FROM "LEADERSHIP" TO "LEADING": POWER RELATIONS, POLYARCHY AND PROJECTS[1]

Clegg, S., Simpson, A. V., Cunha, M. P. & Rego, A. (2023). From "Leadership" to "Leading": Power Relations, Polyarchy and Projects. In O. Epitropaki, M. Larson, D. Schedlitzki, B. Carroll, & M. Bligh (Eds). *Sage Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 395-405). Sage.

INTRODUCTION

There have been very few theories of power in leadership studies; power is generally referred to only in the small sub-discipline of critical leadership studies. Surprisingly, scholarship often fails to identify the conception of the power relations embedding leadership. In principle, power can be *"over"* someone or something. It can also be power to do something ("power *to"*), where others are empowered to do things that they might not otherwise be able to do (Clegg & Haugaard, 2009). Power is also engendered when actors collaborate to exercise "power *with"* each other as a team. In leadership, however, the focus has traditionally largely been on "power *over"*, usually thought of one dimensionally in terms of an assumption that power is something someone 'has', through the control of resources, expertise, information, decisional authority, or coercive control by virtue of being a leader (Pierro, et al., 2013; Raven, 1993), rather than as a relational quality of how leading is done.

In this chapter, we discuss the coevolution of leadership and power, pivoting to a consideration of leading in a digitally enabled organizational democracy. We start by providing sense-making of past theorising, discussing the rational mode of organizing (the default mode of organizing in bureaucracies), which as first suggested by Weber, represents a mode of "power *over*". Next, we discuss this and other varieties of power, including "power *to*" and "power *with*". Power *to* is manifest

[1] Miguel Cunha is grateful to the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (UID/ECO/00124/2019, UIDB/00124/2020 and Social Sciences DataLab, PINFRA/22209/2016), POR Lisboa and POR Norte (Social Sciences DataLab, PINFRA/22209/2016). Arménio Rego is grateful to the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (UID/GES/00731/2019, UID/GES/00315/2019).

in notions of empowerment, where a leader invests followers some elements of decisional power, authority and accountability, which can be even more motivating and efficient than imposed power over. We further consider servant leadership as a way of leading through exercising power *to.* Power "*with*" is at the core of understanding leadership as a process co-created by both leaders and followers (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014), first conceived in the circular theory of power suggested a century ago by Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933).

Subsequently, in our final section, we offer sense-breaking by looking to an emerging future that is seeing growing reliance on distributed leading, mostly focused on project work aided by digital technologies, reliant on power *within* a networked system of social relations. Overall, we argue that power and leadership, leading and organizing, are intertwined – or, better, modes of organizing represent different frameworks of power in action (Clegg, 1989; Cunha et al., 2021), where power, leadership and design are related and coevolve in new organizational forms (see Table 1). Of course, the different types are not mutually exclusive, in fact they may well coexist, but different designs give more prominence to some expression of power than to others.

Table 1

How power, leadership and designs coevolve

	Leadership characterization	**Habitual designs in which each type prevails**	**Exemplars**
Power over	Leaders impose and command control through instruction, rules, mandated digital training.	Organizational hierarchies	Weber (1978)
Power to	Leaders engender commitment by empowering followers with relative autonomy, reinforced by group norms rather than central control.	Hierarchical forms with autonomous working groups	Barker (1993)
Power with	Leaders and followers coactively enact power, not as power sharing, but to increase circular power	A stakeholder orientation, worker representation on boards, workers councils, profit sharing	Follett (1941)

Power within	Emphasis placed on distributed leadership and the emergent power *within* a system of relations	Creative compartments formally democratized, expert teams, collaborative projects	Fairtlough (1994)

POWER *OVER*: LEADERSHIP AS HIERARCHICAL CONTROL

The conventional point of departure for a discussion of power and leadership is the work of Max Weber (1978), who used several concepts to discuss power relations in organizations, mainly bureaucracies. These concepts included domination, legitimacy, authority, and power, which he defined as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his or her own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests" (Weber, 1978, p. 53). In Weber's (1978) theory of bureaucracy, the focus was much more on relations of domination and power, especially the conditions that could sustain them through legitimation as authority.

Domination, when acceded to by those subject to it, is taken to be legitimate, enacted through an individual's voluntary consent to what is thus titled authority. The essence of leadership is the requirement of legitimacy. Weber described three forms of authority premised on the legitimacy of charisma, tradition, and rational legality. Of these three forms of leadership, Weber (1978) held that reliant on rational-legal power to be the most stable and efficient. Being founded on systems of rational rules that transcend individual authority, it could most easily handle succession of authority; it depended neither on the vagaries of fertility nor genetic inheritance nor on the promotion of extraordinary qualities whose extinction might lead to problems with the routinization of charisma. Charismatic leadership might be routinized based on tradition, as has happened with the heirs of the Murdoch family (Graham, 2015), the second generation of whom, in the form of Rupert Murdoch, is handing over the reins to the third generation, as well as the dynastic principle forming the basis of monarchies globally as well as of family firms. In perhaps the strangest case of the dynastic principle, the heirs of Kim il Jung in North Korea have ruled the nation since his death, fusing the dynastic principle with some precepts of communism as a tradition.

