

Strategic Leadership Communication for Crisis Network Coordination

Author Details:

Catrin Johansson
Mid Sweden University

Emelie Bäck
Mid Sweden University

Corresponding Author:
Catrin.Johansson@miun.se

Acknowledgments:

This paper relates to a research project funded by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (Grant No. Dnr 2014-825) led by Catrin Johansson at Mid Sweden University, DEMICOM · CORE, Department of Media and Communication, Sundsvall, Sweden.

Biographical Details:

Catrin Johansson is professor in organizational communication at Mid Sweden University. Her research interests are related to communication, discourse, leadership, organizational change and crisis management.

Emelie Bäck is lecturer in strategic communication at Mid Sweden University.

Strategic Leadership Communication for Crisis Network Coordination

Catrin Johansson and Emelie Bäck

Mid Sweden University

Abstract

In large-scale societal crises, organizations involved in saving lives and protecting the public need to collaborate and coordinate their crisis communication in order to minimize damage and increase resilience. This study analyzed strategic leadership communication fostering such coordination in a network consisting of 24 members representing a variety of authorities, organizations and units established during a large forest fire in Sweden. As the crisis unfolded over a two-week period, ten network meetings were observed and audio recorded. Discourse analysis was employed to analyze network leaders' and members' communication during the meetings. Findings illustrate that leadership communication strategies that fostered networked coordination of organizations' crisis communication differ in significant ways from leadership communication in non-crisis and team contexts. Salient leadership communication strategies of directing/structuring and encouraging/facilitating were employed during crisis network meetings and functioned to coordinate involved organizations' crisis communication efforts during time pressure. The study contributes with new knowledge of strategic leadership communication for crisis network coordination, which is important to crisis management and can be used in crisis preparation to enhance resilience.

Keywords: strategic leadership communication, discursive leadership strategies, network leadership, crisis management, resilience

During crises, strategic leadership communication is important for establishing and sustaining crisis networks comprised of rescue organizations and authorities that need to coordinate and communicate information to evacuate and protect the public. Networking and network leadership has been targeted as one of the priorities for future research that can further develop an enhanced crisis management capacity ('t Hart & Sundelius, 2013). Research illustrates the challenges of networking during crises (Kapucu, 2006; Kapucu, Arslan and Demiroz, 2010; Kapucu, Bryer, et al., 2010; Nolte et al., 2012), and that poor networking can produce antagonistic forms of disaster and crisis response (Adkins, 2010). Studies however are limited in the sense that they do not address how strategic leadership communication functions during a crisis to establish and sustain collaboration in crisis networks and contribute to enhance resilience (Longstaff & Yang 2008). Rather, network coordination is analyzed post crisis (Adkins, 2010; Curtis, 2016), and structural characteristics and relationships of networks are focused (Kapucu & Hu, 2014).

Strategic communication is important to crisis management for several purposes: (a) supporting communication in the response network, (b) monitoring stakeholder needs, and c) communicating with citizens and news media (Hyvärinen & Vos, 2015). Crisis communication professionals participating in crisis networks highlight key success factors of crisis networks such as well functioning communication (in terms of e.g., information sharing, understanding, continuous communication) and coordination (e.g., of messages and communication efforts as well as avoiding duplication of work) within the networks (Johansson, Jendel & Ottestig, 2013). Strategic leadership communication is imperative to organizing of such networks, and can contribute to increase disaster resilience, i.e. the adaptive capacity to identify, mobilize, and stabilize response resources as a disaster unfolds (Paton, 2006). A review illustrated that research on crisis communication of public authorities and governmental organizations responsible for preparing for and managing societal crises in

order to save lives and increase resilience have to date not received much attention (Olsson, 2014). Crisis communication researchers have largely focused on response strategies of organizations such as framing, image restoration and situational crisis communication (Coombs, 2016; Ha & Boynton, 2014). Hence, crisis leadership is reduced to managing the image of the organization during crisis (Littlefield & Quenette, 2007, DuBrin, 2013).

Accordingly, researchers advocate the analysis of communicative behavior of multi-organizational networks as well as strategic leadership communication for network coordination during crises (Adkins, 2010; Johansson, et al., 2013). In addition, research that provides guidance and practical advice to crisis communicators to effectively manage crisis communication in order to positively impact society is advocated (Ulmer, 2012).

Against this background, the purpose of this study is to analyze strategic leadership communication in a network of crisis communicators representing different public authorities during a large-scale societal crisis. Sweden's largest forest fire in 40 years, during August 2014, is an example of such a large-scale disaster involving a large number of organizations that needed to collaborate on crisis management, and presented a rare occasion to study leadership in a network during a crisis situation. Theory on discursive leadership strategies (Wodak, Kwon & Clarke, 2011) is used to analyze how strategies are employed and what role they have for network leadership.

The study makes four contributions to current strategic communication theory and research. First, by focusing on strategic leadership communication for crisis network coordination during crises, this study expands strategic communication into a new field, which adds to previous crisis communication research focusing on image restoration and situational crisis communication (Coombs, 2016; Ha & Boynton, 2014). Second, by investigating how strategic leadership communication practices contribute to establishing and sustaining a network during a crisis, we add to research on crisis networks relying on post

crisis data (Curtis, 2016; Doerfel, et al., 2013). Third, the findings demonstrate that strategic leadership communication during a crisis situation, in this case a forest fire, differ in significant ways from non-crisis and team contexts (Wodak, Kwon & Clarke, 2011). Fourth, practical implications for strategic leadership communication can be used in preparation for crisis network coordination, which can enhance crisis management capacity and contribute to increased resilience.

The next sections of the paper will review literature on networks and interorganizational collaboration, and introduce the theoretical framework of leadership communication and discursive leadership strategies. The following section presents the methodology. Results are presented and discussed, and the paper is concluded by a section on practical implications of the findings.

Networking to Achieve a Common Goal

Communication networks are “relations among various types of actors that illustrate the ways in which messages are transmitted, exchanged, or interpreted” (Shumate & Contractor, 2014, p. 449). Networks differ from groups or teams in that they have no “natural” boundaries (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011). Network organizations are created when there is a need for relationships (or dependencies) and coalition building between organizations, for example partnerships and strategic alliances to pursue common goals (Van Dyke & McCommon, 2010). They are often organized around one central organization, and form a structure where a number of organizations participate (Monge & Contractor, 2001).

In this study, the concept of network is used to signify the loosely structured association of crisis communicators representing public authorities and governmental organizations who participated in network meetings and coordinated their crisis communication during the forest fire. This network is a kind of network organization or

interorganizational collaboration (Cooper & Shumate, 2012), which has a need for exchange and knowledge sharing to address a problem outside the sphere of isolated organizations.

The network organization forms a kind of super-organization whose primary function is to connect organizations and coordinate activities to joint benefits (Müller-Seitz, 2012). In the network organization, knowledge, objectives, resources, personnel and economy can be shared. When the need for the network disappears, the network starts dissolving. Networks in this respect somewhat resemble multi-team-systems (MTS), i.e. two or more teams that interface directly and independently in response to environmental contingencies toward the accomplishment of collective goals, for example in disaster response (Shuffler, Jiménez-Rodríguez, & Kramer, 2015).

Researching Crisis Communication Networks

Researchers traditionally employ social network analysis to describe how networks are structured and what roles participants have. Central concepts like centrality and density of networks are used to describe network characteristics, and researchers illustrate the relations and mutual influence between units (Knoke & Yang, 2008; Monge & Contractor, 2001, Shumate & Contractor, 2014). Communication researchers examined the structure and networking patterns emerging from self-organizing networks (Atouba & Shumate, 2010), the contextual embeddedness and dynamic restructuring of networks (Cooper & Shumate, 2012), as well as the interorganizational relationships in a civil society network, and their role in contributing social capital (Sommerfeldt, 2013, Sommerfeldt & Kent, 2015).

