweeting (2004) have aptly reasoned that despite being unconstrained by party discipline, Mayor Ferguson has the tasks to appeal to popular sentiment if he wishes to be re-elected. Thus, a balancing act is required to acting neutrally, which reflects the nature of integrity and to appeal to the popular sentiment.

The table below shows a comparison between Bristol and Liverpool mayors according to the broad framing principles of social responsibility in leadership of accountability, integrity, dependability, and authenticity at the macro, meso, and micro levels:

Broad framing principles of social responsibility in leadership	Mayor George Ferguson of Bristol	Mayor Joe Anderson of Liverpool
Accountability	Section 1(1) of the Localism Act 2011 gives the general power of competence to the mayors to deliver innovations to meet local needs. However, this is partly constricted by the risk-averse, formal accountability stance under the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 that requires the mayors to conduct impact assessments of their decisions on the local community.	
	Opted for a conventional model of co-production: pooling of budgets with public sector partners and commissioning of services through the voluntary and community sector organisations.	Adopted a bolder approach compared to Bristol by establishing the Mayoral Development Corporation which unites the private, voluntary, and public sector partners, shifting the paradigm from co-production to co-determination of local decision-making process.
Integrity	Pertinent to Mayor Ferguson who ran as an independent	Resembled loyalty to the affiliated party, in line with the

	<p>candidate, who threaded a delicate balance between party-neutrality and acceptability of the political network in the absence of political affiliation.</p>	<p>notion of integrity. Less scrutiny by political peers as the decision-making is expected to be broadly in line with the party visions.</p>
<p>Dependability</p>	<p>Overtaken initial decisions relating to financial cuts on critical services, such as homelessness, following the voluntary and community sector media campaigns, demonstrating dependability in leadership at critical time of austerity.</p>	<p>Undetermined impact despite being subjected to similar persuasions by partners around financial cuts, which is deemed to be to a lesser issue compared to that of Mayor Ferguson in Bristol.</p>
<p>Authenticity</p>	<p>Relinquished the freehold interest of the Bristol City Council in the docks and Avonmouth area for a £10 million return to mitigate the impact of the financial austerity.</p>	<p>Devised a long-term £1.5 billion regeneration plan for Kings Dock and Lime Street in the Liverpool City Centre, which includes an Olympic standard ice rink, an extreme sports complex, as well as restaurants and domestic properties.</p>
	<p>More creative engagement with the local residents</p>	<p>Adopted a conventional top-down approach through a local</p>

	<p>compared to Liverpool mayor by launching an interactive Idea Lab in 2013. The project generated above 300 innovative ideas from the residents, which informed the Mayor's Vision for Bristol.</p>	<p>regeneration plan and established a number of commissions pertaining to health, education, and fairness.</p>
--	--	---

## **Conclusions**

The story of socially responsible leadership is more nuanced than has been appreciated in policy and politics. Turning back to the initial question of this chapter: To what extent have both Mayor Ferguson and Mayor Anderson embraced the social responsibilities in leadership concept within their urban governance context? This chapter has demonstrated the extent to which both of the mayors have embodied the core values within responsible leadership – accountability, integrity, dependability, and authenticity – within their urban governance context, albeit different in the political trajectory, due to the context driven nature and locally contingent issues.

At the macro level, whilst the statutory framework under the Localism Act 2011 have the capability of challenging both Mayor Ferguson and Anderson to deliver authentic innovative solutions in Bristol and Liverpool during a time of austerity, there is no real sense of devolution of powers from Whitehall to these mayors. This, along with the limitations under the Public Sector (Social Value) Act 2012, have reinforced the political rhetoric of the Localism agenda of the Coalition government.

More development of the socially responsible leadership doctrine is seen at the meso level. It has been argued that Mayor Anderson in Liverpool has moved his political relationship with non-state actors from a co-production of the public services towards a co-determination of the local decision-making process, through the Mayoral Development Corporation, compared to his Bristol ally who opted for a more stereotypical mode of governance. At the micro level, the socially responsible leadership has been examined from the citizens' expectation viewpoint. First, in terms of paving the way, both Bristol and Liverpool mayors have made

things happen in their cities through the cities' regeneration plan, demonstrating their inventiveness in managing the cities' wealth. On the other hand, both of them failed in attracting the national funding for a high-speed rail for Bristol and Liverpool, respectively. Such a struggle demonstrates the lack of courageousness of the central government to listen to the local mayors, which can stem from reluctance to devolve more powers to the local areas, reinforcing political rhetoric of the Localism.

Second, Mayor Ferguson has been praised in being creative in inspiring his leadership vision by collaborating with the local electorates through the Ideas Lab, where such an initiative generated more than 300 innovative ideas from the residents for the city. In contrast, Mayor Anderson simply opted for the conventional top-down approach in uniting the local residents, businesses, voluntary and community sector organisations, and other public sector organisations in delivering his political vision in Liverpool. Despite appealing to the different segments of the electorates, both of the mayors have managed to inspire their visions for the local area, testified through their nomination for the World Mayor Award in 2014.

