Title: Co-creating public service leadership development in a new era of collaboration.

Author: Rob Worrall,
National School of Government, UK and Ashcroft International Business School, Anglian Ruskin University, UK

Abstract

The UK Government's policy report (Cabinet Office, 2008) entitled "Excellence and Fairness in Public Services", sets out the new phase of reform which should enable public services to go from "good to great" focused on the needs of service users and citizens, who are empowered to express their needs and make informed choices, rather than around traditional professional structures of service provider hierarchies and organisational boundaries or "*….moving to Dynamic capability – becoming more creative and more capably handling the wicked problems of leadership rather than working in the old familiar ways*" (Clark cited in Public Servant (Thomas, 2008)).

However, recent departmental capability reviews across the UK government (Barwise *et al. 2007)* identified improving leadership within the UK civil service, as key to achieving "world class" public services (Cabinet Office, 2008). In addition, Sutherland and Ley (2009), who interviewed senior civil servants responsible for leading the delivery of the UK government's strategic objectives, clearly identified the need to improve the quality of, and the skills required for, effective collaboration across the public service as one of their key challenges.

In a new era of collaboration, public service leaders in the 21st century need to be able to work collaboratively across the whole public service system horizontally across organisational and sector boundaries, but also vertically across national, regional and local levels of governance (Seddon, 2008; Benington and Hartley, 2009). This will need to use traditional skills such as diplomat and specialist, but also move "*towards using post conventional action logics (mindsets) such as individualist, strategist and alchemist, stepping beyond their existing frameworks into new and more integrative and inclusive action logics*" (Mead, 2009). This provides a significant challenge to both public services and to their respective leadership academies.

Such an alliance of sector based public service leadership academies is attempting to model

collaborative working across organisational and sector boundaries, to co-create and deliver a new leadership development initiative. This collaboration builds public service leaders capacity to work collaboratively across the whole public service system to improve outcomes for individuals, citizens and communities of place and interest.

This working paper sets out an emerging approach for exploring two key issues arising from this work. Firstly, the challenges faced by the leaders of a disparate group of organisations, working within different business models, seeking to work together to create better public service leaders capable of responding to intractable, interdependent, socio-economic problems or "wicked issues" (Grint, 2008; Thomas, 2008).   Secondly, whether in developing their new collaborative leadership initiative, the alliance is able to resist being drawn back into institutional silos and into delivering old models of leadership "*teaching the right answers instead of co-creating new knowledge and theory about how to effectively lead across the public service system* (Mead, 2008).

This exploratory research will seek to build theory from observation and interpretation of people's experiences (Yin, 2003). It will use the development of the leadership initiative by the alliance as a case study, using quantitative as well as qualitative methods in a mixed methodology approach also known as the "pragmatic paradigm" (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998).

Key words: Leadership, collaboration, public services, wicked issues, co-creation, mixed methodology.

Research Aim and Focus

This exploratory research will examine whether an alliance of public service leadership academies is able to successfully model collaborative working to co-create and deliver a new leadership development initiative.

The research will firstly consider the main challenges faced by the leadership academies as they work together to create better public service leaders capable of responding to intractable, interdependent, socio-economic problems or "wicked issues" (Grint, 2008; Thomas, 2008). And secondly, whether the alliance is able to resist being drawn back into institutional silos '*teaching the right answers…*' and co-create '*new knowledge and theory about how to effectively lead across the public service system*' (Mead, 2008) and new methods of delivering leadership development. As a work in progress, it is hoped that this research will benefit from debate and discussion at the Conference.

Introduction

We are living in an era of paradox - whilst the current economic malaise is ushering in a period of extended and severe financial restraint for public spending, society has turned again to Government to kick-start the economy and to offer support to citizens and businesses. There is "and/and" expectation that inter-agency and inter-departmental collaboration will lead to both more effective and more efficient public services (Worrall, 2009).

