From command and control to self-confidence in government: meeting the challenge in Doncaster

Clare Batty and John Hilton

Abstract

This article compares some themes of change management theory against the practical experience of a large UK local authority as it attempts to move from 'command and control' leadership to a more assertive, self-confident style of local government. This move is a response both to changing national legislation and local demand arising from a significant corruption scandal. The concept of 'command and control' management is compared with that of self-confidence within the context of organizing for government, both central and local. The nature of self-confident government is then examined more closely in an attempt to answer some central questions — what is self-confidence, what sustains it and what benefits does it offer? These questions are then considered against the practical experience of a large metropolitan authority in England. The local pressures for organizational and cultural change, including those arising out of recent municipal corruption, are discussed along with the developing local responses. The article then considers the change issues that are arising for local service managers and the role of developing self-confidence in adapting and expanding their capabilities into the future. Some key learning points are identified.

For centuries, and across the world, people have sought better ways to organize together in order to achieve more efficiently, effectively and economically aims and objectives that they have identified as being for their common good. This has been particularly true when groups of people have faced changes over which they felt little, or no, control. In this context, 'the organization' has existed in many respects essentially to seek and to provide mutual protection and advantage. Early in the 20th century, perhaps as a result of the often-bewildering changes arising out of the growth of western society based upon mass production and industrialization, the study of this phenomenon assumed the status of an academic discipline in its own right. No longer seen simply as interesting elements of history or politics, 'management and organization studies' had arrived.

Clare Batty and John Hilton work in the Community Development Unit, within The Directorate of Borough Strategy and Development, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, South Yorkshire, United Kingdom. Clare Batty is Senior Policy Development Officer and John Hilton is Head of Community Development. The views expressed throughout this article are those of the authors and not Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council. CDU: 35.06.

The early work of Taylor (1911) and Fayol (1916) was subsequently built upon by such penetrating observations as those provided by McGregor (1960), Handy (1981), Peters and Waterman (1982) and Drucker (1992), with each breaking new ground and re-working the old to produce successively complex insights into the behaviour of people and organizations, particularly those trying to cope with changing commercial and industrial environments. Reflecting the economic roots from which it had sprung, the great majority of the work focused upon the commercial need to derive greater efficiency and economy from organizations. With the passage of time and the development of the literature, there has been an increasing trend to condemn as repressive and counter-productive the 'us and them' models of authoritarian manager versus reluctant workers. At the same time, there has been rising praise for more collaborative, team-focused approaches. As Margaret Wheatley (1997) asserts, 'we have known for nearly half a century that self-managed teams are far more productive than any other form of organizing'.

Yet, for all these years of in-depth theoretical study and practical casework, many of the more recent contributors to the debate have pointed to evidence that suggests that the theory is a long way from matching what is claimed to be the norm in terms of actual day-to-day organizational practice. Despite being almost universally condemned in the literature of business studies, it appears that in the workplace old managerial habits continue to prevail. This is particularly worrying when, in recent decades, it has become obvious that much of the substance of management is *about* adapting to continuous and accelerating change. Surely, it is now universally recognized that organizational change, deriving from whatever cause, cannot be seen as a finite inconvenience to be endured until it is over.

On this specific point, Christensen (2001) has described as 'scary' the fact that the pace of change is accelerating dramatically, while the track records of most managers suggest that they could not even cope with it before. Even in her largely optimistic article 'Goodbye, Command and Control', Wheatley (1997) opens with the observation that, despite the overwhelming evidence of a radically changing world, 'we cling to what has worked in the past', still thinking of organizations in mechanistic terms, capable of being re-engineered — a scientific approach that looks back to Taylor's Scientific Management theories of the early 20th century.

Senge (1998) goes still further, asserting that McGregor's Theory X, one of the classic models of control and command and one which Senge paraphrases as seeing 'employees as unreliable and uncommitted, chasing a paycheck', 'is still the prevailing philosophy in most large institutions — certainly in the American corporate world'. He goes on to observe: 'if we look honestly at how organizations manage people, most appear to operate with the belief that people cannot work without careful supervision'. Consequently, he writes, we still view people simply as human resources (perhaps significantly, this is a term currently finding renewed favour in UK management vocabulary) to be employed or 'released' at the will of the organization. Many organizations within developing countries will

recognize this as an attitude still prevalent in the approaches adopted by many of the major donor institutions, whether commercial or governmental. The stance of MacGregor et al. (1998) is perhaps typical of this identification of employees simply as an element for 'downsizing' if economic pressures demand. Even while proposing enthusiastically the attractions of the self-confident organization as the model of the future, the very recent work of Pringle and Gordon (2001: 291) also begins from an acknowledgement that 'management by fear is still the norm in most organizations as it is the easiest and often the most comfortable way to manage'.

