

# Reconstructing Public Opinion through Informal Community Leadership in the Age of Fragmented Authority

Mochamad Irfan

Universitas Mayjen Sungkono Mojokerto

Email: irfanmoc@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT** – This study investigates the sociological function of informal leadership figures in shaping public opinion within community environments. It aims to identify and analyze the mechanisms—such as cultural proximity, symbolic capital, and interpersonal trust—that enable these figures to act as intermediaries between communities and broader political or informational narratives. Through a literature review approach, it examines how individuals who are not formally elected or institutionally appointed nonetheless exert substantial influence on collective perception and civic behavior. The research identifies key mechanisms such as cultural proximity, symbolic capital, and interpersonal trust that position these figures as intermediaries between communities and broader political or informational narratives. As formal structures of communication become increasingly fragmented, these informal voices fill the gap, translating complexity into shared meaning and mobilizing communal responses. The paper also explores how these dynamics are amplified in digital spaces, where traditional hierarchies of communication are disrupted. Findings suggest that understanding the emergence and function of informal leadership is crucial to grasp the true contours of public discourse, particularly in societies where institutional trust is volatile or contested. This study contributes to the academic discourse by integrating classical and contemporary theories to provide a conceptual foundation for further empirical investigation.

**Keywords:** informal leadership, public opinion, community sociology, symbolic capital, civic engagement, social networks, communication structures.

## A. INTRODUCTION

Informal leadership emerges as a powerful yet often underexplored force within the dynamics of community communication and public opinion

formation. Unlike institutional authorities, informal leaders derive their influence from social credibility, cultural embeddedness, and interpersonal resonance. Their authority is rarely conferred through formal designation, yet they often become critical reference points in shaping perceptions, preferences, and collective responses to both local and broader societal issues (Potluka, 2021).

In many social settings, individuals who possess charisma, moral standing, or access to information acquire the capacity to influence how others interpret events or respond to emerging situations. These figures—who may be religious figures, respected elders, activists, or even local entrepreneurs—help mediate between community values and external narratives. They often act as cultural translators, reframing public messages in ways that resonate with local norms, thus contributing to the formation of public sentiment outside formal institutional control (Tur et al., 2022).

The relevance of informal leadership becomes even more pronounced in societies where institutional trust is low or where official communication is perceived as disconnected from communal experience. In such circumstances, people often turn to familiar, trusted voices within their immediate social circles for guidance (Glaser, 2016). This dynamic makes informal leaders central to the architecture of informal public opinion, particularly in transitional societies where democratic institutions are still evolving or contested (Potluka, 2021).

In the current age of decentralized information and networked communication, the influence of these figures transcends physical boundaries and permeates digital spaces. Social media platforms have further amplified the visibility and reach of informal leaders, who now engage audiences far beyond their immediate communities. Understanding their

role thus requires an interdisciplinary examination that bridges communication theory, sociology, and political psychology (Heavey et al., 2020).

Despite their widespread presence, the mechanisms through which informal leaders shape public opinion remain insufficiently clarified (Hendriks & Lees-Marshment, 2019). Scholars have pointed to their symbolic capital and proximity to everyday discourse, yet empirical studies remain fragmented and context-dependent (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955; Rogers, 2003; Putnam, 2000). This gap in knowledge complicates efforts to map their influence within contemporary civic life, particularly where formal and informal systems coexist and intersect.

Another pressing issue is the methodological difficulty in identifying, categorizing, and evaluating informal leadership across diverse socio-cultural settings (Harnois & Gangnon, 2022). Unlike elected officials or designated representatives, informal leaders do not operate within fixed parameters. Their legitimacy is fluid, contingent on community recognition and situational relevance. This elusiveness complicates efforts to develop generalizable models for assessing their impact, particularly within pluralistic societies (Tönnies, 2001; Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

A further concern involves the ethical and political implications of unaccountable influence. While some informal leaders promote cohesion and positive change, others may reinforce exclusion, misinformation, or parochialism. The ambiguity surrounding their motivations and affiliations raises questions about transparency, authority, and the boundary between community leadership and populist manipulation (Bennet et al., 2020). These issues are particularly acute when informal authority shapes political engagement and democratic participation in opaque ways (Bherer et al., 2023).