UK Government policy has responded to rising expectations by making it clear that it "…*will fight hard to create excellent public services that give people real power over their lives*…" (Cabinet Office, 2008; HMG, 2009). Supposedly heralding a shift away from centralised targets towards improving access to education and healthcare, public transport, housing and other public services by setting out a clear set of "*enforceable rights, entitlements and guarantees…..*

Greater choice and personalisation of services...." (HMG, 2009).

The Government sees its strategic leadership role as outlining what the public expects and enabling public servants to develop the capability, and giving them more autonomy but also greater external accountability and responsibility for "..*handling the wicked problems of leadership*." (Clark, R. quoted in Thomas, 2008). Thus, how leadership is being exercised from policy through to delivery is an important factor in achieving improved outcomes. This requires a focus on understanding and changing two key relationships - between the state and the citizen - and between the centre, in Westminster and Whitehall, and the frontline and an increase in the development of innovative approaches to developing and delivering public services which "*prevent problems in the first place*...." (Byrne, 2009).

A 2007 review of the first generation of the Departmental Capability Reviews (DCRs)(which are essentially performance reviews of UK central government departments) identified a clear need to consider how departments work together on cross cutting issues, which again require improved leadership within the UK civil service (Barwise *et al.*, 2007). Likewise Sutherland & Ley (2009), looking at the challenges faced by senior civil servants responsible for delivering UK Government's strategic policy objectives identified improving collaborative capability as a key imperative. Thus, through the new generation of DCRs, departments will be judged not only on their ability to deliver results but also on "*their capacity for collaboration and innovation*" (Dudman, 2009).

An expansion of leadership development provision through the establishment of sector focused leadership academies has been a key feature of government attempts to support public service improvement. A central government review has made it clear that academies will need to demonstrate that their products and services are both efficient, but also effective, i.e. have an

impact in improving public service outcomes (Cabinet Office, 2009). This would mean designing leadership development interventions better aligned to government objectives (and in particular the public service reform agenda), and more consistent evaluation of the extent to which they lead to public service improvement. Finally, the review criticised an over emphasis (to a greater extent) on individual and team leadership, and to a significant (but lesser) extent on organisational leadership at the expense of improving leadership across sectors (delivering results across sectoral boundaries and through cross sector working) and across systems i.e. leadership of place concluding that "….. *given the current emphasis on cross sector and inter-agency working to deliver outcomes this balance seems inconsistent*" (Cabinet Office, 2009).

One of the review's key recommendations was that an alliance of leadership academies should become more active in the development and delivery of cross sector and whole system leadership development initiatives. Once the developing theoretical perspectives and literature on inter-organisational collaboration have been explored, the challenges faced by the alliance in developing such an initiative will be considered.

Theoretical Perspectives and Interpretations

As was noted by Trist (1985), collaboration enables organisations to tackle complex often "wicked" issues that fall outside the jurisdiction of a single organisation - in terms of both responsibility and remedy (Grint, 2008; Gash, 2009). The numerous terms for collaboration between public service organisations (partnerships, associations, one stop shop, alliance) tend to describe the entities IOEs (Inter-Organizational Entities) which are a product of the joint working as opposed to the 'relations' between the organisations. Popular descriptors include joined up, multi-agency, coordinated and collaborative and names for the act of inter-organizational working include working together, contracting, outsourcing, collaboration and partnering (Cropper *et al.*, 2008).

Inter-Organizational Relations (IOR) research theory was first espoused by Evan (1965). It was built on by Benson (1975) and Metcalfe (1976) who looked at relations among and between multiple organisations. Drawing on theories derived from politics, they introduced the concept of networks and strategy. These IOR roots branched out into a veritable cornucopia of theories and disciplines from fields as diverse as management, organisational development, psychology, economic geography, public administration, law and sociology. This demonstrates that theoretical boundaries are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and that different approaches may learn from and be enriched by other (theoretical) perspectives. By the 1970's, the abundance of the research had become so significant that that a series of literature and research reviews were carried out (Van den Van, 1976; Galaskiewicz, 1985; Oliver, 1990; Barringer and Harrison, 2000 & Galaskiewicz *et al.,* 2004). Fundamentally, the IOR Handbook (Cropper *et al., 2008)* reminds us that what unifies IOR research is that … *in one way or another, it focuses on the properties and overall pattern of relations between and among organisations that are pursuing a mutual interest while also remaining independent and autonomous, thus retaining separate interests".* (Cropper *et al.*, 2008).