In the face of this stubbornly enduring, fear-based organizational environment, what realistic chance is there for the sustainable development of the relative newcomer to the scene, the so-called self-confident organization? Most English-language dictionary definitions of 'confidence' include a mention of concepts around certainty, reliability and trust. For Pringle and Gordon, it is this latter ingredient, trust, that is the key to building the self-confident organization, which is one that has moved away from repressive authoritarianism, but stops short of total laissez faire.

Structures, rules and lines of authority continue essentially to exist but are clearly articulated, reasoned and prioritized, thereby enabling the organization's operational experience to be one about which all participants feel positive. So, self-confident management offers, its proponents assert, very clear advantages. It is notable, however, that this 21st century model still retains a central role for the chief executive officer as the singular arbiter of the core values of the organization. Pringle and Gordon note, with approval, that few successful organizations have chosen to divide the leadership role; and they also express concern that the pendulum may swing too far *away* from the authoritarian models. Even within the 'participative employee environment' of the self-confident organization, management sets the agenda and 'employees fully understand the parameters within which they operate and can trust their employers to stand by these criteria' (Pringle and Gordon, 2001: 33–34). While urging the move away from fear-based command and control, their self-confident model is no egalitarian utopia.

It is perhaps this element — this continuing echo of earlier management theories — which gives a clue to the future. What is needed is perhaps not so much a full transition from command and control to self-confidence, an abandonment of the one for the other, but rather a synthesis of the two, with trust as the catalyst. If this proposition is accepted, then the real challenge for the organizations of today and tomorrow is equipping their managers *and* their front-line teams with the right tools for each task and the cultural environment in which to develop the skills and the capabilities appropriate to the challenges but without the fear associated with past cultures. Rather than Handy's lone, isolated chief executive who, trusting no one, does indeed become arbitrary and authoritarian, we should be seeking to establish coalitions, where the existence of trust and self-confidence in the teams allows for the emergence of a single decision-maker when it is

appropriate. Belbin's (1981) 'team leaders' would, by consent, become 'solo leaders' when the times were right.

So far, the focus of this article has been upon management theory and practice that has its heart and mind very much within private sector practice and experience. In this respect, it is a reflection of where the mass of academic writing and study continues to focus and it is only relatively recently that the study of public sector organizations and management has entered the literature of business studies. It can hardly be a coincidence that this development gathered pace in the United Kingdom during the late 1970s, when central government itself became much more prepared to consider public administration and management as being as much open to competitive 'market forces' as any commercial enterprise had ever been. This drastic change of policy direction was accompanied by a fiercely critical attitude towards the more local layers of government and began a period of almost 20 years of legislation designed to impose irreversible changes on local government and, in the view of many observers, to undermine its democratic legitimacy. During 1984–85, the violent confrontation between national government agencies and the National Union of Mineworkers was seen by many as another manifestation of a growing centralization of institutional control.

In many respects, this is a trend that went beyond the United Kingdom — similar developments were experienced in Australia and New Zealand during this time. The consequent conflict and internal heart-searching saw the growth of the concept of local *governance*, rather than government, and a move away from the earlier rigid structures and procedures to the fragmentation in the form of issue-based parties and pressure groups identified by Andrew and Goldsmith (1998: 101–17), amongst others. Governance, now open to many interpretations, is here seen as the organization of local public life by a range of community-level bodies, led by the elected local authority. One result of this turbulent period was the significant strengthening of government, both central and local, as a legitimate subject of academic theory alongside business in the literature and study of management and organizations.

It can be argued that, here too, there developed tensions between the authoritarian approach of the centre and the perceived laissez faire approach at the local level — between central and local direction, on the one hand, and democratic participation at the community level, on the other. And, as with the private sector studies, the debate continues within the literature on government. Currently in the United Kingdom there is a good deal of deliberation, some of it quite heated, around the prime ministerial style of Tony Blair. He is seen by some critics as simultaneously preaching to others the virtues of partnership, teamwork and of devolved management, whilst personally practising many of the techniques more often associated with, and expected from, McGregor's Theory X manager.