Similarly, studies of interorganizational crisis networks address network coordination (Adkins, 2010; Curtis, 2016) and focus on descriptions of structural characteristics and relationships of such networks (Kapucu & Hu, 2014). The challenges of networking during crises are demonstrated by several studies (Kapucu, 2006; Kapucu, Arslan and Demiroz, 2010; Kapucu, Bryer, et al., 2010; Nolte et al., 2012). Previous studies have not addressed

how strategic leadership communication functions to establish and sustain collaboration in crisis networks.

Leadership Communication in Networks

Leadership in networked collaboration is different from traditional leadership in organizations or teams, since participants in networks are not bound by any hierarchical order or formal chain of command (Waugh & Streib, 2006). A theoretical model of leadership in cross-sector collaborations comprises initial conditions, processes and practices, structure and governance, as well as contingencies and constraints (Crosby and Bryson, 2010). Typically, business networks and their structural dimensions such as forms and functions have been studied (Saz-Carranza & Ospina, 2011) rather than participants' actual communication practices of leadership, networking and collaboration. A review of leadership in interorganizational networks conclude that it is "essential" for researchers "to contribute further to the current understanding of how leadership is made to happen" (Müller-Seitz, 2012, p. 440).

Compared to leadership in teams, network leaders do neither have positional power nor common resources to rely on, and thus cannot organize network members' work without considering that they have multiple motivations and objectives, both regarding their home organization and the network (Zaccaro, Rittman, & Marks, 2001). Leadership in networks thus resemble leadership in MTS, multi-team systems operating during disaster response, where the role of leadership is critical and challenging since efforts above individual and team levels, spanning the boundaries of multiple organizations, are involved (DeChurch et al., 2011). We adhere to the definition of leadership of a network to be "the direction of the activities of a network /.../ in which this role is commonly perceived and accepted by the other participants" (Müller-Seitz, 2012, p. 430).

Strategic leadership communication in networks consisting of organizations collaborating for a common purpose involves directing and coordinating the activities of network participants. The overall coordinating function of a network has previously been theorized by Wood and Gray (1991) who discussed four types of influences used by the coordinator: legitimizing, facilitating, authorizing, and persuasion. Leaders' communication strategies were evaluated in a study exploring four knowledge network initiatives (Eglene, Dawes & Schneider, 2007). None of these leaders relied on an authoritative strategy involving influencing power to increase participation, since they did not have a formal superior role in the networks. They could have used more directive and forceful communication strategies, but chose to show good reasons for building the network rather than attempting to impose ideas without motivating participants. In another study of three crisis communication networks, the leading and coordinating roles were difficult to distinguish since the networks did not have any formal status or defined mission. Participants said a majority of network members contributed to drive the network forward and that decisions were made in collaboration (Johansson et al., 2013).

Crisis leadership research has largely ignored the coordinating and organizing function of leadership communication but rather focused on leader's personality traits and behavior which influence their ability to deal with and get subordinates through organizational crises by being charismatic and pragmatic, manage emotions and information vacuums and develop confidence and trust (DuBrin, 2013, Littlefield & Quenette, 2007).

Theoretical framework: Leadership communication and discursive leadership strategies

Leadership is enacted in communication, as numerous studies in organizational settings have illustrated over the years (Barge & Hirokawa, 1989; Fairhurst & Connaughton, 2014). Meta-analyses show that communication is ultimately a key aspect of leadership

effectiveness (Morgeson, DeRue, & Karam, 2010). Leaders' communication competence is related to organizational performance and embraces communication behaviors of structuring, facilitating, relating and representing (Johansson, Miller & Hamrin, 2014). These leader communication behaviors include for example setting goals and expectations, coaching and training, conflict management, problem solving and networking; and have been studied as dyadic relationships between leaders/managers and employees, and related to teams or units. According to Johansson et al., the quality and timeliness of these communicative behaviors lead employees, managers, and outsiders to judge leaders as 'effective' or 'ineffective'. Importantly, these sets of leader communication behaviors are related to outcomes such as role clarity, commitment, and effective internal group operating processes and overall organizational performance. However, we lack an understanding of leaders' communicative behaviors in networks, since most studies focus on organizations and teams.

Leadership communication is strategic when targeted to fulfill team and organizational objectives, for example implementing organizational strategy, vision, and mission (Fairhurst, 1993; Johansson, 2003), organizational change (Lewis, 2011) and coordinating geographically distributed units (Connaughton, Shuffler, & Goodwin, 2011).

Empirical studies analyzing leadership practices during meetings and talks illustrates that leadership is accomplished in discourse, which shapes leadership roles and identities (Baxter, 2014; Van De Mierop and Schnurr, 2014; Wilson, 2013). Accordingly, researchers have been able to trace how leadership, organizing and inter-organizational collaboration emerges and is enacted by participant actors through discourse as a social process developing over time (Hardy, Lawrence & Grant, 2005). Discourse is a term referring to language in use, that is talk and texts, and the practices of their production, dissemination, and reception, that brings an object into being (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). Discourse studies covers a broad class of approaches focusing on the constitutive effects of language and reflexive interpretive

analysis aimed at deciphering the role of discourse in a socially constructed reality (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2014; Schiffrin, Tannen & Hamilton, 2003).

A discursive approach to collaboration ‘highlights the ways in which language constructs organizational reality, rather than simply reflects it’ (Hardy et al., 2005: p. 60). Collaboration is produced through conversations, and creates a common identity important to effective collaboration, which is characterized by the balancing of divergent concerns and produces innovative and synergistic solutions for the involved organizations. Specifically, how network leadership is shaped and developed in discourse has not previously been studied empirically, thus, employing a discursive approach to the study of how network leadership is shaped and developed in discourse would illuminate specific network leadership practices during collaboration.

Discursive Leadership Strategies

Discursive leadership is a concept aimed at investigating how leadership is accomplished in discourse (Fairhurst, 2007) and highlights the co-construction of communication and interaction by involved leadership actors, leaders and co-workers as well as the importance of the different contexts surrounding leadership communication (Hamrin, 2016). Discursive leadership strategies have previously been studied in meeting discourse by Wodak, Kwon and Clarke (2011). They identified five discursive leadership strategies, employed by a chief executive officer in a multinational defense corporation for the purpose of building consensus and driving decision-making. The empirical study of Wodak, Kwon and Clarke illustrates how a leader can influence the outcome of a meeting in both positive and negative ways, through the choice of five discursive strategies of (1) Bonding; (2) Encouraging; (3) Directing; (4) Modulating; and (5) Re/Committing. Wodak, Kwon and Clarke conclude that in order to achieve a durable consensus, an egalitarian leadership style is preferred instead of a more hierarchical authoritarian style. The five strategies found in the

meetings do not appear specifically tied to the business context, but rather general as some of them seem closely related to the more general central communicative leadership behaviors of structuring, facilitating, interacting and representing theoretically developed by Johansson et al. (2014).

The first strategy of *bonding* serves the discursive construction of group identity that supports motivation to reach consensus and a decision; for example, by using the personal pronoun ‘we’ instead of ‘I’ (Wodak et al., 2011: p. 603). This strategy is related to the general communicative leadership behavior of ‘relating’ (Johansson et al., 2014), as it shapes the relationships between leadership actors. The second strategy of *encouraging* stimulates the participation of other speakers to explore new ideas or summarize existing knowledge through, for example, soliciting opinions via open questions, and/or requests for reports, advice and knowledge. This discursive strategy is related to the leadership communication behavior of shaping openness and supportiveness by ‘relational dynamics’ (Johansson et al., 2014). The third strategy of *directing* is conceptualized by Wodak, Kwon and Clarke as the opposite of encouraging. Here the purpose is to bring the discussion towards closure and resolution by reducing the number and eventual equivocality of ideas, by for example explicitly challenging or criticizing ideas through closed questions, interruptions, and declarations. Here the chair forwards her or his perspective without inviting to discussion or dialogue, and may block others’ summaries, reformulations or frame shifts through shifting the topic. The directing strategy is one form of general communicative ‘structuring’, another central communication behavior of leaders (Johansson, et al., 2014). The fourth strategy of *modulating* is used to regulate the perception of external threats, or institutional imperatives to act, often through appeals to common knowledge, for example by commenting on threats in order to intensify or mitigate the perception of danger and of action/inaction (Wodak, et al., 2011). Finally, the fifth strategy of *re/committing* entails moving the attention from a

consensual understanding of the issue towards a commitment to address it, thus taking the decision to make a step forward, for example through promises or by reminding others of their formal organizational or personal responsibilities. The strategy entails a shift to a value-laden discourse, which is oriented towards the future (Wodak, et al., 2011). This could also be interpreted as a form of communicative ‘structuring’ behavior (cf. Johansson et al., 2014).