Weber recognised that, despite its benefits, the limitations of bureaucratic power included the stifling of individual autonomy, freedom, and creativity. Later writers added to its offences, rule tropism, where rules are followed for their own sake while forgetting their originally intended purpose (Merton, 1936), creating labyrinthine organizational forms (Clegg et al., 2016). These tensions arise from bureaucracy as a system of power over those subject to it. The more effective any bureaucracy is as a system of control and productivity, the more it is likely to undermine its prospects due to stifling individual autonomy, creativity, motivation, and wellbeing on the part of rule-followers (as recently discussed by Hamel & Zanini, 2020). Control mechanisms in the past sought to ensure employees observed formal policies and procedures (Tyler & Blader, 2005) put in place by an organizational hierarchy that operated as a complex dynamic command and control system. In modern organizations, power *over* employees was originally embedded in the files and the bureau of an organization, where they were written down, initially in longhand, later mechanically by typewriters and today, digitally and virtually. The bureau is increasingly enacted through technologies that seek to optimise workforce performance by monitoring, directing, evaluating, and rewarding employee behaviours through a "digitocracy" (Ballesteros, 2020) or "algocratic" system (Malhotra, 2021) leading increasingly towards a "surveillance capitalism" (Zuboff, 2019).

Simons (1995) describes four levers of control operated by managers across varied situations: systems of belief, boundaries, diagnosis, and interaction. Lewis, Brown and Sutton (2019, p. 488) note that "an over reliance on the direct control of employee behaviour only emphasises the need for employee empowerment", an observation supported by evidence. External control forced on individuals potentially diffuses responsibility, followed by decline in trust levels and subsequent performance. Despite this, payoffs from tighter control tend to be achieved more quickly, more easily and with greater certainty, at least in the short run while the "cogs" are energized with a reasonable level of (continuance) commitment. Consequently, organisations have tended to favour control over autonomy, even when the narrative suggests otherwise (i.e., an alleged autonomy is used to control). This is the

case of several platforms operating in the gig-economy (Prassl, 2018): a narrative full of terms such as "autonomy", "freedom", "entrepreneurship", "independence freelancers", "independent suppliers", and "sharing economy" often conceals an algorithmic hyper-control. Illustrative is the case of Deliveroo, accused of "creating vocabulary" to avoid calling couriers employees (e.g., "Supplier agreement review" means "Performance management/disciplinary meeting/(final) warning"; see Butler, 2017). Even when it appears otherwise, leadership as bureaucratic control is often used as a default management approach, despite its being often experienced by employees, cast as rule followers, as rigid, stifling, coercive and suffocating (Adler & Borys, 1996; Ritzer, 1993).

POWER *TO*: LEADERSHIP AS EMPOWERMENT

The literature on power recognizes at least two more basic conceptions of power than power over: "power *to*" and "power *with*". "Power to" is facilitative rather than prohibitive. Rather than being based on getting someone to do what they would otherwise not do or having them refrain from doing what they prefer to do, the concept of "power to" taps into the concept of power as a creative capacity. Facilitative "power to" as a social science conception was first elaborated in the work of Talcott Parsons (1963), who represented power as a systemic property of the political system. Parsons argued that the creation of power normally "presupposed consensus on system goals" (Haugaard, 2003, p. 90), providing a framework within which facilitative power can operate. The leadership task is to frame this consensus.

Critics of Parsons argue that although power might be positive for those aligned with collective managerial goals, as authority, for those with values and objectives that differ from the prevailing majority, power will be experienced as less legitimate (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006). That is why the leadership task is seen to be so focused on framing consensus. Where this framing is not achieved, the lack of a consensual basis of legitimate authority undermines Parsons' notion of leadership enabling power to as creative and dynamic. People are likely not to feel empowered when

they understand there are structural mechanisms at work that put some people, the leaders, in a position to empower others but only if they first accept the consensual frame that is being subtly imposed by the leadership's framing. Howcroft and Wilson (2003, p. 10) observe that one does not have power where it is given but can be taken away if the agency granted is not channelled in the frame that the leader has prepared.

In organizational terms, the classic study of giving power to people is that of Barker (1993), who details an ethnography of a transition in power relations. The transition is from a situation in which power was exercised unambiguously over employees in terms of hierarchical bureaucratic control to one empowering teams, giving them the power to self-manage. All was not what it might appear to be, however. The power of a direct supervisor over the employees was replaced by a strongly normative control embedded in the team whereby they exercised what Barker termed *concentrative control of each other*. They established and policed a system of normative controls that proved to be more binding and encompassing than the relatively remote control of supervision over them. What had previously been control by exercises of power over was replaced by their ability to exercise power to do things in ways that the team approved; however, team approval became the key control. It was not so much an overt control, premised on exercises of power of some over others; instead, it was a tacitly agreed set of normative principles premised on 'mateship' among team members who, in principle, would not let each other down. Control became increasingly rationalized in terms of these norms and their self-management as power to become a most effective and more disciplined substitute for the power over of the frontline supervisor.