It seems now that in recent years the notion of governance, as outlined earlier, may have begun to lose its prominence and, whilst it remains relevant when considered in the context of local problem-solving, it is beginning to be challenged by a resurgence of support for the importance of national government. Although

the fragmentation of public administration may be seen as a response to the more de-humanizing aspects of globalization, paradoxically the apparent rise of public support for the more centralized national government also comes from the excesses and tragedies of globalization. Electorates which have demanded more local autonomy, participation and choice in order to bring a human face to their individual experiences of government see no apparent contradiction in calling for national and international action against, for instance, environmental degradation and acts of global terrorism. Should this also be interpreted in terms of the swinging of the pendulum, this time towards the authoritarian style of management? Not necessarily, for in the UK at least, central government calls for more and more management at local neighbourhood level whilst simultaneously seeking a place on the world stage alongside the United States. Again, this can be seen in terms of choosing the right tools for the job, equipping managers and organizations with the skills and capacity to adapt to challenges as they arise, on whatever scale and whether local, national or global. Inevitably, this again involves the building of trust, that 'key to self-confidence', on an unprecedented scale.

It is a common observation that local government in the United Kingdom has been undergoing rapid and large-scale change for more than 25 years. This is no less true elsewhere in the world, where such changes have often occurred against the backcloth of quite massive social, environmental and economic upheaval. Whilst the root causes may differ widely across the world, the fact that change is not only with us but is going to remain with us, will be readily recognized by any local government practitioner. Change management in large organizations is complex, going beyond relatively straightforward structural changes to encompass the more vital transitions in culture that can be sustained, rather than slipping back to the old ways. Kanter (1999) has noted that many change processes fail to become embedded because they require the ongoing efforts of people throughout the organization. For Christensen (2001), the focus must be upon the capacity of the entire organization to adapt its resources (the easiest), processes (harder) and core values (the hardest) to the demands of the changing world around it.

If the same analytical techniques used for the study of business organizations are now seen as appropriate to the public sector, is there anything to suggest that attempts to embed more open and participatory models — in a search for more self-confident management — will be any more successful in government than in business? Evidence points to the scale of the task in hand. The upper tiers of local government organizational structures tend to be dominated by a number of professions — and professionals, Scott (1995: x) has warned, seek cognitive, normative and regulatory control for themselves. They look not only to exercise control over the conditions of work, but also to define its very nature. Professionals, he has said, 'attempt to employ their power to shape the institutional frameworks supporting their activities in the broadest possible terms'. O'Donovan (1994: 39–53) is generally much more optimistic but points to the need for local government managers to begin to understand group dynamics in the future — no simple

undertaking, especially for those who remain driven primarily by the need to deliver day-to-day public services.

Overall, this does not appear to be an encouraging picture, for, alongside its professional officers, local government is essentially dependant for its democratic legitimacy upon leadership from elected, and therefore often 'amateur', councillors. In the UK, greater participation is demanded for local communities and most community development practitioners are themselves not recognized as possessing mainstream 'professional' skills in terms that are acceptable to many senior colleagues.

This article has been, so far, an outline of the theoretical background to the managerial and organizational challenges currently facing government, particularly at the local level, in very many communities and in very many different settings. Whether coming from central governments, funding institutions or from the communities themselves, the demand for greater participation by local people has become identified as the key to the future of local democracies across the world. If governments, whether local or central, are to continue their hold upon the moral high ground of democratic legitimacy, they must surely seek to adapt to these aspects of change management with more success than observers have so far claimed for their commercial counterparts.

It has been argued previously that what may be needed is not so much a total abandonment of command and control in favour of self-confident management but rather a development of self-confidence, based fundamentally upon levels of trust that allow the selection of the appropriate management techniques for each organizational challenge. In order to test this proposition, we now turn to examine some of the practical lessons being learned in Doncaster, a metropolitan local authority in the United Kingdom, where command and control was for so long 'the only game in town' and where self-confidence and trust have only recently begun to emerge as major elements in local community development. Gillespie et al. (1996) have warned, however, of the importance of taking account of the complex matrix of cultural, social, economic and political relationships that form the context within which development programmes must succeed or fail. If we are to heed that warning, before describing the dramatic organizational challenges that are taking place in Doncaster it is essential first to sketch briefly an outline of this 'matrix' as it relates to change management for the local authority.