Although the context of leadership in network meetings during a crisis is different from leadership in business meetings, the purpose of the crisis communication network meetings was similarly to get input from participants concerning perceptions of the external threat (encouraging, modulating), coordinate crisis communication efforts (directing, re-committing), and establish relationships (bonding). Considering the discursive strategies seem rather general and not particularly tied to the business context, we expected this theoretical framework to be fruitful also for our purpose of studying network leadership.

Research questions

The purpose of this study is to analyze strategic leadership communication in a network of crisis communicators representing different public authorities during a large-scale societal crisis. We focus on how the crisis communication network was led and communicative actions coordinated, by studying discursive leadership strategies in network meetings. Hence, we pose two research questions:

- 1) What discursive leadership strategies are employed during the network meetings?
- 2) What role do different discursive leadership strategies have for network leadership, as it emerged during the network meetings?

Method

The Swedish forest fire in 2014 is an example of a large-scale disaster involving a large number of organizations that needed to collaborate on crisis management, and presented

a rare occasion to study leadership in a crisis communication network during a crisis situation. The forest fire became a national concern due to the magnitude of the natural disaster. The fire that spread over 14,000 hectares and involved close to 2,000 organized and non-organized personnel, created extreme challenges for rescue organizations and authorities which needed to coordinate and communicate information to evacuate and protect the public.

Crisis management was led by the Västmanland County Administrative Boardⁱ, and supported by The Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency (MSB)ⁱⁱ, the national authority that supports and coordinates crisis management and crisis communication across and between sectors and areas of responsibility. During a crisis, MSB initiates networks for collaboration on crisis communication. Several networks exist within fields such as natural disasters, CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear) events, animal- and human contagion, transport and infrastructure and IT. During an event, these networks can be rapidly activated and collaborate on meeting the information needs of the public.

Forest fires are included in the network area of natural disasters, but there was no pre-established network in this case, since the forest fire in Västmanland was a sudden and unexpected local event that quickly developed into a broad societal crisis spanning several local municipalities and affecting a vast geographical area. MSB supported coordination of the establishment of a crisis communication network active during the crisis. The network was characterized as ‘ad hoc’, established by 24 local and national authorities that participated to varying extents depending on their involvement in the crisis (see Appendix 1).

During the forest fire, the crisis communication network collaborated on crisis communication using telephone conferences led by two alternating experienced network coordinators from MSB. The meetings followed a structured agenda involving roll call, reports from all participants concerning information needs of the public and crisis communication activities to provide a common overview of the situation, and actions needed.

Network participants were given access to a common digital platform, where a Questions and Answers (Q&A) database was produced in collaboration with and available for all participants. These Questions and Answers were also published on MSB's public website, and other authorities linked the Q&A database to their own websites. Different media used the information extensively during the crisis.

Data collection and analysis

Researchers obtained access to network meetings that were held in the form of telephone conferences during a period of intensive fire-fighting, from 6 to 22 August 2014. All network meetings during this period were observed and recorded, amounting to 10 meetings. Overall, our transcribed dataset is six hours long, and includes 233 pages of transcribed text. The empirical data from the meetings were analyzed through qualitative discourse analysis (Fairhurst & Putnam, 2014) using both the audio recordings, researchers' meeting notes and the transcribed text. When analyzing discourse on the micro-level, actors' interaction sequences are shaped by form and syntax; on the meso-level, actors' experiences, interpretations or arguments are invoked and framed and meanings emerge (Putnam, 2008).

The discourse analysis was conducted in four steps by the first author. First, recordings and transcripts were analyzed for content of all meetings, and a list of all issues discussed was compiled. In the second step, a detailed sequential analysis of specific discursive strategies aimed at leading the network meetings by studying the linguistic, pragmatic and rhetorical devices (words, sentences, larger clauses and their functions) used in the meetings was conducted (cf. Wodak et al., 2011). In this step, the discursive leadership strategies developed by Wodak, Kwon and Clarke were specifically (deductively) searched for, but all content was also analyzed (inductively) in order to searching for any other discursive leadership strategies. In this step the talk, roles and performance of all participants,

not only the network coordinators from MSB was analyzed, since all participants of the network could possibly enact leadership strategies.

During the qualitative coding of the discourse of the network meetings both authors met and discussed the interpretation and labeling of leadership strategies to ensure codes were applied consistently. The discursive leadership strategies developed by Wodak et al. (2011) were found to cover all discursive leadership strategies used by actors, and no new or different discursive leadership strategies emerged. However, we discovered that the directive strategy described by Wodak et al. in our data was composed of a number of sub-strategies. In the third step of the analysis we differentiated between these, creating eight categories of directive leadership strategies. In the final step, all discursive leadership strategies were related to the outcomes during the meeting and quotes were selected to illustrate the findings.

Results: Discursive leadership in crisis communication network meetings

In the following sections, we will answer our research questions of (1) ‘What discursive leadership strategies are employed during the network meetings?’ and (2) ‘What role do different discursive leadership strategies have for network leadership, as it emerged during the network meetings?’

Discursive leadership strategies employed during crisis network meetings

The discourse analysis revealed that five discursive leadership strategies, originally found in business meetings and used for the purpose of developing consensus and making decisions (Wodak et al., 2011), were also found in the discourse of MSB coordinators during the network teleconferences. Although all participants could possibly enact leadership strategies, primarily the two alternating coordinators from MSB did that, and accordingly, they clearly emerged as the network leaders. Only on very few occasions a representative from another public authority or governmental organization initiated any discursive leadership strategy. Discursive strategies of bonding, encouraging, directing, modulating and

re/committing were used by the leaders. Two of the strategies: *bonding* and *modulating* were rarely used by the leaders, while the strategy of *directing*, was used on several occasions during each meeting (see Table 1).

Include Table 1. here

Bonding.

The network leaders used bonding on a few occasions, for example during the first meeting, when the leader commented on the establishment of the common Q&A database: ‘this is the beginning of a collaboration on Questions and Answers and a common management of phone questions’ (IF, 6 August 2014). By explicitly referring to the “beginning of a *collaboration*” and “*common* management”, the network leader discursively established the bond between the participants through referring to the task. The reason for not using the bonding strategy more, is probably that this network was created for a special purpose during a limited period of time, and there were no distinctive needs for establishing a common identity and good relationships among all participants of the network. The meetings were also confined by the time pressure of the crisis situation, so no general “social talk” occurred at all. Moreover, all participants had a similar professional role. They represented their organizations as professional communicators working with crisis communication, thus, network leaders did not try establishing any deep relationships, but rather focus on the important tasks at hand in order to manage the crisis through coordinating crisis communication to the public. This interpretation is supported by the next quote, where the leader is commenting on the participants’ professionalism: ‘This is with due respect for you who are responsible for the information, you know this best, we just point to general needs that we can see and you know what is correct and what is not ... an issue we think is topical is

fire damage to houses ... but you can help us with what these property owners have asked' (IF, 11 August 2014). By pointing to the common denominator of the professional identity, a type of professional bond between participants is established. The answer from the crisis call center representative: 'yes, above all, they ask when they can return, and otherwise it's how they find out the status, what it looks like around their house if the house is left or not' (113 13) illustrates that she accepts the bond created by the network leader.

Modulating.