The link between IOR research literature, leadership in collaboration and the leadership development review's charge that a greater focus needs to be placed on cross sector and whole system leadership development can perhaps be traced back to Boulding (1956) applying von Berthanlanffy's (1951) general systems theory to a range of social science problems. However, in reality our understanding of what leadership in practice or the act of doing leadership in a collaborative context really means is only starting to emerge (Archer and Wright, 2009).

 Huxham and Vangen (2005) point out that mainstream leadership research which focuses on style, traits or charisma is not appropriate as it *"assumes a formal leader who either influences*

or transforms members of a group or organization".   In the same vein, Benington and Hartley (2009) emphasise the need for the development of leadership theories and models which reflect the complexity of working across sectoral and organizational boundaries, with varied groups and interests.

Leadership in collaboration means influencing beyond individuals to whole organizations and there is often ambiguity in terms of partners and the aims of the collaboration. Huxham and Vangen (2005) suggest that notions of informal and emergent leaders (Hosking, 1988), decentring of leadership (Martin, 1992) and shared leadership (Judge and Ryman, 2001) are more relevant, to which could be added distributed leadership (Bennett *et al.*, 2002) and adaptive leadership (Heifetz, 1994). Researchers' focus on leadership in collaboration has tended to emphasize relational leadership (Murrell, 1997), processes for inspiring, nurturing, supporting and communicating (Crosby and Bryson, 2004; Feyerherm, 1994) and organisations as leaders (Ryan, 2001). Thus delivering collaborative leadership development interventions is about sense making, understanding, committing and learning that it may not always be as explicit as traditional concepts of leadership.

The approach will draw on the work of Huxham and Vangen (2005) who have given meaning to leadership in collaboration by focusing on what *'makes things happen'*. They conceptualise leadership in collaboration through three media - structures, processes and participants, which will be used as framework for recording our observations.   Leadership through participants is the most relevant and challenging to the role the author plays within the leadership academies alliance as effectively a partnership enabler.

However, all three are important and those who wish to lead actively must be "*concerned not only with their own ability to lead and influence others but also with the design of structures*

and processes that are effective for the purpose of collaboration" (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). However structures and processes just emerge from activities and many of the influencers are not necessarily members of the collaboration. "*Recognising the ease with which the shaping and implementation of collaborative agendas can move out of the control of the membership is thus very important in managing the leadership media*" (Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

Huxham and Vangen (2005) also identify the following key leadership activities

- Managing Power and controlling the agenda - which can be seen as manipulation - using the power of position, skills or tools to influence activities; which others would as empowering others to play a full role in the collaboration;

- Representing and mobilising member organisations - participants lead their organisation's role in collaboration - ensuring its needs are represented and that it plays its role as a partner

- Enthusing and empowering those who can deliver collaboration aims - ensuring active involvement of those critical to delivering partnerships aims

However, whilst specific leadership activities do affect the outcomes from collaboration, Huxham and Vangen's research (2005) suggests that an unwritten law of unintended consequences means that "*…efforts to move forward a collaboration can be thwarted by difficulties and dilemmas so the outcomes are often unintended*" (Huxham and Vangen, 2005). Thus unintended consequences could be one of the key challenges (referred to at the end of the previous section) faced by the alliance.