Observation of informal leadership is necessary because it highlights the everyday sources of influence that shape collective understanding beyond institutional boundaries. Public discourse does not emerge from policy forums alone; it is cultivated in everyday interactions, shaped by trusted voices embedded within the fabric of daily life (Fung, 2015). Mapping these voices offers insight into the social infrastructure of democratic deliberation and civic behavior (Li, 2016).

Equally, attention must be paid to how these leadership figures adapt to changing media environments. As communities become

increasingly hybrid—blending physical and digital spheres—the modes of informal leadership evolve as well. Leaders who once spoke in village meetings now livestream their opinions to national audiences (Boulianne, 2015). This shift raises questions about scalability, accountability, and the nature of influence in a rapidly transforming public sphere.

This study aims to investigate how informal leadership figures contribute to the formation of public opinion in community environments. It seeks to examine the social mechanisms, communicative practices, and relational dynamics through which these figures build credibility and exercise influence. The findings are expected to provide a clearer theoretical framework for understanding informal authority and contribute to broader discussions on democratic engagement and social representation in grassroots governance.

## B. METHOD

This study adopts a qualitative literature review approach grounded in interpretive social inquiry. The method is chosen to explore theoretical and empirical insights related to informal leadership and public opinion construction across diverse community contexts. By analyzing peer-reviewed journals, classical sociological texts, and interdisciplinary publications, this research aims to synthesize fragmented knowledge into a coherent analytical perspective. The literature review is guided by thematic coding, allowing for the identification of patterns and conceptual linkages that explain how informal figures acquire influence, negotiate legitimacy, and shape discursive environments. The sources examined range from foundational theories in communication studies to contemporary analyses in community psychology and political sociology.

The selection of literature follows a purposive sampling strategy. The inclusion criteria emphasize works that provide clear discussions on symbolic leadership, grassroots mobilization, opinion leadership, and trust-based communication networks. Data is drawn from publications such as *The American Journal of Sociology*, *Political Communication*, and *Journal of Community Psychology*. Analytical rigor is ensured through triangulation of interpretations, comparative synthesis, and attention to historical and cultural variation. As Flick (2009) emphasizes, qualitative literature reviews must not only compile existing knowledge but interpret it reflexively, seeking underlying

assumptions and cross-disciplinary relevance. This methodology thus supports a multidimensional understanding of informal leadership as a social construct embedded within community life.

### C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In many societies, the channels through which public opinion emerges are far from institutional. Beyond media campaigns and official discourse, the communal sphere remains shaped by voices that do not belong to formal authorities (Salkin, 2022). These voices, often emerging organically within neighborhoods, religious groups, or informal associations, hold sway not because of their title but due to the social gravity they command. Their presence exemplifies the latent architecture of influence that persists in daily interactions.

What distinguishes these individuals is not formal training or political appointment, but a history of relational investment. They are often turned to in times of uncertainty, not out of obligation, but from a collective intuition of trustworthiness. Whether they are elders, activists, or cultural stewards, their counsel resonates not due to coercion but credibility. As such, they occupy a liminal space between the private and the public, channeling local sentiment into shared meaning (Cronin, 2018).

Their influence is not merely conversational. In shaping how events are interpreted, whom to trust, and which narratives to prioritize, these figures curate the emotional and symbolic framing of community consciousness. They do not simply transmit information—they translate it. In doing so, they filter institutional messages through moral codes, communal history, and the affective tone of collective memory (Crow & Jones, 2018). Their power is semantic as much as it is relational.

The rise of fragmented media and the erosion of trust in formal governance further elevate the relevance of these actors. When institutions falter in clarity or legitimacy, people often retreat to more proximate sources of coherence. Informal leaders fill this interpretive vacuum, offering frameworks for judgment that align with lived experience. Their authority is thus not reactive, but structurally embedded in social routines and cultural norms (Poletta, 2022).

Furthermore, these individuals often embody the aspirations and anxieties of the groups they represent. Through them, collective identities are reinforced, validated, and sometimes reimaged. This affective alignment

allows them to mobilize sentiment and foster communal action. Whether in times of crisis or celebration, they act as symbolic anchors that stabilize public mood and guide behavioral consensus (Mihaylov & Perkins, 2015).

Given these dynamics, understanding informal leadership is not a peripheral exercise—it is central to grasping how opinions are truly shaped. Their embeddedness in social life renders them crucial actors in the formation of collective awareness. To ignore their influence is to misread the anatomy of civic consciousness at its most intimate level (Venkatesan et al., 2021).