Modulating is a discursive strategy used by leaders in business meetings 'to regulate the perception of external environmental threats, or institutional imperatives to act, linked to the strategic issue under discussion' (Wodak et al., 2011: p. 605). In the crisis network meetings, this strategy was only used by network leaders twice. The following quote shows how the network leader evoked the anxiety and rumors following the threat of the fire:

I think it is really important that all information is confirmed and true when rumors or anxiety, different versions are occurring, and we have a possibility to do this together if we call this a crisis communication network, through short check-ups and through working with the common tool (IF, 6 August 2014).

The modulating strategy of referring to the threat of rumors and different versions of information is used by the leader to justify the need for acting and participating in the network. We interpret the rare occasions of modulating as there is no need for this strategy during the teleconferences because all participants are already very aware of the threat, which is the main reason for participating in the network. As a consequence, there is no need to invoke the threat in order to intensify the perception of danger and the need for action.

Encouraging.

This strategy was prominent during the telephone conferences, and it was also integrated into the structure of the agenda. The network leaders were asking for input on ‘new questions’ that needed coordinating, and paused to let everyone speak:

- I don’t know if there is any new information that needs coordinating. If anyone is having such an issue right now I am opening the debate (AvS, MSB, 10 August 2014)
- Yes, [1177 Vårdguiden]. We thought about the new [web-] subpage to return after an evacuation [...] there are several links now and I wonder if it is obvious for the residents what to read because there are so many (AM, 1177 Vårdguiden).

Thanks to the open question by the network leader, this participant brings up an important issue that she noticed, that public information on the common website now has become difficult to grasp. The discursive strategy of encouraging was successful in order to elicit suggestions and issues, most of the time new questions were proposed by participants. Pauses to let people speak were about five seconds long, and that appeared to be an adequate length to allow people to voice their issues. If pauses were too short, there would be a risk that telephone conference participants did not have time to get ready to propose their questions.

The agenda also contained the standing item ‘Other issues’ where the floor was opened up to the participants to raise their own issues. This item resulted in participants contributing several important issues, as the following interaction excerpt illustrates:

- then I wonder if anyone has any other issue to propose (AvS, MSB)
- Yes [Länsstyrelsen Västmanland] when we see inaccuracies on Krisinformation.se [the national crisis web page], when something should be updated, is there any contact person, perhaps others already have it but I haven’t? (Länsstyrelsen Västmanland)

- Send an e-mail to the editorial office ‘@krisinformation.se’ there is always someone who is covering that address (KP, Krisinformation.se)
- Good, thanks (Länstyrelsen Västmanland).

The quote illustrates that a critical issue, whom to approach to correct inaccuracies on the website, is raised by the participant representing the authority most involved in crisis management. The lack of information on the part of this person probably depended on the relief of personnel working during the fire, and that there were not enough updates on the operations of the network for crisis communication collaboration or information on which addresses were supposed to be used for support.

Directing.

We found that the directing strategy was well-developed and extensively used during the network meetings. Since this outcome was intriguing, a more thorough analysis of this strategy was conducted, which revealed eight types of directing sub-strategies used by the network leaders (see Table 2). This strategy means that the leader pulls together the threads in the discussion, reduces the diversity of ideas, and clarifies equivocality (Wodak et al., 2011). The strategy also means that the leaders can make direct requests for information, ask critical questions, interrupt or block other participants, propose ideas of their own or shift topic.

Insert Table 2. here

The first discursive directing strategy: *directing structure* concerns who is entitled to talk, in which order items on the agenda are discussed, and disciplining participants to start by saying their name so everyone knows who is talking: ‘now I will be a little nit-picker of order it is really good if you state your name when entering because then you know who had a

question and we can give you feedback later ... who did that question come from?’ (IF, MSB, 11 August 2014) ‘yes, [name] from the Swedish National Food Agency’. To ensure this routine of each participant stating the name of the organization before speaking was critical in the telephone meetings, to save time and maximize clarity.

The next quote illustrates that the leader is also structuring through adapting the agenda in a flexible way, and passes over items that are not considered acute because of the time pressure: ‘instead of discussing this now I would like to jump to item three so we can become united on what are the most important actions right now’ (IF, MSB, 6 August 2014). The structure is improvised from the pre-designed network meeting template into a structure that fits better in the actual situation. The leaders are also controlling the structure of the meetings through distributing the speaking turns since there are many participants in the telephone conference, and only one person at a time can talk: ‘Thank you, we continue with The Swedish Transport Administration’ (AvS, MSB, 7 August 2014) ‘yes, they are doing a first visual inspection of the railway between Ängelsberg - Ramnäs today to see the damage’ (Swedish Transport Administration). As illustrated, the directing strategy was strictly adhered to by participants in the meetings who followed leaders’ prompts.

Second, *directing reports* is used to obtain reports on the situation concerning information needs and communication activities: ‘then I would first like to, before we work on Questions and Answers, obtain a short situational overview for communication with the public, and you can report briefly on what is going on, and I will begin with [Länsstyrelsen i Västmanland], please’ (AvS, MSB, 7 August 2014). This was a standing item on the agenda, with the purpose of establishing a common overview of all issues needing answers and what communication activities the authorities were planning and implementing. The strategy was also used for specific information requests, as illustrated by the following interaction:

- Today we have focused on roped-off areas and the need for information on roped-off areas, we also had questions on clarifications of roped-off areas for the water bombing, because there it was stated it was within the roads, but on the map there is a line drawn and if you live in between, there is a void between the roads and this line and people living in between wants to know what is valid (113 13)
- Did you contact the people with responsibility for this who may help you answer these questions? (AvS, MSB, 7 August 2014)
- We contacted this number we have for the information staff, I was to receive feedback from them concerning the issue on roped-off areas and just got a call when entering this meeting, so he would get back to me at 1 p.m. (113 13).

In this quote, the directing reports strategy is used by the network leader to ask specifically if 113 13 (the participant representing the organization responsible for emergency calls on the number 113 13 used during the crisis) contacted responsible people and got support in answering questions important for the residents that are still inside the roped-off areas where water bombing is ongoing. In this example, the requested information is satisfying, the issue with the roped-off areas is currently work in progress, and so, the directing reports strategy resulted in specific additional information. We also conclude from the quote that the network meeting in this case actually delayed the feedback, since the call that would help solve the issue with the roped-off areas was postponed until after the meeting.

The third directing strategy is *directing summary*, made by the leaders to summarize all reports on information needs and communication activities, this strategy is made explicit to participants through the use of the word “summary”:

a short summary from your reports, it feels like we entered, most are reporting a decreasing [media] pressure, if we look at the communication situation, we have entered a calmer phase. Media is not leading with this anymore, the image is turning

... a new phase where it is about a future orientation, compensation issues, responsibility issues, guilt issues, returning, final extinction (IF, MSB, 11 August 2014).

The summary is important as it directs the meeting by highlighting and focusing on the pressing issues, and needs of coordination of questions and people. Our observations during the meetings revealed that the directing summary strategy is very demanding for the network leaders, since it requires presence of mind and concentration to remember all important issues, select and highlight the most urgent ones, and comment on which actors need to coordinate issues. In some of the meetings note taking was supported by a colleague. The directing summary strategy also operates through the identification of issues in need of coordination after the teleconference is over. We found that no important issues were lost in the summaries and concluded that the network leaders handled this demanding task in a professional way.

The fourth directing strategy is *directing tools*, which was used by both leaders and representatives from Krisinformation.se. This strategy includes direct requests and recommendations to use the Questions and Answers tool and to provide information in the web-based database that is available for all participants:

I am working with My pages and FAQ [Frequently Asked Questions], and I can like someone else just said, certify that SvD [national newspaper] and Aftonbladet [daily tabloid] will provide links to the FAQ, and that is good news because it means that we are getting [the information] out, I would just have a simple, er, two simple things. First, when you update questions, they are entered in the FAQ without problems, if you provide new questions I am grateful for an e-mail so I can monitor it and enter them in the FAQ at once (KP, Krisinformation.se, 8 August 2014).