The notion of servant leadership is another more recent attempt at capturing a notion of leaders giving power *to* followers. Servant leadership contradicts the assumption of leadership as top down and considers instead that leading can be simultaneously both a service *and* a guide (Van Dierendonck, 2011). Servant leadership is about people leading by exercising *responsibility*, not asserting a *right* or

claiming a *freedom* (Hutson, 2017) to act denied to others. The expression "servant leadership" was coined by Greenleaf (1970, p. 15). According to the *Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership* (initially called "The Center for Applied Ethics," founded in in 1964), servant leadership "is a philosophy and set of practices that enriches the lives of individuals, builds better organizations and ultimately creates a more just and caring world."[3] Spears (2002) studied Greenleaf's original writings and identified ten critical characteristics of servant leading: 1. listening, 2. empathy, 3. healing, 4. awareness, 5. persuasion, 6. conceptualization, 7. foresight, 8. stewardship, 9. commitment to the growth of people, 10. building community. These principles, in various forms and combinations, have been adopted as a guiding philosophy in companies including Herman Miller, ServiceMaster, Synovus Financial Corporation, Southwest Airlines, and TDIndustries (Spears, 2002).

Except for an article by Graham (1991) in the inaugural issue of *The Leadership Quarterly*, servant leadership attracted little interest from the academic community until the 2000s. Since then (mainly after the seminal work of Ehrhart, 2004), researchers have examined the conceptual underpinnings of servant leadership, developed theory, and carried out a significant number of empirical studies (e.g., Chiniara & Bentein, 2016; Donia et al., 2016; Hu & Liden, 2011; Liden et al., 2014a, 2014b; Neubert et al., 2008; Peterson et al. 2012; Sousa & van Dierendonck, 2017) and meta-analyses (e.g., Lee et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). A central feature is placing "the good of those led over the self-interest of the leader, emphasizing leader behaviours that focus on follower development, and de-emphasizing glorification of the leader" (Hale & Fields, 2007, p. 397). Leaders remain, however; albeit, somewhat reduced in hubris and power over others.

Donia et al. (2016, p. 722), argue that these ideas appear "particularly relevant in today's business world". The "interests of all stakeholders" will be taken into consideration and employees will "experience greater wellbeing, more positive attitudes, and, as they themselves adopt a serving

[3] https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/.

orientation akin to that of their leader, exhibit behaviors which are beneficial to the organization, its members, and the greater community." The leader leading as a benign and caring guide premised on the legitimacy of the service they provide is the key theme. Servant leadership suggests the notion of power being shared across an organization; however, individual leaders still lead. What is missed is the essential insight from Follett (1924): any claims to lead always imply relations of power; where these are vested in specific individuals, power *over* is implied.

POWER *WITH*: LEADERSHIP AS PARTNERSHIP

A further conception of power involves "power *with*". This conception differs from "power to" in that it involves the capability to achieve a jointly desired outcome working together with others towards the common objective. Its key conceptualisation is its system-expanding capabilities which are based in the efforts of the many joined in a common intended outcome (Reed, 2012; Zald & Lounsbury, 2010). The classic proponent of this view was Mary Parker Follett (1924; see Boje & Rosile, 2001; Carlsen et al., 2020; Melé & Rosanas, 2003). An American political scientist sometimes described as the mother of organization studies (Clegg, Pitsis & Mount, 2021), Follett was a person ahead of her time (Graham, 1995). Writing in the 1920s and 1930s, Follett (1924, 1995) saw enterprise as a social setting rather than merely an economic one. In some respects, it has been argued, there were some continuities between her arguments and those deployed much later by Foucault (Carlsen et al., 2020) as well as by Clegg (Boje & Rosile, 2001).

Follett sought to manage tensions in the perennial conflict between owners of capital (shareholders and managers employed to represent their interests) and labour (workers) by harmonising power relations, writing: "What is the central problem of social relations? It is the question of power; this is the problem of industry, of politics, of international affairs" (Follett, 1924, p. xii). Follett described genuine power not as coercive power over, but as coactive power, writing: "This kind of power, power-with, is what democracy should mean in politics or industry" (p. 187). Follett held that power cannot

be delegated by leaders within organizations as genuine power is not a "thing" that the powerful can bestow upon the powerless. Power cannot be given or seized because it is not a material possession but a social relation. Managers and workers in conflict seeking outcomes where a single side wins, producing a loss for both sides in which the whole has been depleted rather than enriched, she maintained.