In terms of local government in England and Wales, Doncaster Council is a unitary authority[1] and, geographically, the largest of the Metropolitan Boroughs, covering an area of 58,000 hectares. The Borough has a population of around 300,000 most of which, outside Doncaster town itself, is concentrated into a number of relatively small, urban pockets based around traditional, once thriving, coal-mining communities. After decades of employment dependent upon the now largely defunct coal and steel industries, the common image of the Borough is one of an unrelenting landscape of abandoned coal mines, un-reclaimed spoil heaps and general dereliction.

In many respects, however, the reality is very different. The 'urban pockets' are

set within an agricultural landscape that constitutes more than 60 percent of the Borough and contains a number of historical sites that are of national significance and a racecourse that hosts the oldest classic horse race in the world. The rail and road systems facilitate excellent connections in all directions and there is a strong chance that Doncaster may soon establish an international airport. Significantly, this former industrial heartland is looking to become an example of how to turn economic decline into stunning success.

So the Doncaster of today is very much at a crossroads, for the virtual disappearance of the traditional employing industrial base has taken a heavy toll in terms of social deprivation. Unemployment is high, particularly long-term unemployment amongst older men. A total of 11 of Doncaster's 21 Wards,[2] containing virtually one-half of the total population of the Borough, are defined as being within the 10 percent generally most deprived in England. As a consequence of this, local people often have low self-esteem, educational attainment is poor and levels of crime relatively high. With 14,500 staff, the Council is now the largest employer in the Borough.

Established in 1974, Doncaster Council, in common with most local government throughout the country, tended to adopt a very traditional approach to service delivery. Any innovation and strategic planning tended to be very much on the periphery and community involvement and participation was tested in only small areas of development and not in terms of influencing mainstream service delivery. Service departments acted as independently of one another as they could and, in terms of both elected and professional leadership, a 'command and control' culture was very much in evidence. The near-total domination of one political group played an important part in maintaining this position. Even within this very restrictive environment, however, by the mid 1990s it was possible to identify 'champions for change' both at a political and officer level.

In the wake of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the Council's early work on Local Agenda 21[3] saw professional officers and elected councillors working closely as colleagues and beginning to engage with local citizens on quality of life issues. This experience of joint working between Council departments, officers and councillors was to become an important developmental process for all involved, particularly during the early stages when important lessons were learned and principles established for the future. A key outcome from this early work was the embryo of what was to become known later as the 'Doncaster Model' for partnership working, forming the heart of Community Action in the late 1990s and coming to fruition in 2001 with the formal development of Doncaster's Local Strategic Partnership. By working in this way, officers also became more aware of the impact of decisions beyond their own professional boundaries and the differing demands upon officers and members became more clearly understood by all concerned. Doncaster began to experience real change, with authoritarian professionals beginning to yield control under pressure from the dynamics of group working.

This early promise of cultural change was soon to be put to very severe test

when, even as the green shoots of Local Agenda 21 developments were beginning to flourish, the Council entered the bleakest period in its history. Years of command and control had nourished some small pockets of greed and arrogance in a small number of councillors and officers. Within the context of UK local government, Doncaster's name became associated with fraud and corruption in cases that were to make headlines for local and national media over many months. Whilst the continuing high standards of public service delivery were never in question, the attention and energies of many senior professional and elected managers were diverted by an extensive internal inquiry, in addition to investigations by police and the District Auditor. The turmoil of investigation, accusation and prosecution, which was to last until 2001, led many to doubt the ability of the Council, in terms of management and organizational capacity, to sustain the cultural transition that it had begun.

These fears were to prove unfounded, however, for the consequent changes of political and professional leadership had brought people into positions of power who were eager to introduce new ideas and attitudes. Corporately, the Council had suffered severely in terms of a loss of self-confidence and of public trust and was in no position to resist widespread demands for change. It was clear that Doncaster's response would be closely scrutinized by all who had an interest in local government.

Hardly pausing for breath, and whilst criminal investigations were still ongoing, the Council embarked upon an intense and ambitious phase of Strategic Planning. Initially adopting the 'Agenda for Change' brand, this was based upon a recognition of, and firm commitment to, the urgent need to change the way the Council operated, in terms both of its internal management and, most importantly, its relationship with its customers, the people of the Borough. In both spheres, confidence and trust had been severely shaken and, as Pringle and Gordon (2001: 130) observe, countless surveys show that 'the vast majority of citizens want companies and people to be trustworthy'. Refreshingly, the new Council leadership made clear its desire to strongly re-emphasize Community Development policies and, in so doing, acknowledged the potential of integrating it with the Local Agenda 21 focus upon environmental, social and economic factors as the driver for delivering the necessarily far-reaching programme needed.