Informal leadership figures significantly influence the formation of public opinion within community settings through various mechanisms. Their impact is rooted in social credibility, cultural embeddedness, and interpersonal resonance, allowing them to act as critical reference points in shaping perceptions and collective responses (Carnabuci et al., 2018).

In many communities, individuals who possess charisma, moral standing, or access to information acquire the capacity to influence how others interpret events or respond to emerging situations. These figures—who may be religious leaders, respected elders, activists, or local entrepreneurs—help mediate between community values and external narratives. They often act as cultural translators, reframing public messages in ways that resonate with local norms, thus contributing to the formation of public sentiment outside formal institutional control (Engelbert et al., 2023).

The relevance of informal leadership becomes even more pronounced in societies where institutional trust is low or where official communication is perceived as disconnected from communal experience. In such circumstances, people often turn to familiar, trusted voices within their immediate social circles for guidance (Schulte et al., 2020). This dynamic makes informal leaders central to the architecture of public opinion, particularly in transitional societies where democratic institutions are still evolving or contested.

In the current age of decentralized information and networked communication, the influence of these figures transcends physical boundaries and permeates digital spaces (Ud Din et al., 2023). Social media platforms have further amplified the visibility and reach of informal leaders, who now engage audiences far beyond their immediate communities

(Glaser, 2016) Understanding their role thus requires an interdisciplinary examination that bridges communication theory, sociology, and political psychology.

Despite their widespread presence, the mechanisms through which informal leaders shape public opinion remain insufficiently clarified. Scholars have pointed to their symbolic capital and proximity to everyday discourse, yet empirical studies remain fragmented and context-dependent (Maton, 2019). This gap in knowledge complicates efforts to map their influence within contemporary civic life, particularly where formal and informal systems coexist and intersect.

Another pressing issue is the methodological difficulty in identifying, categorizing, and evaluating informal leadership across diverse socio-cultural settings. Unlike elected officials or designated representatives, informal leaders do not operate within fixed parameters. Their legitimacy is fluid, contingent on community recognition and situational relevance. This elusiveness complicates efforts to develop generalizable models for assessing their impact, particularly within pluralistic societies (Ayres, 2022).

A further concern involves the ethical and political implications of unaccountable influence. While some informal leaders promote cohesion and positive change, others may reinforce exclusion, misinformation, or parochialism (Marion et al., 2016). The ambiguity surrounding their motivations and affiliations raises questions about transparency, authority, and the boundary between community leadership and populist manipulation (Fenster, 2021). These issues are particularly acute when informal authority shapes political engagement and democratic participation in opaque ways.

Observation of informal leadership is necessary because it highlights the everyday sources of influence that shape collective understanding beyond institutional boundaries. Public discourse does not emerge from policy forums alone; it is cultivated in everyday interactions, shaped by trusted voices embedded within the fabric of daily life (Johansson, 2017). Mapping these voices offers insight into the social infrastructure of democratic deliberation and civic behavior.

Equally, attention must be paid to how these leadership figures adapt to changing media environments. As communities become increasingly hybrid—blending physical and digital spheres—the modes of informal leadership evolve as well. Leaders who once spoke in village meetings now livestream their opinions to

national audiences. This shift raises questions about scalability, accountability, and the nature of influence in a rapidly transforming public sphere (Sullivan et al., 2023).

The migration of community discourse into digital domains has redefined the landscape of informal leadership. No longer confined to geographic proximity, these figures now operate within fluid networks that extend their reach far beyond local borders (Chouliaraki & Georgiou, 2019). This expansion offers new opportunities for visibility but simultaneously introduces complexities surrounding the authenticity of their influence. When leadership becomes performative in digital spaces, the nature of trust must be recalibrated.

As visibility grows, so too does scrutiny. Leaders once protected by the intimacy of face-to-face settings must now contend with an audience that is dispersed, critical, and algorithmically fragmented. Public accountability is no longer moderated by shared values alone but by the shifting logics of virality and platform governance (Schmidt & Van Dellen, 2022). This transformation affects how credibility is constructed and contested in public consciousness.

Digital affordances may enhance the reach of informal leaders, yet they also expose them to strategic co-option by political and commercial interests. When influence is monetized or weaponized, the organic legitimacy they once held may be diluted (Ryan et al., 2022). This introduces a paradox: as these figures gain broader access, their independence and relational purity may be undermined. Influence becomes a commodity, susceptible to manipulation.