Follett's (1941/2003) circular theory of power describes managers and workers, influencing one another in a complex social relational web. She espoused democratic authority in which bureaucratic institutions are replaced with networks of people analysing, producing and taking responsibility for outcomes at each stage of organizational processes. Circular power updates the facts accounted for in an evolving context, accommodating new interpretations, experiences, and insights across time; as interpretations of the realities constructed change, so do the relations inscribed in this changing reality. Follett conceptualises power as a democratic accomplishment that organizational leaders can facilitate workers in growing. Conditions allowing a single individual or group to empower others, as in "power *to*", can be just as likely to undermine empowerment (Gruber & Trickett, 1987; Simon, 1990). Empowerment can arise only through democratic participation of all on premises all can accept, all can follow, to conclusions that all can agree. At the organisational level, the objective of circular coactive "power *with"* is not power sharing but to increase power: "our task is not to learn where to place power; it is how to develop power … Genuine power can only be grown, it will slip from every arbitrary hand that grasps it" (Follett, 1941/2003, pp. xii-xiii). Authentic democracy is what grows power.

Follett's writings anticipate more contemporary discussions on empowerment (Eylon, 1998). She believed that a definitive driver of human behaviour is the desire for self-governance in directing one's own affairs, yet this desire is incompatible with collective participation necessary for realising an individual's full potential. In the view of Follett, genuine empowerment will only occur when all

parties perceive one another as equal partners. Under these conditions, individuals can contribute their unique knowledge, abilities, and experiences to the collective. Leaders should manage by seeking to be and remaining adaptive to member contributions. Management has a responsibility to orchestrate a collaborative environment that is adaptive to "the law of the situation" (Follett, 1924, p. 152); something that is incompatible with exercising power *over*, something requiring mutuality and collaborative framing in social relations.

The intention to collaborate and integrate is insufficient, in Follett's (1924) view, for the transfer of formalised power, as is the notion of 'giving' power to people. Rather, the removal of all structural impediments to the full participation of the organization's members in all activities responding to the law of the situation is the only means of achieving true democratic power. Follett (1924) wrote: "Many persons' idea of increased democracy within the cooperative movement is to democratize the organization: to have it less hierarchical than at present, to have more democratic elections, etc. This is not enough, to elect the officials and then to listen to their policy and consent. The farmers must also contribute" (p. 215). Follett's conceptualisation is not the action of authorising but rather a concerted action to build, develop and increase power through the coordination of relationships (Murrell, 1985; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

In the process of developing and increasing coactive power, Follett (1995) paid due attention to language. She argued that words such as "higher" and "lower" or "over" and "under", were unhelpful in the organizational context. They denote hierarchical relational constructs of power such as overseeing, super(ordinate)vision, subordination and so on. These words and the practices that they represent and legitimize undermine specific individual contributions by placing some in positions where their contributions may be overlooked (p. 142) – in both senses of the word. In contrast, words such as "persuade" rather than "convince" (p. 104) seek to clarify differences between management based on power *over*, opposed to what she espoused as the only beneficial mode of organizational

power, power *with*. For Follett, organizations provide the context for such coordination and expansion of people sharing power with others.

Follett's concept of growing coactive power *with* also bears a close relationship with her ideas concerning conflict, where she sees the most sustainable solutions as being those obtained by understanding and satisfying the needs of both parties. "A business should be so organized," Follett (1995, p. 76) writes, "... that full opportunity is given in any conflict, in any coming together of different desires, for the whole field of desire to be viewed". Unless power is understood as coactive, it will involve zero-sum perceptions of one party's winning depending on another party losing. Achieving power-with outcomes, however, requires all parties putting aside the expectation that "their" perspective on an issue must prevail. Instead, relationships must be understood in terms of commonality, integration, and circularity:

> "Circular behaviour is the basis of integration. If your business is so organized that you can influence a co-manager while he is influencing you, so organized that a workman has an opportunity of influencing you as you have of influencing him, if there is an interactive influence going on all the time between you, power-with may be built up" (Follett, 1995, p. 107).

Follett also further advocated the need for a free flow of information as vital to growing coactive power. Her notion of information flow goes beyond open communication by being associated with a notion of establishing respectful ongoing dialogue between all organizational members. To her credit, Follett acknowledges that her proposed dynamic approach to collective organization is not simple or easy. Rather, in correspondence with contemporary findings, she recognizes empowerment as a cyclical process (e.g., Thomas & Velthouse, 1990), where despite the challenges involved, it is the cycle itself that facilitates success within the process. Achieving coactive power requires leaders recognising empowerment as a dynamic and dialectic process in which they cease to be "leaders" per

se, in which the leader is considered a more powerful being. It is an iterative process of ongoing adaptation and adjustment between individual members, in which leadership is a collective and democratic responsibility defining the essential characteristics and functions of organizational practices and work.