This quote illustrates how the web-editor is directing participants' use of the digital tool by providing evidence that the media is using the information and that their work is producing results. He also wants participants to notify him of new questions that they add to the Q&A database. This strategy was also used to instruct participants on how to manage their questions and answers, for example to check that all information was adequate and up to date.

The fifth directing strategy is directing response, used by network leaders to comment on reports from the participants. Responses can be positive as well as negative, but we only saw one single negative response in the material. The following interaction contains a proposal from one participant, with a following directing (positive) response from the leader:

- to further avoid negative [media] coverage and keeping us on track with what different authorities are doing, one proposal from my part is that when we provide news or more extensive materials it is additional to when we update our FAQs so to speak; we disseminate it to each other via this address that you use when sending notices to attend this meeting so you get a 'heads up' before it is published and done, I don't know whether you all think this can be a possible solution (LL, Jordbruksverket)
- from MSB coordinating function we think that is an excellent proposal, that makes us continuously updated (AvS, 8 August 2014).

In this quote, we can see that the network leader is directing the proposed issue through her response: she is not leaving this issue open for all to discuss, which would take more time, but instantaneously makes a decision that this is a good proposal, and discursively directs her response by stating that it was a good proposal and encouraging all to follow suit. The positive directing responses are often in the form of minimal responses (thank you, good), and used for the purpose of creating a good climate, and to engage the participants.

The sixth directing strategy is *directing decisions*, which means that the leader is directing common decision-making during the teleconference meetings. This strategy was predominantly used for common decision-making by asking for consensus, rather than by decisions exclusively directed by the network leaders themselves:

my question to the meeting is actually, we who participate now, could this, even if you all have a lot of regional collaboration conferences, this way of working with short common authority reports be a [inaudible] that we can continue with? [a helicopter sound is heard in the background] A question of order, could you please mute your phones? We have a helicopter here [inaudible] in the meeting (IF, MSB, 6 August 2014).

This quote comes from the very first meeting, and the network leader from MSB wants the participants to decide together that the crisis communication network is to continue. The second part of the quote illustrates the directing structure of the meeting order when the sound of a water-bombing helicopter disturbs the meeting; everybody needs to mute their phones in order to improve the sound quality of the telephone conference.

By posing a question to the network participants, the network leader does not take the sole responsibility for such a decision, but wants the network participants to confirm the need for further meetings and make the decision in collaboration. In addition, the words used by the network leader in the example are mitigated: “could this ... way of working” in order not to precede the participants’ input and close off the decision. The responses highlight the urgent situation for participants involved in the acute crisis management:

‘yes, as long as meetings are very short’ (County Administrative Board)

‘I agree with [name], very short meetings’ (municipality representative)

‘yes the reason is to save time, not waste time (IF, MSB)

This interaction illustrates that network leaders by this strategy invited participants to participate in the decision-making and state they wanted to continue to meet in the crisis network and collaborate on coordinating crisis communication.

The seventh directing strategy is when the leader corrects faults, that is *directing corrections*:

- 113 13 here, there was an e-mail yesterday saying that they would send [contact details for] contact persons to ‘coordination 113 13.se’ (113 13)
- yes, in that case there has been a little mistake, that is to go through me and then I send it to 113 13, so they know what contact persons they are, so to speak, when a question comes from the citizens (AvS, MSB, 7 August 2014).

The network leader is explicit to acknowledge the problem by using the word “mistake” although it is mitigated by “little”. Fortunately, this strategy only occurred on two occasions in the data. If the strategy were more salient, it would mean that the leaders had to correct many mistakes, and experience unwanted problems with incorrect information.

The eighth directing strategy is *directing coordination* and was used in all meetings by the network leaders. This strategy means that the leaders are coordinating the other participants’ contacts that in most cases are taking place after the teleconferences are over. One example is illustrated in the next quote, where the leader is coordinating the work with Questions and Answers. The different authorities need to confirm that the information is consistent, which means that they need to scrutinize and “sync” the content:

- I wanted to point to a few more [questions] in addition to those you mentioned that are in need of syncing [synchronizing]. I start with question 0480082, ‘Can I walk inside the roped-off area during water bombings?’ I just want to, it would be good if MSB and Länsstyrelsen could sync that rope-off issue, but I understand that you did that already. Is it possible for MSB and Länsstyrelsen to

contact each other so we can see that it is synced in My pages? (IF, MSB, 9 August 2014)

– We will do that (KA, Länsstyrelsen Västmanland).

The network leader mentions which participants need to contact each other, and the immediate response from Länsstyrelsen Västmanland shows that they take the issue seriously (walking within the area of the water-bombing is potentially very dangerous) and will take action to coordinate information on the issue directly after the teleconference.

Re/committing

Leaders who move the focus from a common established consensus to the need for action use the discursive re/committing strategy. The following example follows the established consensus to use the number 113 13 as the common telephone number during the forest fire, instead of the involved municipalities different numbers: ‘we would appreciate that you put 113 13 on the top, since that is the number that the public should call’ (IF, MSB, 10 August 2014). As seen in this quote, the leader employs a positive tone: ‘we would appreciate’ in order to focus on the need for action. The response illustrates that this strategy is received in a positive way and stimulates action: ‘County Administrative Board here, I can just say that we have informed all municipalities, the county health administration and the police that we use 113 13, and I have the impression that all [municipalities, health administration and police] started to use it. (County Administrative Board)

The re-committing strategy is used in several ways in the discourse of network leaders during the meetings: to motivate future action, pay attention to future scenarios, promise to act, or remind participants of their responsibilities.

The role of discursive leadership strategies for network leadership

Findings demonstrate the important role of three discursive leadership strategies for network leadership during a crisis situation: directing, encouraging, and re/committing. The

directing strategy, including the sub-strategies, resulted in the shaping of structure and order, of content and focus, and of directing the network participants' work with Questions and Answers during the teleconferences. The directing/structuring role emerges as an important network leader role enacted throughout all of the network meetings that we studied, and it certainly had a pivotal function to manage the participants' coordination of their organizations' crisis communication during the forest fire.

Directing sub-strategies contributed to ensure meeting structure and create a good order, for example each participant stating the name of the organization before speaking was critical in the teleconferences, to save time and maximize clarity, and distribution of the word allowed one person at a time to talk. The discursive leadership strategy of directing reports resulted in participants adding specific information and contributing to a common understanding of the situation, as well as informing each other of communication activities they were planning and implementing. Moreover, by prompting all participants to report on their perceived information needs and communication activities, leaders directed all participants to contribute to the establishment of a common view of the situation, and to collaborate on observing issues that needed coordinating in a structured way.

Directing summary had another specific function for the network leaders, as the summary highlights and focuses on pressing issues, and needs of coordination, thus it directed the focus of the meetings and consequently formed a basis for action.

Directing tools was a more instructive strategy, as it functioned to inform participants on how to manage their questions and answers in the common database, for example to check that all information was adequate and up to date. The strategy of directing response often consisted of short feedback with the purpose of creating action, for example when a network leader acknowledged the proposal was excellent and then encouraged all to follow suit.

Directing decisions was geared towards participatory decision-making. For network leaders, the role of this strategy was demonstrated to involve participants and make them voice their opinions of the decisions made during the meeting. This strategy was for example used in the first meeting to create consensus around the need for continued network meetings and the interorganizational collaboration on crisis communication during the forest fire.

The sub-strategy of directing corrections was used by leaders to acknowledge mistakes and diverging information, and had the primary role of creating accurate information. However, it is possible that the strategy to openly admit mistakes and correct them also contributed to create trust for network leaders, since they acted as role models in creating an open communication climate without repressions when openly allowing mistakes.

Directing coordination also had a key role for network leaders, and served to find issues in need of coordination, and to facilitate the coordination of participants' contacts on messages and information that they needed to exchange and clarify, in most cases through separate contacts after the teleconferences were over.