The structural conditions of the networked public further complicate these shifts. In digital spaces, audiences are no longer passive recipients but active participants in shaping reputation and discourse. Informal leaders are continuously evaluated, sometimes amplified, and at other times discredited through collective judgment (Marion et al., 2016). The pace and volatility of this feedback loop challenge their ability to maintain a consistent public persona.

Moreover, the hybridization of community spaces blurs the distinction between personal and collective representation. When informal leaders speak, are they articulating their own convictions, or performing an aggregated voice on behalf of a dispersed constituency? The pressures of alignment and coherence across platforms require new forms of self-regulation and rhetorical strategy. This navigational demand reshapes not only message delivery but the very constitution of leadership.



Ultimately, informal leadership in contemporary society is characterized by its fluid boundaries, relational adaptability, and communicative agility. These figures remain vital in translating collective sentiment into public meaning, yet their roles are increasingly mediated by tools that both empower and constrain. Recognizing the evolving terrain on which they operate is essential for understanding the future of civic formation in both grounded and digitized communities.

#### D. CONCLUSION

Informal leadership figures hold a powerful, albeit often unregulated, position within the social ecosystems of communities. Through personal credibility, cultural resonance, and embedded networks, they shape how public opinion forms, circulates, and crystallizes. The findings underscore that their influence is not accidental but systematically situated within the everyday structures of trust, information access, and interpersonal proximity. Their role continues to evolve in response to the digitalization of civic discourse, demanding scholarly attention that moves beyond institutional analysis alone.

The implications of these findings stretch across several academic and practical domains. For sociologists, they challenge conventional frameworks of authority by foregrounding the latent, relational dimensions of leadership. For policymakers and civic designers, they highlight the importance of accounting for these informal channels when crafting communication strategies, interventions, or democratic reforms. Ignoring them risks misreading the true engines of collective sentiment and community response in both local and digital spheres.

Based on this study, it is recommended that future research pursue more granular, ethnographic, and comparative inquiries into the formation of trust and legitimacy among informal leaders. There is also a need for interdisciplinary frameworks that integrate sociological theory, communication studies, and political analysis. Only with such multidimensional insight can societies better understand how to engage, support, or critically assess the informal mechanisms that shape public life.

#### REFERENCES

- Al Hakim, Y. R., D. S. Sagita, & M. Irfan. 2022. Leadership Influence in Shaping Responsive Organizational Culture in the Face of Ongoing Change, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 207 – 212.
- Ayres, S. 2022. A Decentred Assessment of the Impact of 'Informal Governance' on Democratic Legitimacy. *Public Policy and Administration*, 37(1), 22-45.
- Bennett, D. L., C. Boudreaux, & B. Nikolaev. 2023. Populist Discourse and Entrepreneurship: The Role of Political Ideology and Institutions. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 54(1), 151-181.
- Berger, P. L. & T. Luckmann. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Anchor Books, Garden City, New York.
- Bherer, L., P. Dufour, & F. Montambeault. 2023. What Is Informal Participation?: Introduction to the Special Issue: Quietly Standing Out: Understanding Informal Forms of Political Engagement. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 36(1), 1–16.
- Boulianne, S. 2015. Social Media Use and Participation: A Meta-Analysis of Current Research. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524-538.
- Carnabuci, G., C. Emery, & D. Brinberg. 2018. Emergent Leadership Structures in Informal Groups: A Dynamic, Cognitively Informed Network Model. *Organization Science*, 29(1), 118-133.
- Chouliaraki, L. & M. Georgiou. 2019. The Digital Border: Mobility Beyond Territorial and Symbolic Divides. *European Journal of Communication*, 34(6), 594-605.
- Crow, D. & M. Jones. 2018. Narratives as Tools for Influencing Policy Change. *Policy & Politics*, 46(2), 217-234.
- Engelbert, L. H., M. van Elk, M. Kandrik, J. Theeuwes, & M. van Vugt. 2023. The Effect of Charismatic Leaders on Followers' Memory, Error Detection, Persuasion and Prosocial Behavior: A Cognitive Science Approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 34(3), 101656.
- Fenster, M. 2020. Populism and Transparency: The Political Core of an Administrative Norm. *U. Cin. L. Rev.*, 89, 286-343.
- Flick, U. 2009. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, London.
- Fung, A. 2015. Putting the Public Back into Governance: The Challenges of Citizen Participation and Its Future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 513-522.
- Glaser, J. E. 2016. *Conversational Intelligence: How Great Leaders Build Trust and Get Extraordinary Results*. Routledge, New York.