To summarise, Follett differs from the power *over* response of denying the need for autonomy of power *to* in offering a rhetoric of empowerment to disguise more subtle technologies of disempowerment and control. Follett (1995) describes genuine power not as the zero-sum game of power *over* or even power *to* but as the self-developing capacity of power *with*. Leadership that is premised on being able to exercise power *over* others or that presumes it can 'give' power *to* others is premised on a fundamental flaw. As Marcus Garvey (1938) knew well from the experience of being black in a white America only oneself can free one's mind, a sentiment that Bob Marley (1979) channelled in his "Redemption Song": "Emancipate yourself from mental slavery, none but ourselves can free our minds". Only cooperative democratic self-governance can free ourselves from the 'mental slavery' entailed by normative adherence to forms of concertative control framing and constraining empowerment. Leaders have no rights to rule under these arrangements other than to be conduits of collective temporal assent, although Follett (1995, p. 222) acknowledged that power over will never be eliminated entirely:

> "What we need is some process for meeting problems. When we think we have solved a problem, well, by the very process of solving, new elements or forces come into the situation and you have a new problem on your hands to be solved. When this happens, men are often discouraged. I wonder why; it is our strength and our hope. We don't want any system that holds us enmeshed within itself".

Follett's insights concerning coactive power inform modern management approaches acknowledging stakeholder needs, the representation of workers on organizational leadership boards, codetermination, and participative management, where management consult with workers councils on decisions relating

to employee rights and status (Logue et al., 2015) and profit-sharing initiatives. Strictly speaking, no followers feature in Follet's coactive vision of power because she does not presume an a priori ascribed leader for whom there might be followers. In this respect, she is an iconoclastic voice in debates linking power and leadership, as for her, authentic power comes from sharing, not following. She assumes a leader's confidence and independence in their own power, power *within, power shared with others.*

POWER *WITHIN:* EMPOWERING LEADING (NOT LEADERS)

Looking to the future of power and leadership, as the boundaries between leaders and followers continue to blur, the focus on "the leader" in more traditional theories is becoming increasingly problematic; especially as technology, artificial intelligence and deep-learning, simplification, and automation advance. Where is 'the leader' in Apple or Google's algorithms? When skills and responsibilities are distributed and shared throughout an organization, enabled by technology, where 'leadership' as power *over* or as power given *to* others by empowerment no longer makes sense, an emphasis is placed on the process and practice of leading and not on the attributes or style of a unique person or set of persons – the "leaders". In short, *dispersed leadership theories* – theories that move leadership away from an individual person (Gordon, 2002, 2010; Konradt, 2014; Rosile et al. 2018) – see leadership as emergent and not a property of individuals. Leading as a relational process suggests that the leader–follower relationship is no longer of central importance to the study of leadership. More important, we argue, is the ability for agents to be critically reflexive about how power *within* a system of relations informs practices and how these practices relate to and impact on oneself and others (Gambrell et al., 2011; Ladkinn & Probert, 2021), which is a different take on power *within* as inner personal strength expressed through self-creation (Cunha et al., 2020).

If we shift from the reification of leadership as a noun, as something invested in a person instead to consider leading as a practice that can be distributed amongst people equally but differentially capable of guiding on specific issues, in specific directions, collectively agreed, then we can begin to appreciate

the potency of Follett's democratic thought. Researchers such as Raelin (2012) describe this as 'leaderful practice', something that, in an organization of excellence and difference, can produce a "creative compartment" (Fairtlough, 1994) in which something akin to an 'ideal speech situation' (Habermas, 1971) might flourish in a democratic organization of science and technology. The political philosopher Carole Pateman (2002) comes close to capturing the essence of this vision:

> "In a democratized firm all participants are legally responsible for their joint activities, although they may delegate some authority to managers (representatives). [...] The participants in a democratized firm are not employees. They are self-governing (autonomous) members and partners in the firm, with the rights of citizens" p. 48).

Collaborative and democratic teams – employing power *within* and from each participant rather a single leader – are being recognised as necessary for delivering projects planned to add value through a product, service, or event in a specified time in which the project will start and end. Nieto-Rodriguez (2021) argues, projects increasingly characterize both short-term performance and long-term value creation of organizations as a global phenomenon whose projected value will be $20 trillion in 2027. Projects make for more meaningful work, which to be realized, suggests Nieto-Rodriguez (2021.p. 4), requires "adopting a project driven structure and creating a collaborative and empowering culture that reaches across silos". Projects are concerned with innovation, transformation, agility, and long-term value creation achieved by flat structures, organized in projects that are culturally entrepreneurial and collaborative. In a project-based organizational world, the old habits of command and control (power *over*), or giving away a little power to enhance normative control (power *to*), will not be adequate or appropriate.

To call projects collaborative and democratic processes has a precise meaning. As Frega (2020) argues, it is important to distinguish democracy as an institutional arrangement dependent on processes of voting, decision-making and so on, from democratic processes dependent on the values, attitudes, and

activities of people. Normatively, these are underlain by three principles that have significant implications for leading in organizations. These principles are relational parity, inclusive authority, and social involvement.