The discursive strategy of encouraging involved prompts to get participants to provide ideas, opinions or new knowledge. The researchers observed that as a consequence of this strategy, participants were able to voice their concerns during the meetings. Findings illustrated that the discursive strategy of encouraging made participants contribute with their issues and opinions, and this encouragement by network leaders created an open communication climate during the meetings.

The recommitting strategy created commitment to further action, and consequently led, together with the other discursive strategies, to the successful establishment of the Questions and Answers database, which embraced a large number of important questions and was created in collaboration by the involved organizations. The Q&A database/webpage was also used frequently by different media organizations, which contributed to the information

becoming more uniform and integrated, and reducing the risk for diverging information and recommendations to the public. In this way, the recommitting strategy was imperative to the outcome of coordinated action.

Two of the discursive leadership strategies: bonding and modulating were rarely used in the crisis network meetings. When used by network leaders, the bonding strategy contributed to create a relationship and common identity in the network, through referring to the common purpose and work, and to the common profession of communication that participants shared. Similarly, the strategy of modulating, referring to the external threat was rarely used, due to the threat was self-evident in this case and needed no interpretation or comment. Through strategically using the strategy of modulating, the leader can appeal to common knowledge and comment on possible threats to support or mitigate perceptions of those threats and balance the need to act. In the current crisis communication context, with a forest fire raging outside, and water-bombing helicopters occasionally disturbing the meeting when participants forgot to mute their phones, the threat is explicit and challenging, which would lead us to think that leaders would comment on the threat, but they used the modulating strategy on just a few occasions.

In another crisis context, for example in a more complex crisis situation like pandemic flu and recommendations for taking a vaccine or not, network leaders may need to use the strategy of modulating to make sense of the situation and establish a common understanding of the external threat. In this network, the external threat and crisis is the main reason for participating in the network. As a consequence, there is no need to invoke the threat in order to intensify the perception of danger and the need for action, because all participants are already very aware of the crisis.

Discussion

This empirical study on strategic leadership communication for crisis network coordination expands strategic communication into a new field, which adds to previous research that focus on image restoration and situational crisis communication (Coombs, 2016, Ha & Boynton, 2014). Findings illustrate in-depth how strategic leadership communication contributed to establish and sustain a crisis communication network, what discursive strategies were used and which role they play for network leadership.

Network leaders have an important role in supporting the networking process, building a spirit of community, bridging over diversities without oppressing them, and facilitating interaction between network participants through creating a common structure and process (Ospina and Saz-Carranza, 2010). In this study, MSB coordinators were found to act as network leaders (albeit without any positional or formal influence over participants), although potentially all participants of the network could take the lead. During the network meetings, the leadership role was distinctly different from the other participants' roles. Network leaders were found to use discursive leadership strategies of directing structure, encouraging, directing summary and re/committing to structure, coordinate and facilitate network meetings. In this way, strategic leadership communication paved the way for the coordination of crisis communication activities of participating organizations.

Network research highlight the important role of relationships between participants, to build coalitions and strategic alliances for the purpose of pursuing common goals (Van Dyke & McCommon, 2010). For network leaders in non-crisis contexts, creating an open climate and active participation in the network is important, according to Ospina and Saz-Carranza (2010), who advocate that network leaders need to attend to relational aspects. Participants that feel needed in the network become more motivated, and ties created through personal interaction build a foundation for mutual respect.

Contrariwise, our analyses illustrated that in the crisis communication network there were very few instances of strategic leadership communication using the bonding strategy, rather, the relational aspects of the network were suppressed because of the seriousness of the situation. Our results do not support the idea that network leaders in general are more person-oriented than task-oriented as illustrated in a study comparing organizational leaders and network leaders (Silvia & McGuire, 2010). This is probably due to the specific conditions for leaders of networks operating during crises. In this case, network meetings were very object-oriented – the purpose was to coordinate crisis communication to inform the public of what to do to be safe. There was no time to develop any deeper relationships during the meetings, and there were no attempts or expressed wishes from participants to attend to relationships during the meetings. However, participants relied upon a common identity as professional crisis communicators, appealed to by one of the network leaders. The common professional identity could possibly compensate for the lack of time for more personal bonding processes and the building of personal relationships in the network. Moreover, the professional function seemed more important than personal experiences and qualities, since participants representing their organization sometimes alternated during the period of the crisis which was extended in time.

Collaborating under time pressure on a common task with a finite life span demands the establishment of “swift trust” (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999) in temporary teams formed by members with no previous history of working together. Communication is key to the development of trust – although trust might be imported, “it is more likely created via a communication behavior established in the first few keystrokes” (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999, p. 811). Strategic leadership communication around the project and task appears to be particularly necessary to maintain trust in the context of crisis, where social (relational) communication may complement task communication and strengthen trust. Professional

identification, thus may be a source of trust, which is imported into crisis communication networks and then developed through communication.

Strategic leadership communication by network leaders clearly differed from previous studies from organizational and business contexts (Wodak, Kwon & Clarke, Johansson, Miller & Hamrin, 2014). Researchers have recently highlighted the importance of different contexts surrounding leadership communication (Hamrin, 2016). Our findings illustrated the abundance of directing strategies enacted by the MSB coordinators that served to structure the meetings and prompt participants' contributions to manage the crisis communication network effectively during time pressure can be related to the urgent situation. The context of crisis, in this case a raging forest fire, which put pressure on crisis communicators to quickly and accurately provide advice and recommendations to the public, most certainly influenced our findings. There was not much time to discuss and have a dialogue to reach consensus. Already in the first meeting, the representatives from the local government most involved in crisis management, addressed that meetings had to be very short, otherwise they would not be able to participate. Hence, network leaders attended to the need for a time-efficient and structured work process through the strategic use of directing strategies in their communication. The context might also explain why the modulating strategy was superfluous and rarely used during the crisis network meetings. Due to the threat of the forest fire, participants were motivated to engage without the network leaders using the modulating strategy and explicitly commenting on the external threat.

This study addressed strategic leadership communication practices that contribute to establish and sustain networks, and accordingly can enhance disaster resilience (Paton, 2006, Longstaff & Yang, 2008). The role of communication in supporting community resilience is conceptualized by Hyvärinen and Vos (2015, p. 588), who highlighted that communication “serves as an interface function within response networks, between public and private

organizations and between organizations and citizen groups”. Communication is important before (for awareness and preparedness), during and after crises (for community resilience and citizen response). The overall coordinating function of a network, which here was enacted by MSB through their network coordinators, was clearly proactive and facilitating (cf. Wood & Gray, 1991). We conclude that the leadership and coordination of the forest fire network organized collaboration and mutual results that indeed facilitated the crisis management and coordination of information to the public.

As a result, network leaders contributed to increase community disaster resilience, i.e. the adaptive capacity to identify, mobilize, and stabilize response resources as a disaster unfolds (Paton, 2006), during and after the forest fire. Resilience has previously been studied from an organizational perspective, analyzing post-disaster interviews to investigate how organizations communicated and reorganized after Hurricane Katrina through the use of ICT (Chewning et al., 2013). Our findings extend these results by illustrating that strategic leadership communication of network leaders supported not only network building, but served to coordinating organizations’ crisis communication efforts, and thus supported inter-organizational resilience – defined as a capacity to communicate, organize and reorganize resources between organizations. Even though this network was not pre-established (cf. Doerfel, et al., 2013), participating authorities involved in crisis management strengthened their crisis communication capacity by coordinating their communication and creating a common Q and A database available for all participants.

In large-scale and complex crises, inter-organizational resilience is part of the resilience of communities and society, and consequently these types of networks and network leadership are important to consider in future research. Our findings cast new light on the role of strategic leadership communication for crisis network coordination, and illustrate that it is

important to study crises as they evolve, since this knowledge will aid in preparation of future crisis management and interorganizational networking.