- Harnois, Y. G. & S. Gagnon. 2022. Fighting Corruption in International Development: A Grounded Theory of Managing Projects Within a Complex Socio-Cultural Context. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 19(5), 677-712.
- Heavey, C., Z. Simsek, C. Kyprianou, & M. Risius. 2020. How Do Strategic Leaders Engage With Social Media? A Theoretical Framework for Research and Practice. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(8), 1490-1527.
- Hendriks, C. M. & J. Lees-Marshment. 2019. Political Leaders and Public Engagement: The Hidden World of Informal Elite-Citizen Interaction. *Political Studies*, 67(3), 597-617.
- Irfan, M. & A. R. Putra. 2021. Leadership Approaches to Preserving Quality of Services and Products Amid Organizational Uncertainty, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 273 – 278.
- Johansson, M. 2017. Everyday Opinions in News Discussion Forums: Public Vernacular Discourse. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 19, 5-12.
- Katz, E. & P. F. Lazarsfeld. 1955. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. Free Press, Glencoe, IL.
- Li, Y. 2016. Measuring Social Capital: Formal and Informal Activism, Its Socio-Demographic Determinants and Socio-Political Impacts. In *Social Measurement Through Social Surveys* (pp. 173-194). Routledge, London.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan, D. 2022. Situational Leadership Strategies to Improve Change Management and Team Performance, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 247 – 252.
- Marion, R., J. Christiansen, H. W. Klar, C. Schreiber, & M. A. Erdener. 2016. Informal Leadership, Interaction, Cliques and Productive Capacity in Organizations: A Collectivist Analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(2), 242-260.
- Maton, K. 2019. Semantics From Legitimation Code Theory: How Context-Dependence and Complexity Shape Academic Discourse. *Academic Discourse: Systemic Functional Linguistics and Legitimation Code Theory*. Routledge, London.
- Mihaylov, N. L. & D. D. Perkins. 2015. Local Environmental Grassroots Activism: Contributions from Environmental Psychology, Sociology and Politics. *Behavioral Sciences*, 5(1), 121-153.
- Polletta, F. 2022. Personal Storytelling in Social Movements. In *The Routledge Companion to Narrative Theory* (pp. 104-116). Routledge, New York.
- Potluka, O. 2021. Roles of Formal and Informal Leadership: Civil Society Leadership Interaction with Political Leadership in Local Development. In *Handbook on City and Regional Leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.
- Putnam, R. D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Rogers, E. M. 2003. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 5 th Edition. Free Press, New York.
- Ryan, S., I. Conway, & K. Cassedy. 2022. The Commercialization of Influence Operations. In *The Great Power Competition Volume 3: Cyberspace: The Fifth Domain* (pp. 167-195). Springer International Publishing, Cham.
- Salkin, W. 2022. Democracy Within, Justice Without: The Duties of Informal Political Representatives 1. *Noûs*, 56(4), 940-971.
- Schmidt, G. B. & S. A. Van Dellen. 2022. Leadership of Place in Virtual Environments. *Leadership*, 18(1), 186-202.
- Schulte, B., F. Andresen, & H. Koller. 2020. Exploring the Embeddedness of an Informal Community of Practice Within a Formal Organizational Context: A Case Study in the German Military. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 27(2), 153-179.
- Silverman, D. 2006. *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Sullivan, J., Y. Zhao, & W. Wang. 2023. China's Livestreaming Local Officials: An Experiment in Popular Digital Communications. *The China Quarterly*, 256, 1036-1052.
- Tönnies, F. 2001. *Community and Civil Society*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Tur, B., J. Harstad, & J. Antonakis. 2022. Effect of Charismatic Signaling in Social Media Settings: Evidence from TED and Twitter. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(5), 101476.
- Ud Din, I., K. A. Awan, A. Almogren, & J. J. Rodrigues. 2023. Integration of IoT and Blockchain for Decentralized Management and Ownership in the Metaverse. *International Journal of Communication Systems*, 36(18), 1-35.
- Venkatesan, S., R. Valecha, N. Yaraghi, O. Oh, & H. R. Rao. 2021. Influence in Social Media: An Investigation of Tweets Spanning the 2011 Egyptian Revolution. *MIS Quarterly*, 45(4).

Yin, R. K. 2003. Case Study Research: Design and Methods (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.