A relation is asymmetric whenever external conditions impose on a given category of individuals by, for instance, specializing duties of care on a gendered basis thus bestowing comparatively higher interaction costs; hence relational parity strives to eliminate these (Frega, 2020). Inclusive authority is furthered by practices such as quality circles, lean organization and other solutions that promote a shared exercise of authority and deliberative competence. Leading becomes a shared and distributed practice. Social involvement entails fusing instrumental and expressive value. The former is efficacious; the latter entails social recognition that one is more than a cog in a machine but a valued member free to speak up and participate fully, one who is socially bonded and included in the expressive life of an organization guided by principles of tolerance, diversity, and constructive conflict resolution when differences surface. Efficaciously, members of project teams need a flexible approach to project management skills as a toolbox from which they might select or discard as they fit project issues, working adeptly with collaborators and contributors in defining scope, managing risk, monitoring progress, marshalling expertise, strategizing, managing democratically and ethically. As we shall argue next, digitally enabled organization goes some way to accommodating these various principles.

Digital instruction, premised on relational parity, inclusive authority, and social involvement, is a means of informing and securing consent to a form of leading and serving that is mutually constitutive. Typically, digitalization in the workplace is seen as an example of ‘veillance’ (Zorina et al. 2021). Could the veillance that is deployed be used not as a power tool for centralizing and hierarchizing surveillance but as a tool to instil democracy in organizations? Many people working within universities will be familiar with the digital quizzes that HR often insists we take to be informed about

policies. Organization members must consent to complete these quizzes; consent and completion ensures that the organization's norms are formally instituted as a shared practice. Explicitly constructed quizzes that strive to expunge illegitimate breaches of civil democracy at work could be devices for translating organizations into normative democracies in which distributed leading on various projects became the norm, as various types of expertise play leading roles at different moments in the evolution of projects. Typically, with such quizzes a substantial internalization of (or at least high sensitivity towards) the goals and values of those engaged in leading the organization is assumed (Levay & Waks 2009; Rhodes, 2007). The focus is on the subject's commitment being realized as a part of team and peer scrutiny and (digital) self-monitoring.

Digital self-monitoring need not only be constructed in an interest in control (Habermas, 1971); it could also be designed with an interest in fostering democratic critique of leadership autocracy embedded in organization rank and status. These presumptions and practices run counter to the notion of the organization as composed of various projects, in which democratic principles are valued, in which leadership is eschewed, and leading as a process is assumed by different expertise at different stages in the evolution of the project. The democratic principles of organizing and leading can be worked out together by employees, with the advice of expert organizational researchers best able to advise on how to frame what is wanted and to assist in devising digital frameworks defining membership, frameworks that can be subject to periodic review and updating.

CONCLUSION

Leadership and power coevolve. As organizational designs change, leadership roles, practices and expectations change with them. The move from organizational command and control to organizations as projects and employees as project managers requires different forms of power, a move from organizational leadership to leading in projects. We have discussed how leadership is evolving from hierarchical bureaucracies to fluid networks of differential but equal membership organized along the

lines of democratic parity, inclusivity and involvement. Leadership *becoming* a relational process of leading rather than a positional status of *being* a leader is a key means of breaking the conventions of the leadership literature as well as leadership practice.

Scientific research organizations, such as Fairtlough (1994) studied as 'creative compartments', provide a blueprint. As organizations become increasingly projectified in an adaptive mode, reliant on multi-scalar networks for the coordination of project activities and knowledge (Munck af Rosenschöld, 2019) there is no necessary congruence between status ascription and power. Leading projects can be conceived as process in which different people's expertise will lead different phases of the project. Organizationally, these people will be normatively constituted and constrained by local articulations of the democratic principles discussed. Leading will be permeated by open, fluid, and dynamic power networks, with leading being shaped by social relations that are democratically framed and limited. Leading will be pervasively present; leadership will be situationally shared rather than being an exalted status. One must not, however, be naïf as if power *over* was an historic relic. On the contrary: leading through exercising power *over* is an essential feature of several organizations of our digitalized world, often concealed by appealing narratives suggesting otherwise. As Prassl (2018, p. 52) stated: "Today, Taylorism is back in full swing, resurrected under the guise of the on-demand economy, with technology and algorithms providing a degree of control and oversight of which even Frederick himself could not have dreamed".

REFERENCES

Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(1), 61-89.

Ballesteros, A. (2020). Digitocracy: Ruling and being ruled. *Philosophies, 5*(2), 9. https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies5020009

Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*(3), 408-437.

Boje, D. M. & Rosile, G. A. (2001) Where's the power in empowerment? Answers from Follett and Clegg, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 37(1), 90-117.