Practical implications – strategic leadership communication for network leaders

Strategic leadership communication clearly contributed to networking results and can impede diverging and antagonistic forms of disaster and crisis response (cf. Adkins, 2010). Traditionally, studies on strategic communication during crises often rely on participants reports through interviews post crisis, which gives a constructed (and sometimes biased) view of what happened (Johansson, Jendel & Ottestig, 2013). The qualitative discourse analysis employed here, based on audio recorded and transcribed naturally occurring communication, revealed discursive strategies that network participants and leadership actors are not always aware of. When these communicative network leadership strategies are made explicit however, they can be trained in crisis preparation exercises, and potentially increase network leadership performance during a crisis.

Strategic leadership communication in a network with participants which have not previously collaborated during an acute crisis event is a difficult task. Hence, organizations which face the risk of having to coordinate their crisis communication with other organizations during a major natural disaster or other large-scale crisis are recommended to prepare for both leading and participating in networks for crisis communication coordination.

In this case, network leaders of MSB were experienced, and had developed a process and systems for establishing and sustaining crisis communication networks. However, organizations and public authorities without previous crisis experience expecting to take on a coordinating role during a crisis are recommended to prepare and train network leaders by rehearsing probable crisis scenarios and explicitly train strategic leadership communication strategies needed in network meetings.

Directing/structuring strategic leadership communication was found important for network leaders, but in order to ensure that adaptive capacity is maintained, one important implication of our findings is that a balance is needed between communicating structure and flexibility. The structured agenda used by the MSB coordinators allowed all participants to report on urgent issues and needs, as well as contained open items where anyone could bring up an issue that was not foreseen. In that way, flexibility and adaptability that are important during crisis events, was built into the structure of the meetings.

Our findings illustrate the importance of directing strategies for network leaders in an acute crisis situation characterized by time pressure, inexperienced network participants and unknown scenario. It is however recommended that network leaders try to balance directing with encouraging, in order not to foreclose participants to contribute, but instead supporting the network by establishing a clear and organized way of collaborating. Network leaders in the meetings that we observed were above all giving positive feedback to any initiative from participants, which contributed to create an atmosphere where all questions and issues were allowed to come up. We assume that overly negative feedback from the network leader, for example focusing on correcting mistakes, would impede participants' contribution and questions. In crisis, situational constraints repress relationship building to accomplish trust. Our findings imply that strategic leadership communication contributing to encouraging and directing participation have important functions for network leaders.

Accordingly, salient discursive leadership strategies employed during crisis network meetings such as directing/structuring and encouraging/facilitating functioned to coordinate crisis communication efforts during time pressure and contribute to an enhanced crisis management capacity.

References

- Adkins, G. L. (2010). Organizational networks in disaster response: An examination of the US Government network's efforts in Hurricane Katrina. In W. T. Coombs & S. H. Holladay (Eds.), *The Handbook of Crisis Communication* (pp. 93-114). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Atouba, Y., & Shumate, M. (2010). Interorganizational networking patterns among development organizations. *Journal of Communication*, 60(2), 293-317.
doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01483.x
- Barge, J. K., & Hirokawa, R. Y. (1989). Toward a communication competency model of group leadership. *Small Group Behavior*, 20(2), 167-189.
doi:10.1177/104649648902000203
- Baxter, J. (2014). 'If you had only listened carefully ... ': The discursive construction of emerging leadership in a UK all-women management team. *Discourse & Communication*, 8(1), 23-39. doi:10.1177/1750481313503224
- Borgatti, S. P., & Halgin, D. S. (2011). On network theory. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1168-1181. doi:10.1287/orsc.1100.0641
- Chewning, L. V., Lai, C.-H., & Doerfel, M. L. (2013). Organizational resilience and using information and communication technologies to rebuild communication structures. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 27(2), 237-263.
doi:10.1177/0893318912465815
- Connaughton, S. L., Shuffler, M., & Goodwin, G. F. (2011). Leading distributed teams: The communicative constitution of leadership. *Military Psychology*, 23(5), 502-527.
doi:10.1080/08995605.2011.600147

- Coombs, W. T. (2015). *Ongoing crisis communication. Planning, managing, and responding* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coombs, W. T. (2016). Reflections on a meta-analysis: Crystallizing thinking about SCCT. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 1-3. doi:10.1080/1062726X.2016.1167479
- Cooper, K. R., & Shumate, M. (2012). Interorganizational collaboration explored through the bona fide network perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(4), 623-654. doi:10.1177/0893318912462014
- Crosby, B. C., & Bryson, J. M. (2010). Integrative leadership and the creation and maintenance of cross-sector collaborations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 211-230. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.003
- Curtis, C. A. (2016). Organizational Networks in Times of Crisis: Lessons from Katrina. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, (online version). doi:10.1111/1468-5973.12138
- DeChurch, L. A., Burke, C. S., Shuffler, M. L., Lyons, R., Doty, D., & Salas, E. (2011). A historiometric analysis of leadership in mission critical multiteam environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 152-169. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.12.013
- Doerfel, M. L., Chewning, L. V., & Lai, C.-H. (2013). The evolution of networks and the resilience of interorganizational relationships after disaster. *Communication Monographs*, 80(4), 533-559. doi:10.1080/03637751.2013.828157
- DuBrin, A. J. (Ed.) (2013). *Handbook of research on crisis leadership in organizations*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Eglene, O., Dawes, S. S., & Schneider, C. A. (2007). Authority and leadership patterns in public sector knowledge networks. *American Review of Public Administration*, 37(1), 91-113. doi:10.1177/0275074006290799

- Fairhurst, G. T. (1993). Echoes of the vision. When the rest of the organization talks total quality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6(4), 331-371.
doi:10.1177/0893318993006004001
- Fairhurst, G. T. (2007). *Discursive leadership. In conversation with leadership psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Connaughton, S. L. (2014). Leadership: A communicative perspective. *Leadership*, 10(1), 7-35. doi:10.1177/1742715013509396
- Fairhurst, G. T., & Putnam, L. L. (2014). Organizational discourse analysis. In G. T. Fairhurst & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Communication. Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods* (Third ed., pp. 271-295). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ha, J. H., & Boynton, L. (2014). Has crisis communication been studied using an interdisciplinary approach? A 20-Year content analysis of communication journals. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 8(1), 29-44.
doi:10.1080/1553118X.2013.850694
- Hamrin, S. (2016). Recontextualizing communicative leadership: The interplay of discourses in a Swedish multinational organization. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 10(1), 18-35. doi:10.1080/1553118X.2015.1073733
- Hardy, C., Lawrence, T. B., & Grant, D. (2005). Discourse and collaboration: The role of conversations and collective identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 58-77.
doi:10.5465/AMR.2005.15281426
- Hyvärinen, J., & Vos, M. (2015). Developing a conceptual framework for investigating communication supporting community resilience. *Societies*, 5(3), 583-597.
doi:10.3390/soc5030583

- Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science*, 10(6), 791-815. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.10.6.791
- Johansson, C. (2003). *Visioner och verkligheter. Kommunikationen om företagets strategi*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Johansson, C., Jendel, L., & Ottestig, A. T. (2013). *Nätverk för kriskommunikation – Om myndigheters informationssamordning vid kriser* (MSB 549). Stockholm: MSB.
- Johansson, C., Miller, V. D., & Hamrin, S. (2014). Conceptualizing communicative leadership – A framework for analysing and developing leaders' communication competence. *Corporate Communication: An International Journal*, 19(2), 147-165. doi:10.1108/CCIJ-02-2013-0007
- Kapucu, N. (2006). Interagency communication networks during emergencies: Boundary spanners in multiagency coordination. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(2), 207-225. doi:10.1177/0275074005280605
- Kapucu, N., Arslan, T., & Demiroz, F. (2010). Collaborative emergency management and national emergency management network. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 19(4), 452-468. doi:10.1108/09653561011070376
- Kapucu, N., Bryer, T., Garayev, V., & Arslan, T. (2010). Interorganizational network coordination under stress caused by repeated threats of disasters. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 7(1), Article 45. doi:DOI: 10.2202/1547-7355.1629
- Kapucu, N., & Hu, Q. (2014). Understanding multiplexity of collaborative emergency management networks. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 46(4), 399-417. doi:10.1177/0275074014555645
- Knoke, D., & Yang, S. (2008). *Social network analysis* (Second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Lewis, L. K. (2011). *Organizational change: Creating change through strategic communication*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Littlefield, R. S., & Quenette, A. M. (2007). Crisis leadership and hurricane Katrina: The portrayal of authority by the media in natural disasters. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35(1), 26-47. doi:10.1080/00909880601065664
- Longstaff, P. H., & Yang, S.-U. (2008). Communication management and trust. Their role in building resilience to "surprises" such as natural disasters, pandemic flu, and terrorism. *Ecology and Society*, 13(1), 3 [online].
- Monge, P. R., & Contractor, N. (2001). Emergence of communication networks. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 440-502). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morgeson, F. P., DeRue, D. S., & Karam, E. P. (2010). Leadership in teams: A functional Approach to Understanding Leadership Structures and Processes. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 5-39. doi:10.1177/0149206309347376
- Müller-Seitz, G. (2012). Leadership in interorganizational networks: A literature review and suggestions for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14(4), 428-443. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00324.x
- Nolte, I. M., Martin, E. C., & Boenigk, S. (2012). Cross-sectoral coordination of disaster relief. *Public Management Review*, 14(6), 707-730. doi:10.1080/14719037.2011.642629
- Olsson, E. K. (2014). Crisis communication in public organisations: Dimensions of crisis communication revisited. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 22(2), 113-125. doi:10.1111/1468-5973.12047

- Ospina, S. M., & Saz-Carranza, A. (2010). Paradox and collaboration in network management. *Administration & Society*, 42(4), 404-440.
doi:10.1177/0095399710362723
- Paton, D. (2006). Disaster resilience: integrating individual, community, institutional and environmental perspectives. In D. Paton & D. M. Johnson (Eds.), *Disaster resilience: An integrated approach* (pp. 320-341). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse analysis. Investigating processes of social construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Putnam, L. L. (2008). Images of the communication— discourse relationship. *Discourse & Communication*, 2(3), 339-345. doi:10.1177/1750481308091916
- Saz-Carranza, A., & Ospina, S. M. (2011). The behavioral dimension of governing interorganizational goal-directed networks-managing the unity-diversity tension. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21(2), 327-365.
doi:10.1093/jopart/muq050
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2003). *The Handbook of discourse analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Silvia, C., & McGuire, M. (2010). Leading public sector networks: An empirical examination of integrative leadership behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 21(2), 264-277.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2010.01.006
- Shuffler, M. L., Jiménez-Rodríguez, M., & Kramer, W. S. (2015). The science of multiteam systems: A review and future research agenda. *Small Group Research*, 46(6), 659-699.
doi:10.1177/1046496415603455
- Shumate, M., & Contractor, N. S. (2014). Emergence of multidimensional social networks. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational*

- Communication. Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods* (Third ed., pp. 449-474). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sommerfeldt, E. J. (2013). Networks of social capital: Extending a public relations model of civil society in Peru. *Public Relations Review*, 39(1), 1-12.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.08.005
- Sommerfeldt, E. J., & Kent, M. L. (2015). Civil society, networks, and relationship management: Beyond the organization–public dyad. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 9(3), 235-252. doi:10.1080/1553118x.2015.1025405
- 't Hart, P., & Sundelius, B. (2013). Crisis management revisited: A new agenda for research, training and capacity building within Europe. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 48(3), 444-461. doi:10.1177/0010836713485711
- Ulmer, R. R. (2012). Increasing the impact of thought leadership in crisis communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(4), 523-542.
doi:10.1177/0893318912461907
- Van De Mieroop, D., & Schnurr, S. (2014). Negotiating meaning and co-constructing institutionalisable answers: Leadership through gate-keeping in performance appraisal interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 67, 1-16. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.008
- Van Dyke, N., & McCommon, H. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Strategic alliances: Coalition building and social movements*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Waugh, W. L., & Streib, G. (2006). Collaboration and leadership for effective emergency management. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 131-140. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00673.x
- Wilson, N. (2013). Interaction without walls: Analysing leadership discourse through dramaturgy and participation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 17(2), 180-199.
doi:10.1111/josl.12024

Wodak, R., Kwon, W., & Clarke, I. (2011). 'Getting people on board': Discursive leadership for consensus building in team meetings. *Discourse & Society*, 22(5), 592-644.

doi:10.1177/0957926511405410

Wood, D. J., & Gray, B. (1991). Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(2), 139-162. doi:10.1177/0021886391272001

Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00093-5

Table 1. Discursive leadership strategies in network meetings

	Bonding	Encouraging	Directing	Modulating	Re/Committing
Meeting 1. August 6, 44 mins, 10 participants	2	7	28	1	3
Meeting 2. August 7, 33 mins, 15 participants	2	10	21	-	3
Meeting 3. August 8, 27 mins, 12 participants	1	5	10	-	5
Meeting 4. August 9, 35 mins, 12 participants	-	3	17	1	5
Meeting 5. August 10, 38 mins, 13 participants	-	8	14	-	4
Meeting 6. Aug 11, 45 mins, 18 participants	1	8	25	-	8
Meeting 7. August 12, 40 mins, 19 participants	-	14	18	-	10
Meeting 8. August 14, 33 mins, 19 participants	-	10	11	-	3
Meeting 9. August 18, 45 mins, 20 participants	-	13	12	-	10
Meeting 10. August 22, 14 mins, 10 participants	-	3	5	-	1
Total	6	81	161	2	52

Table 2. Directing strategies

1. Directing structure	Directing the structure of the telephone conference
2. Directing reports	Directing participants' reports
3. Directing summary	Directing the summary of participants' reports
4. Directing tools	Directing use of common (digital) tools
5. Directing responses	Directing participants' responses
6. Directing decisions	Directing collaborative decision-making
7. Directing corrections	Directing inconsistencies and inaccuracies
8. Directing coordination	Directing participants' coordination efforts

Appendix 1. Network Participants

Communication professionals to act as representatives in the crisis communication network from the following organizations participated in the network meetings. Some organizations had alternating people representing, since the fire was extended over a long period of time.

1.	MSB Collaboration crisis communication
2.	MSB / Digital communication department [Kriskommunikation.se]
3.	MSB / Communication department
4.	County administration in Västmanland [Länsstyrelsen i Västmanland]
5.	SOS Alarm [responsible for emergency number 112]
6.	SOS Alarm / 113 13 [national emergency number 113 13]
7.	1177 Vårdguiden [national health counselling]
8.	Local municipalities
9.	County health administration [Landstinget i Västmanland]
10.	The Swedish Transport Administration [Trafikverket]
11.	SVA Statens Veterinärmedicinska Anstalt [National Veterinary Institute]
12.	County administration in Dalarna [Länsstyrelsen i Dalarnas län]
13.	Jordbruksverket [Swedish Board of Agriculture]
14.	Socialstyrelsen [National Board of Health and Welfare]
15.	Folkhälsomyndigheten [Public Health Agency of Sweden]
16.	Skogsstyrelsen [Swedish Forest Agency]

17.	Livsmedelsverket [Swedish National Food Agency]
18.	Svensk försäkring [Insurance Sweden]
19.	Konsumenternas försäkringsbyrå [Swedish Consumers Insurance Bureau]
20.	LRF [The Federation of Swedish Farmers]
21.	Boverket [National Board of Housing, Building and Planning]
22.	Försäkringskassan [Swedish Social Insurance Agency]
23.	Skatteverket [Swedish Tax Agency]
24.	Naturvårdsverket [Swedish Environmental Protection Agency]

Endnotes

ⁱ <http://www.lansstyrelsen.se/vastmanland/En> [15 August 2016]

ⁱⁱ <https://www.msb.se/en> [15 August 2016]