Finally, challenging the *status quo* within the political landscape comes naturally for Mayor Ferguson who stands in as an independent candidate, compared to Mayor Anderson who is a Labour politician. Mayor Ferguson in this context faced nearly unsurmountable challenges in balancing between managing his political network actively whilst appealing to the popular sentiment.

Leadership is an expansive activity. There have been various developments around the mayoral leadership that will either expand or diminish their powers. 'Metro Mayors' and devolution deals may be a threat to the mayoral power. This can be politically challenging for

Bristol, where the Devolution Deal of the West of England can unveil a political dynamic between the mayor and the leaders of other participating councils, such as South Gloucestershire, Bath and North East Somerset, and North Somerset (West of England Local Enterprise Partnership, 2015). Such spaces offer the potential to move the mayoral debate beyond the micro level, towards the impact of the mayoral prefecture on the institutional, societal, and global political outlook. Although social responsibility values are relational, and they may only offer partial motivating forces, both Mayor Ferguson of Bristol and Mayor Anderson of Liverpool have embraced social responsibility in their local leadership, albeit in a different trajectory, as mediated by their context and locality.

## References

- Badaracco, J. and Ellsworth, R. R. (1989) *Leadership and the quest for integrity*, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.
- BBC (2014) 'Reprieve for Bristol's public toilets in Mayor's revised budget cuts', Bristol: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-bristol-25733377>
- BBC (2015) 'Queen's Speech 2015: Metro mayors able to replace PCCs', London: BBC, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-32897288>
- Benjamin, J. (1988) *The bonds of love: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and the problem of domination*, New York: Pantheon.
- Bristol City Council (2013a) 'A vision for Bristol', Bristol: Bristol City Council, <http://www.bristol.gov.uk/page/mayor/vision-bristol>
- Bristol City Council (2013b) 'George's Ideas Lab encourages brightest and boldest Bristol innovations', Bristol: Bristol City Council, <http://www.bristol.gov.uk/press/george%E2%80%99s-ideas-lab-encourages-brightest-and-boldest-bristol-innovations>
- Bristol City Council (2013c) 'State of the city: Mayoral priorities', Bristol: Bristol City Council, [http://www.bristol.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/council\\_and\\_democracy/lord\\_mayor\\_of\\_bristol/mayoral\\_information/State%20of%20the%20City%202013-%20Mayoral%20vision%20v8.pdf](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/council_and_democracy/lord_mayor_of_bristol/mayoral_information/State%20of%20the%20City%202013-%20Mayoral%20vision%20v8.pdf)
- Bristol Post (2012) 'Labour in turmoil over decision on mayor's cabinet', Bristol: Bristol Post, <http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Labour-turmoil-decision-mayor-s-cabinet/story-17433731-detail/story.html>
- Bristol Post (2014a) 'Mayor says Bristol must not miss out on high-speed train plans', Bristol: Bristol Post, <http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Mayor-says-Bristol-miss-high-speed-train-plans/story-21280758-detail/story.html>
- Bristol Post (2014b) 'Plenty of ideas for how to spend £10m windfall from sale of freehold at Avonmouth', Bristol: Bristol Post, <http://www.bristolpost.co.uk/Plenty-ideas-spend-10m-windfall-sale-freehold/story-20859267-detail/story.html>
- Buse, K., Mays, N., and Walt, G. (2012) *Making health policy* (2nd edn), Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Cabinet Office (2010) 'Transcript of a speech by the Prime Minister on the Big Society', London: Cabinet Office, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/big-society-speech>