Butler, A. (2017). Deliveroo accused of "creating vocabulary" to avoid calling couriers employees. *The Guardian*, 5 April (https://www.theguardian.com/business/2017/apr/05/deliveroo-couriers-employees-managers)

Carlsen, A., Clegg, S. R., Pitsis, T. S., & Mortensen, T. F. (2020). From ideas of power to the powering of ideas in organizations: Reflections from Follett and Foucault. *European Management Journal*, *38*(6), 829-835.

Clegg, S., Cunha, M.P. Munro, I., Rego, A. & Sousa, M.O. (2016). Kafkaesque power and bureaucracy. *Journal of Political Power, 9*(2), 157-181.

Clegg, S. R., & Haugaard, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The SAGE handbook of power*. London: Sage.

Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. Thousand Oaks: CA, Sage.

Clegg, S. R., Pitsis, T. S., & Mount, M. (2021). *Managing and organizations: An introduction to theory and practice*. London: Sage.

Chiniara, M., & Bentein, K. (2016). Linking servant leadership to individual performance: Differentiating the mediating role of autonomy, competence and relatedness need satisfaction. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 124-141.

Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.

Clegg, S., Cunha, M. P., Munro, I., Rego, A., & Sousa, M. O. (2016). Kafkaesque power and bureaucracy. *Journal of Political Power, 9*(2), 157-181.

Cunha, M.P., Clegg, S., Rego, A. & Berti, M. (2021). *Paradoxes of power and leadership*. London: Routledge.

Cunha, M. P., Rego, A., Simpson, A. V., & Clegg, S. (2020). *Positive Organizational Behaviour: A Reflective Approach*. London: Routledge.

Donia, M. B., Raja, U., Panaccio, A., & Wang, Z. (2016). Servant leadership and employee outcomes: The moderating role of subordinates' motives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(5), 722-734.

Eylon, D. (1998). Understanding empowerment and resolving its paradox: Lessons from Mary Parker Follett. *Journal of Management History*, 4(1), 16-28.

Fairtlough, G. (1994). *Creative Compartments: A Design for Future Organizations*, Amersham: Adamantine Press.

Follett, M. P. (1924). *Creative experience*. Longmans, Green, and Co.

Follett, M. P. (1941/2003) *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett: Early sociology of management and organizations.* Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Follett, M. P. (1995). Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of management. *Boston: Harvard Business School*.

Frega, R. (2020). Democratic patterns of interaction as a norm for the workplace. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, *5*(1), 27-53.

Gambrell, K. M., Matkin, G. S., & Burbach, M. E. (2011). Cultivating leadership: The need for renovating models to higher epistemic cognition. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *18*(3), 308-319.

Garvey, M. (1938). "The work that has to be done". *Black Man Magazine*, 3(10), 7-11.

Gordon, R. D. (2010). Dispersed leadership: Exploring the impact of antecedent forms of power using a communicative framework. Management communication quarterly, 24(2), 260-287.

Gordon, R. D. (2002). Conceptualizing leadership with respect to its historical–contextual antecedents to power. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *13*(2), 151-167.

Graham, D. A. (2015). A Short History of Rupert Murdoch's Heirs Apparent. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/06/history-of-rupert-murdoch-successor-intrigue/395678/.

Graham, J. W. (1991). Servant-leader in organizations: Inspirational and moral. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *2*, 105–119.

Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis: Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Gruber, J., & Trickett, E. J. (1987). Can we empower others? The paradox of empowerment in the governing of an alternative public school. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *15*(3), 353-371.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. London: Heinemann.

Hale, J. R., & Fields, D. L. (2007). Exploring servant leadership across cultures: A study of followers in Ghana and the USA. *Leadership*, *3*(4), 397-417.

Hamel, G. & Zanini, M. (2020). *Humanocracy*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

Hu, J. & Liden, R. C. (2011). Antecedents of team potency and team effectiveness: An examination of goal and process clarity and servant leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 851-862.

Haugaard, M. (2003). Reflections on seven ways of creating power. *European journal of social theory*, *6*(1), 87-113.

Howcroft, D., & Wilson, M. (2003). Participation: 'Bounded freedom'or hidden constraints on user involvement. *New Technology, Work and Employment*, *18*(1), 2-19.

Hutson, M. (2017). When power doesn't corrupt. *The New York Times*, May 21, BU11.

Konradt, U. (2014). Toward a theory of dispersed leadership in teams: Model, findings, and directions for future research. *Leadership*, *10*(3), 289-307.

Ladkin, D., & Probert, J. (2021). From sovereign to subject: Applying Foucault's conceptualization of power to leading and studying power within leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *32*(4), 101310.

Lee, A., Lyubovnikova, J., Tian, A. W., & Knight, C. (2020). Servant leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, moderation, and mediation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 93(1), 1-44.

Levay, C., C. Waks, (2009). Professions and the pursuit of transparency in healthcare: Two cases of soft autonomy. *Organization Studies,* 30(5), 509-527.