Research Method and Methodology

Following Huxham and Vangen's example (2005), our particular focus will be on leadership as enacted by participants , making our observations against their two perspectives on leadership

activities - facilitative activities undertaken in the spirit of partnership and manipulative activities labelled 'collaborative thuggery'. There will also be an initial focus on the author's leadership role as partnership manager, but this will not be the sole focus. Interestingly Huxham and Vangen have compared the two ways of enacting leadership as similar to two alternative approaches to leadership, viz., *"democratic versus autocratic; participative versus directive, relationship versus task-oriented and consideration versus initiating structure … "* (identified by Stodgill (Bass, 1981) or even the *"transactional versus transformational leadership dichotomy"* (identified by Burns, 1978 - both cited in Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

This research is based on the case study of an alliance of sector based public service leadership academies and their attempt to model collaborative working across organisational and sector boundaries. The research is exploratory and is seeking to build theory from observations and interpretation of people experiences (Tashakorri & Teddlie, 1998). The major paradigm underlying this research is relativist, as the author's interpretation of his observations and interactions between people and objects will be influenced by his beliefs and how he sees the world. The approach is based on a mixed methodology using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The former is usually based on numerical data often derived from questionnaires and/or structured interviews whilst the latter is based on descriptive data derived from observation or unstructured interviews.

A number of researchers have challenged the validity of making a distinction between the two by explicitly linking the former with natural science (positivist - associated with methods such as passive observation, measurement and statistical analysis; survey / questionnaire, experiment, simulation and case study) and the latter with social science (interpretive - associated with methods such as interviews, content analysis, ethnography, grounded theory and participant observation) (Moon & Moon, 2004).

Yin (2003) argues that far from being incompatible, both paradigms have a role to play within social science research. In particular, Tashakorri and Teddlie (1998) have argued that there distinction between the positivism and interpretivism and the nature of the data and methods normally associated with each one is more artificial than real. Thus a new paradigm known as *"Pragmatism"* supports the use of mixed methodologies (Moon & Moon, 2004).

The research will include triangulation as a "… *vehicle for cross validation when two or more distinct methods are found to be congruent and yield comparable data"* (Moebius, 2002 cited in Moon and Moon, 2004) to test and validate findings. Participant observations, semi-structured interviews, and evaluation of the leadership development intervention developed and delivered by the alliance in terms of both content and impact will enable me to mine a rich seam of data. The data collected will be interpreted using grounded theory analysis, as this will allow theory to be developed from data and then re-tested and validated as the research progresses. The theory to be generated is how successful a disparate group of organisations can be in implementing leadership in collaboration to co-create new approaches to developing and delivering a whole systems leadership development intervention. This working paper represents only the initial findings from the first phase of participant observation, with the semi structured interviews and evaluations of the impact of the leadership development intervention planned for later phases.

Research design

The first stage in the research is based on observations in a reflective diary based on the author's participation in formal meetings and informal discussions with the task group charged with taking forward the development, delivery and evaluation of the leadership development

initiative. Added to this, will be the author's observations from the formal meetings of the Chief Executives group, which has to sanction the proposals and subsequent actions put forward by the task group. These will be analysed using the two "doing leadership" perspectives developed by Huxham and Vangen i.e. activities carried out in the spirit of collaboration, and secondly manipulative activities termed *'collaborative thuggery'.* Our analysis will have a particular focus on leadership in collaboration as enacted by participants, but will also be influenced by observations on structures and process. In terms of the latter, consideration will be particularly given to the collaboration's traditional approaches to governance and the consequences for the expected activities identified for the spirit of collaboration perspective: embracing, empowering and involving members; and the collaborative thuggery perspective: manipulating the collaborative agenda and playing the politics.

The second stage will involve carrying out a series of semi-structured interviews with participants, stakeholders and wider influencers such as the leadership review team. A representative sample of any consultants commissioned to help co-create, deliver and evaluate the leadership development initiative, and participants who participate in the pilot initiative will also be interviewed. A key focus will be to ascertain to what extent the level of support for and commitment to develop a new leadership development intervention over rides any organisational barriers, i.e. whether collective interest is put above self (individual organisation) interest. The questions will be build on the Huxham and Vangen framework used in stage one.