In order to maximize the potential for success, and to avoid duplication of effort, it was decided that the processes of Community Development and Local Agenda 21 could and should be merged. Early in 1998, councillors endorsed a report that proposed an ambitious programme of policy development under the banner of Community Action. Fundamentally Community Action is the recognition of the principle that local problems need local solutions, identified and acted upon through a partnership approach at all levels. At this time a new Council Committee was established to ensure political support and an appropriate policy-making structure and to send strong messages to internal and external audiences regarding the level of commitment to the chosen direction. It was fortuitous that this strong local impetus for community development as the vehicle through

which to deliver change coincided with the declared ambitions of a newly elected central government, which began to tie its funding programmes closely to evidence of greater participation at local community level.

The drive towards more meaningful participation and engagement with local communities began with the development of seven Community Action Forums (CAF) which, by 1999, covered the whole geographical area of the Borough. Each CAF now has a significant budget allocation to support local projects that contribute to achieving quality of life improvements in their areas, and each is supported by a cross-disciplinary team of officers drawn from the most senior tiers of the Council's structure. Each area also has a dedicated senior officer working on a day-to-day basis linking the local communities to the Council and to other public sector agencies. The basic philosophy of this officer support structure is that they form a partnership for the communities, rather than engaging specifically in the decision-making process. Similarly, councillors use their local knowledge and experience to advise and shape local forums and have no right of direct participation in the form of voting.

By 2000, the lessons being learned from experience with Community Action suggested that command and control had given way to a model approaching that which we would now recognize under the name of 'self-confident government'. Initially, deep levels of mistrust were expressed by citizens with regard to the Council's new approach, partly in the context of the continuing investigation into corruption and partly originating from their experience of the way in which the Council had historically conducted its business. During the earliest stages, the most frequently asked question to Council officers and members was: 'This will not last, will it?'. In some respects, a similar mistrust had also been displayed by some Council representatives who, with Community Action, were being asked to work in very unfamiliar ways. Both problems were diminished by officers and councillors attending meetings on a regular basis, discussing issues and achieving real outcomes of local relevance and value — an interesting variation on Peters' 'Management by Walking About'. The Council remained firm in its intention to adopt a supportive rather than a directive role and it was made clear to all participants, whether from communities or the Council, that the high level of support would be sustained even when the leadership of the CAFs was taken over by the communities themselves. There could and would be no going back to the extremes of the past.

Whilst these lessons and this progress were indeed very significant, to interpret what was happening as a cultural transition from command and control to self-confidence is far too simplistic. In some CAF areas, there have been strong moves towards quite formal structures, elections and written constitutions; in some it is the community representatives who have shown a preference for authoritarian working methods, posing challenges for the Council's preferred management models. Paradoxically, other communities have rejected the early blank page approach and press for the Council to adopt a more directive stance. Some Council officers have embraced the new group working methods with enthusiasm, whilst

others would prefer to concentrate upon their more familiar and traditional professional duties. Onerous as the burdens of delivering everyday council services can be, they are at least disciplines and skills that have been learned over years. The constantly changing and challenging environment of community development and participation is alien territory and not one into which all would venture by choice.

These organizational and cultural contradictions have been brought into sharper focus by the enactment of the Local Government Act 2000, bringing with it the duty for each local authority to prepare a Community Plan. Whilst retaining, even enhancing still further, the principles of community participation and development, there are deadlines to meet and structures to be put in place. The Council has the lead responsibility in establishing a Local Strategic Partnership to work with communities and with other service delivery agents to establish a strategy that will bring about real improvements in the quality of local lives, together with a monitoring framework to measure success. In this regard, the real challenge for the Council has been to balance the demand for tangible progress towards fulfilling its responsibility to the clear legislative programme of the central government against the need to send clear messages to its local partners that they would work together over time to arrive at a strategy that would serve the needs of the citizens of the Borough. Within that context, there remains the pressing need to resolve the contradictions of organizational change management that have arisen from the implementation of the Community Action initiative.

In 2002, the Council fulfilled its immediate role within the context of the Local Strategic Partnership by launching the Borough Strategy — Doncaster's Community Plan. This was not only a very significant event in its own right but also one that represented a major landmark in its journey out of the mistakes of the command and control management style of earlier years. Much remains to be done but the lessons learned so far have facilitated some important shifts locally in theory and practice.