Lewis, R. L., Brown, D. A., & Sutton, N. C. (2019). Control and empowerment as an organising paradox: implications for management control systems. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(2), 483- 507.

Liden, R. C., Panaccio, A., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., & Wayne, S. (2014a). Servant leadership: Antecedents, processes, and outcomes. In D. V. Vay (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of leadership and organizations* (357-379). New York: Oxford University Press.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Liao, C., & Meuser, J. D. (2014b). Servant leadership and serving culture: Influence on individual and unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 1434–1452.

Logue, D. M., Jarvis, W. P., Clegg, S., & Hermens, A. (2015). Translating models of organization: Can the Mittelstand move from Bavaria to Geelong? *Journal of Management & Organization*, *21*(1), 17-36.

Malhotra, A. (2021). The postpandemic future of work. *Journal of Management, 47*(5), 1091-1102.

Marley, B. (1979) Redemption Song, *Uprising* (Bob Marley & the Wailers L.P.) London: Island Records.

Melé, D., & Rosanas, J. M. (2003). Power, freedom and authority in management: Mary Parker Follett's "power-with". *Philosophy of Management*, *3*(2), 35-46.

Merton, R. K. (1936). The unanticipated consequences of purposive social action. *American Sociological Review, 1*(6), 894-904.

Munck af Rosenschöld, J. (2019). Inducing institutional change through projects? Three models of projectified governance. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *21*(4), 333-344.

Murrell, K. L. (1985). The development of a theory of empowerment: Rethinking power for 91 organization development. *Organizational Development Journal*, 34, 34-38.

Neubert, M. J., Kacmar, K. M., Carlson, D. S., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2008). Regulatory focus as a mediator of the influence of initiating structure and servant leadership on employee behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1220-1233.

Nieto-Rodriguez, A. (2021) The project economy has arrived, *Harvard Business Review, 99*(6), 38-45.

Parsons, T. (1963). On the concept of political power. *Proceedings of the American philosophical society, 107*(3), 232-262.

Pateman, C. (2002). Self-ownership and property in the person: Democratization and a tale of two concepts. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 10 (1), 20–53.

Peterson, S., Galvin, B. M., & Lange, D. (2012). CEO servant leadership: Exploring executive characteristics and firm performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 65, 565–596.

Pierro, A., Raven, B. H., Amato, C., & Bélanger, J. J. (2013). Bases of social power, leadership styles, and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*(6), 1122-1134.

Prassl, J. (2018). *Humans as a service: The promise and perils of work in the gig economy*. Oxford University Press.

Raelin, J. A. (2012). Dialogue and deliberation as expressions of democratic leadership in participatory organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 25(1), 7-23.

Raven, B.H. (1993), The bases of power: Origins and recent developments. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49(4): 227-251.

Reed, M. (2012). Researching Organizational Elites: A Critical Realist Perspective. In D. Courpasson, D. Golsorkhi, and J. J. Sallaz (Eds.) *Rethinking Power in Organizations, Institutions, and Markets* (*Research in the Sociology of Organizations,* Vol. 34, pp. 21-53). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Rhodes, R.A. (2007). Understanding governance: Ten years on. *Organization Studies, 28*(8), 1243-1264.

Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization Thesis*. London: Sage.

Rosile, G. A., M Boje, D., & Claw, C. M. (2018). Ensemble leadership theory: Collectivist, relational, and heterarchical roots from indigenous contexts. *Leadership*, 14(3), 307-328.

Simon, B. L. (1990). Rethinking empowerment. *Journal of Progressive human services, 1*(1), 27-39.

Simons, R. (1995). *Levers of control*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Spears, L. C. (2002). Introduction: Tracing the past, present, and future of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Focus on leadership: Servant-leadership for the twenty-first century* (pp. 1-16). New. York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sousa, M. & van Dierendonck, D. (2017). Servant leadership and the effect of the interaction between humility, action, and hierarchical power on follower engagement. *Journal of Business Ethics, 141*(1), 13-25.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, *15*(4), 666-681.

Tyler, T. R., & Blader, S. L. (2005). Can businesses effectively regulate employee conduct? The antecedents of rule following in work settings. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*(6), 1143-1158.

Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*(1), 83-104.

Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.

Weber, M. (1922/1978). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Zald, M. N., & Lounsbury, M. (2010). The wizards of Oz: Towards an institutional approach to elites, expertise and command posts. *Organization Studies*, *31*(7), 963-996.

Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Zhang, L., Xu, S., Liu, X., & Chen, W. (2021). A meta-analytic review of the consequences of servant leadership: The moderating roles of cultural factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *38*(1), 371-400.

Zorina, A., Belanger, F., Kumar, N., and Clegg, S. R. (2021) The Web of Veillance: Enacting Visibility in the Digital Age, *Organization Science*, Articles in Advance, pp. 1–26

Zuboff, S. (2019), *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.