The third stage will analyse the approach taken to develop the leadership development intervention, exploring whether it is carried out in a real spirit of collaboration and to what extent the task group continues to own the initiative going forward and take responsibility for its success and impact. This will include observing a workshop looking at the development of the intervention which will take place at a public service leadership conference planned for

November 2009.

The fourth stage will look at the evaluation of the pilot phase and see whether there is a clear and strong link between the delivery model's structure and content and the wider public service reform objectives as set out in the leadership development review.

Following initial analysis and write up, the penultimate stage will involve presenting preliminary findings to an invited focus group audience, which would include the task group, leadership development review team, those involved in the development and delivery of the intervention and pilot initiative participants. The aim will be to challenge findings and emerging recommendations for the future development of the initiative.

The last stage will be the final write up and presentation of the report.

The Case Study

The case study focuses on a loose alliance of ten leadership academies who have been working together since 2005. Each of the organisations focuses on leadership development for a particular sector, with the oldest one dating back to 1992, with most of them being established from 1999 onwards. The leadership academies are all different legal entities ranging from Company and Charity, to Executive Agency to central government department. A number cover the whole of the UK, whilst others cover only England and Wales. Leadership development within each of the academies is supported by training, thought leadership and research, but they also deliver a number of other services and functions, namely, improving sector operational capacity through specialist training, improvement and development (through peer reviews for example) and specialist services (such as the provision of the National Police DNA database).

Their business models range from under 5 to over 80% guaranteed funding with a mix of subsidised and free places to users paying the full market rate. Most academies are moving towards a commissioner or a purchaser driven model - with some incorporating elements of both – as this is seen as more efficient and effective (Cabinet Office, 2009). However, the leadership development review noted that "*this mixed pattern of provision acts as a barrier to greater collaboration and joint provision*" , and distorts the relationship between alliance members, which partially explains piecemeal and slow integration (Cabinet Office, 2009). Like all collaborations, it has been through a number of stages of development since being established.

Phase One – set up in 2005 by a Central government department with the ambitious aim of "*achieving smarter working and efficiency, and developing flexible, customer focused leaders able to work effectively across the traditional boundaries between public services*" (Cabinet Office, 2006). Membership was at Chief Executive level so that members had the authority to commit their organisations to agree and actions decisions. In practice the main focus seemed to be on sharing information and discussing matters of mutual interest. A series of documents were produced on customer focused leadership but take up and impact appears to have been limited.

Phase Two – Following a decline in seniority and consistency of those attending meetings, the collaboration was re-launched as an alliance in 2007 with the leadership academy responsible for central government leadership development re-affirmed as the lead agency following its de-merger from its parent department. The re-launch included a Memorandum of Understanding which committed members to an annual subscription, with a focus on sharing information and learning. The alliance continued to meet every quarter and fund projects put forward by member organisations and also commissioned a number of research projects (Bennington and

Hartley, 2009).

Phase Three - This phase was characterised by two catalysts which set off a more active collaboration amongst member organisations from September 2008 onwards. Firstly, on becoming Chair, the new Chief Executive at the lead agency was determined to ensure the collaboration made a real difference, with more dynamic support arrangement. Secondly, the announcement of a leadership development review lead by a central government department, which held out the possibility of leadership academies being merged, gave added impetus to the members wanting to prove that they were capable of collaborating to improve efficiency and effectiveness of leadership development provision.

During this phase, the collaboration also has its first away event facilitated by a consultant who was a former leadership academy chief executive. The collaboration worked together to influence the outcomes of the leadership development review. The collaboration now had an agreed way forward - with a clear set of priorities which influenced and mirrored the recommendations set out by the leadership development review including:

- development of a clear action plan setting out priorities
- the development of a community of practice website as the first phase of a communications strategy
- co-creation and delivery of a top level cross sector leadership development intervention

These initiatives will be showcased at the collaboration's first public service leadership conference in November 2009. The conference signifies that the collaboration is reaching out and engaging with its service users i.e. senior public service leaders to understand what type of leadership development will enable them to build their leadership capacity to improve public service delivery. The conference will include a debate on the future of public service leadership and a workshop on how the top level cross sector leadership development intervention should be shaped through co-creation.