Perhaps the first important lesson has been the realization that there will be no straightforward transition to establishing a culture of self-confident government. We have recognized that, in the complex and continuously evolving world of change management, organizations must seek to build the capacity to choose the right approach for the task in hand. In some situations, the Council needs to demonstrate clear leadership. In others, it must recognize that others have that role. In still other situations, genuine partnership approaches are appropriate. The essential foundation for creating the organizational capacity necessary to enable managers to thrive within this volatile environment must be the establishment of trust which is truly the key to eventual self-confidence. The Council is learning to trust in itself and in its partners and, in so doing, is proving itself trustworthy to others.

We have promoted trust by opening up our structures and procedures to internal and external scrutiny. The most senior managers have abandoned their bureaucratic anonymity and are increasingly accessible to partner agencies and commu-

nities. There is far greater clarity and consistency in the messages that we send to others and a demonstrable willingness to listen to, and act upon, those that we receive in return. In consultation with others, Doncaster Council has established clear organizational values and goals — its vision of the Borough's future is expressed in terms of improving the quality of life for its residents. In summary, our first key learning points have been as follows.

- Take time building trust and capacity.
- Be prepared to use varied approaches.
- Be open and transparent.
- Be accessible.
- Send consistent messages.
- Listen to, and act upon, messages received.

In five years' time, when progress towards meeting the key targets of the Borough Strategy will be reviewed, the Council will be able to judge, and be judged by, its success. In terms of the specific targets, its performance will be measured against a series of national and local indicators. Just as important, but more difficult to audit, will be the assessment of how much has been achieved in building trust and in moving from command and control to more self-confident government.

Notes

1. A unitary authority is a local government body that carries out all the local government functions of the area; it is a single-tier system, rather than having distinct county and district councils.

2. A ward is the name used in the UK to refer to the geographical electoral divisions of the local authority which split the area up, each ward having one or more councillors elected to represent that area.

3. Local Agenda 21 was a chapter in the agreement signed by world leaders at the environmental summit meeting in 1992. It recognized a leading role for local authorities in achieving environmental improvements at local level. In many ways, it has been overtaken in the UK by the recognition of the importance of sustainable development to improve the quality of life. This goes beyond concerns for the natural environment to include also social and economic well-being.

References

Andrew, C. and Goldsmith, M. (1998) 'From Local Government to Local Governance — and Beyond?', *International Political Science Review* 19(2): 101–17.

Belbin, M. (1981) *Management Teams: Why They Succeed or Fail*. London: Butterworth Heinemann.

Christensen, C.M. (2001) 'Assessing Your Organization's Innovation Capabilities', *Leader to Leader* 21(Summer). Available at www.drucker.org/leaderbooks/l2l/summer2001/christensen.html

Drucker, P.F. (1992) *Managing for the Future*. London: Heinemann.

Fayol, H. (1916) *Administration Industrielle et Générale: prévoyance, organization, commandement, coordination, contrôle*. Paris: Dunod.

Gillespie, P., Girgis, M. and Mayer, P. (1996) '"This Great Evil": Anticipating Political Obstacles to Development', *Public Administration and Development* 16(5): 431–53.

Handy, C.B. (1981) *Understanding Organizations*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Kanter, R.M. (1999) 'The Enduring Skills of Change Leaders', *Leader to Leader* 13(Summer). Available at www.drucker.org/leaderbooks/l2l/summer1999/kanter.html

MacGregor, J., Peterson, S. and Schuftan, C. (1998) 'Downsizing the Civil Service', *Public Administration and Development* 18: 61–76.

McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. London: McGraw-Hill.

O'Donovan, I. (1994) *Organizational Behaviour in Local Government*, Managing Local Government Series. Harlow: Longman.

Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H. Jr (1982) *In Search of Excellence*. New York: Harper and Row.

Pringle, H. and Gordon, W. (2001) *Brand Manners*. Chichester: Wiley.

Scott, R.S. (1995) *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Senge, P.M. (1998) 'The Practice of Innovation', *Leader to Leader* 9(Summer). Available at www.drucker.org/leaderbooks/l2l/summer1998/senge.html

Taylor, F.W. (1911) *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper.

Wheatley, M. (1997) 'Goodbye, Command and Control', *Leader to Leader* 5(Summer). Available at www.drucker.org/leaderbooks/l2l/summer1997/wheatley.html