- Cameron, K. and Caza, A. (2005) 'Developing strategies and skills for responsible leadership', in J. P. Doh and S. A. Stumpf (eds), *Handbook on Responsible Leadership and Governance in Global Business*, Gloucester: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Danet, B. (1981) 'Client-organisation relationships', in P. C. Nystrom and W. H. Starbuck (eds), *Handbook of organisational design*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dobson, J. (2012) 'Commissioning for social value: What the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012 means in practice', York: Housing Quality Network, <http://urbanpollinators.co.uk/wp-content/plugins/downloads-manager/upload/Commissioning%20for%20social%20value.pdf>
- Fenwick, J. (2013) 'Elected mayors: Slumbering deeply', *Policy and Politics*, 41(1): 123–25.
- Freeman, E. and Auster, E. R. (2011) 'Values, authenticity, and responsible leadership', *Responsible Leadership*, 15-23.
- Grant, W. (1989) *Pressure groups, politics and democracy in Britain*, Hertfordshire: Philip Allan.
- Hambleton, R. and Bullock, S. (1996) *Revitalising local democracy – The leadership options*, London: Local Government Management Board.
- Hambleton, R. and Howard, J. (2012) *Public sector innovation and local leadership in the UK and The Netherlands*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Hambleton, R. and Sweeting, D. (2004) 'US-Style leadership for English local government?', *Public Administration Review*, 64(4): 474–88.
- Harding, A., Anderson, J., Jones, A., Le Gales, P., and Flamson, J. (2013) 'Do global cities need a mayor?', Liverpool: University of Liverpool, <http://www.liv.ac.uk/events/policy-provocations/difference-a-mayor-makes.php>
- Hayman, A. (2011) 'LCG view – social enterprises', *Local Government Chronicle*, 14.
- HM Government (2010) 'The Coalition: Our programme for government', London: HM Government, [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/78977/coalition\\_programme\\_for\\_government.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78977/coalition_programme_for_government.pdf)
- HM Treasury (2010) *Spending review 2010*, Cm 7942, London: The Stationery Office.
- Hudson, J. and Lowe, S. (2004) *Understanding the policy process: Analysing welfare policy and practice*, Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Kouzes, J.M. and Posner, B. Z. (2007) *The leadership challenge* (4th edn), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Leach, S., Hartley, J., Lowndes, V., Wilson, D., and Downe, J. (2005) *Local political leadership in England and Wales*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Liverpool City Council (2012a) 'Mayor's commissions', Liverpool: Liverpool City Council, <http://liverpool.gov.uk/mayor/mayoral-commissions/>
- Liverpool City Council (2012b) 'Mayor's priorities', Liverpool: Liverpool City Council, <http://liverpool.gov.uk/mayor/pledges/>
- Liverpool Echo (2014) 'Mayor unveils ambitious £1.5billion plans for Liverpool City Centre', Liverpool: Liverpool Echo, <http://www.liverpoolecho.co.uk/news/liverpool-news/liverpool-city-centre-15-billion-7128109>
- Liverpool Express (2014) 'Mayor's statement about high speed rail', Liverpool: Liverpool Express, <http://www.liverpoolexpress.co.uk/mayors-statement-high-speed-rail/>
- Liverpool Express (2015) 'Exclusive: Liverpool mayor Joe Anderson 'confident' of saving some of Liverpool's SureStart centres from closure', Liverpool: Liverpool Express, <http://www.liverpoolecho.co.uk/news/liverpool-news/exclusive-liverpool-mayor-joe-anderson-8668955>
- Liverpool Vision (2013) 'Liverpool Vision business plan', Liverpool: Liverpool Vision, <http://www.liverpoolvision.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Liverpool-Vision-Business-Plan-2013.pdf>
- Lowndes, V. and Pratchett, L. (2012) 'Local governance under the Coalition Government: Austerity, Localism, and the 'Big Society'', *Local Government Studies*, 38(1): 21 – 40.
- Lowndes, V. and Squires, S. (2012) 'Cuts, collaboration and creativity', *Public Money and Management*, 32(6): 401–8.
- Marsh, A. (2012) 'Is it time to put the dream of elected mayors to bed?', *Policy & Politics*, 40(4): 607–11.
- Meegan, R., Kennett, P., Jones, G., and Croft, J. (2014) 'Global economic crisis, austerity and neoliberal urban governance in England', *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 7(1): 137–53.
- Meindl, J. R. and Ehrlich, S. B. (1987) 'The romance of leadership and the evaluation of organizational performance', *Academy of Management Journal*, 30: 91–109.
- Missing Link (2014) 'A successful campaign – women-only services protected', Bristol: Missing Link, <http://www.missinglinkhousing.co.uk/missinglink/news/a-successful-campaign-women-only-services-protected/>
- Mouritzen, P. E. and Svava, J. (2002) *Leadership at the apex: Politicians and administrators in Western local government*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Osmani, S. R. (2007) *Participatory governance: An overview of the issues and evidence in participatory governance and the millennium development goals*, New York: United Nations.
- Pugh, P. (2011) 'It's just the state of the third sector', *Local Government Chronicle*, 14.
- Skelcher, C. and Sullivan, H. (2008) 'Theory-driven approaches to analysing collaborative performance', *Public Management Review*, 10(6): 751–71.
- Stoker, G. (1998) 'Governance as theory: Five propositions', *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155): 17–28.
- Turrini, A. D., Cristofoli, F., Frosini, F., and Nasi, G. (2010) 'Networking literature about determinants of network effectiveness', *Public Administration*, 88: 528–50.
- West of England Local Enterprise Partnership (2015) 'West of England proposes ambitious devolution deal worth £2bn to economy', Bristol: West of England Local Enterprise Partnership, <http://www.westofenglandlep.co.uk/news/ambitious-devolution-deal>
- World Mayor (2014a) 'World Mayor 2014: The 26 finalists', London: World Mayor, [http://www.worldmayor.com/contest\\_2014/shortlist-2014.html](http://www.worldmayor.com/contest_2014/shortlist-2014.html)
- World Mayor (2014b) 'Testimonials for George Ferguson, Mayor of Bristol, UK', London: World Mayor, [http://www.worldmayor.com/contest\\_2014/bristol-mayor-ferguson.html](http://www.worldmayor.com/contest_2014/bristol-mayor-ferguson.html)
- World Mayor (2014c) 'Testimonials for Joe Anderson, Mayor of Liverpool, UK', London: World Mayor, [http://www.worldmayor.com/contest\\_2014/liverpool-mayor-anderson.html](http://www.worldmayor.com/contest_2014/liverpool-mayor-anderson.html)