Initial Observations

Firstly, in considering Huxham and Vangen's three leadership media (2005), in terms of **structure**, the history of the alliance has been marked by the tendency towards having an open arrangements which has allowed members to send whom they want to the quarterly meetings.   It is clear that the initial re-launch was at least in part due to the seniority of membership declining, coupled with a lack of consistency of representatives from member organisations.   Whilst research was commissioned into, for example, improving leadership evaluation, and developing a common evaluation framework, there was no real commitment to act on the resultant recommendations.   However, this may not have been expected of the collaboration.   These loose arrangements have also meant agenda items have been for discussion rather than for decision.   This echoes observations made from Huxham and Vangen's (2005) extensive experience of researching and observing different collaborations i.e. that decisions that have been made have tended to be non-controversial.

The collaboration has essentially determined its own structures, but whilst the original motivation for setting up the collaboration did not differ significantly from the recommendations of current leadership development review, the "driver" subsequently moved onto pastures new. The collaboration gained control of its own destiny, but with no real incentives to commit to working on an action programme for real change, there has been a tendency towards "*collaborative inertia*" (Hexham & Vangen, 2005).

In terms of **process**, the main guidance document, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is very loose in terms of what arrangements should be made for communications other than the Chief Executives Group meeting quarterly to discuss to learn from each other and discuss joint projects. There has previously been very little communication between meetings and a lack of

processes to engage members, support their development and provide them with an opportunity to have real debate about future priorities for the collaboration. The first facilitated away event coincided with the announcement of the leadership development review and provided members with an opportunity to unite around a (potential) threat, how to proactively shape the review and what the future priorities of the collaboration should be.

The leadership development review may have jolted the member organisations into action, and provided an incentive to develop a number of task focused activities to clear deadlines, initially centred on influencing the scope and terms of reference of the review and responding to requests for evidence and other information from the review team. This endeavour subsequently evolved into taking forward a clear set of activities which pre-empted and influenced the review's recommendations. Two task groups were established, one focusing on the co-creation and delivery of the leadership development intervention, and the other on the development and delivery of the conference, website and community of practice.

In terms of **participants** Huxham and Vangen identify the partnership manager as someone supposedly independent but also highly influential, whose "*.. personal values and beliefs are likely to dictate the energy with which they drive different agenda items forward"*. This realisation presented the author with a dilemma because whilst previously my focus was going to be on leaders, the partnership manager also has a clear leadership role and will not be objective in playing the multiple roles of participant, manager, co-ordinator and gate keeper. Moreover, participants are perhaps the strongest influencers influencing the design of both the structure and process of any collaboration.

Moreover, the organisation the author works for has what Huxham and Vanger have called *'positional leader legitimacy'* through being designated as the 'lead organization' which has also

been strengthened by his role in supporting the Chair's leadership role in consultation and discussion meetings with the leadership development review team.   Legitimacy has also been increased through ensuring that members have a voice in expressing their concerns and have a chance to challenge what are seen as misconceptions by explaining constraints or challenges faced by member organisations.   Once concerns are raised at face to face meetings, position and response papers are quickly drawn up and circulated by email to ensure that members have a chance to make additional comments or make additional changes giving members greater confidence that their issues will be raised as part of any collective response.

Huxham & Vangen (2005) suggest that from the spirit of collaboration perspective, a progression of four closely related leadership activities contribute to the mainly facilitative leadership role embracing, empowering, involving and mobilizing. In this sense, there has been a high level of leadership activities being carried out which reflect the spirit of collaboration perspective - these activities have helped to build trust, manage power relations, facilitate communication and handle the different and conflicting interests of members.   In practice, whilst conflicting interests have been articulated, there has been an overriding concern to ensure that the leadership development review is well informed and comes up with a measured and realistic set of recommendations. It has in fact acted as a mobilizer.

The leadership development intervention task group has elements of both the spirit of collaboration and collaborative thuggery perspectives.   Compared to the conference task group, it probably has a higher element of the latter.   However the conference task group's objectives are fundamentally less controversial, less contentious and as a one off event has arguably fewer potential consequences.   In addition, the vision statement that has shaped the conference has been through numerous iterations before the group was even established.

In the case of the leadership development intervention task group, the lead organisation has split development and commissioner roles for its officers, which may make it more difficult and less straightforward. The pressure to go straight down the commissioning route for the delivery of the intervention also sits difficultly alongside the need for co-creation and design. The pressure to deliver to a tight timescale has to be balanced against the need to get the process right. In this situation, there is a real danger that the group commissions a leadership development intervention that ends up "delivering the old models of leadership" (Mead, 2008). Informally sense-checking emerging proposals with the Chair on a regular basis helps to ensure senior level partner buy-in.

As partnership manager the author has split loyalties because the organisation he works for has a vested interest in ensuring it wins a commercial stake in the creation and delivery of the leadership development intervention. This is in stark contrast to other task group members parent organisations who have no direct commercial interest. Nonetheless, the author has had to be quite pro-active behind the scenes positively manipulating the agenda – carrying out some of the key activities identified by Huxham and Vangen such as reminding or helping people develop an *"understanding of substantive isssues…"..*and *"….manoeuvring members towards addressing the agenda…"* and *"…deciding, on behalf of others, how to move the agenda forward …"* Reassuringly, proactive engagement in the second collaborative thuggery activity i.e. playing the politics - has been limited to *"probing the political undercurrents between and around members…"* (Huxham and Vangen, 2005).

Initial conclusion

The framework developed by Huxham and Vangen (2005) has assisted the interpretation and understanding of the author's experience of supporting the collaboration of the ten leadership academies. Being able to conceptualise leadership in collaboration through the three leadership

media and through the two perspectives of the spirit of collaboration and collaborative thuggery has also been helpful.   Comparing the activities of two task groups has provided insights into the relative maturity of each group, and put into perspective the constraints and challenges faced by the latter leadership development intervention task group.

It is also clear from initial observations that the most important leadership media is leadership through participants, and that the approach of participants clearly shapes the outcomes of the leadership activity more than process and structure. It is also clear that potentially negative factors such as uniting against a potential foe can also act as a catalyst for organisations to begin to proactively collaborate.

However, these initial observations only take into account the author's perspective, which is evidently subjective. The completion of this stage with a deeper level of analysis and reflection, and the completion of the subsequent stages will provide a more rounded perspective and more informed answers to the initial research questions.   In particular, observation and analysis of the leadership activities and styles of other key participants such as task group chairs may, when explored, provide insights which may challenge the author's initial perceptions. Sharing these initial proposals and observations with the Fifth European Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance participants will provide an opportunity to critically challenge the research design and methodology ahead of completing the research.

Rob Worrall

Programme Director, Centre for Strategic Leadership, National School of Government
Doctoral Student, Ashcroft International Business School, Anglian Ruskin University
Visiting Lecturer in Strategic Management and Leadership, University of Northumbria

References

Archer and Wright (2009). *Collaborative Leadership: How to Succeed in an Interconnected World*, Butterworth-Heinemann, London.

Barringer, B.R. & Harrison. J.S. (2000). 'Walking a Tightrope: Creating Value Through Interorganizational Relationships'. *Journal of Management*, Vol. 26, Issue 3, 367-403

Barwise, P., MacLeod, D., Richards, S., Thomas, H., & Tranfield, D. (2007). Take-off or Tail-off? An evaluation of the Capability Reviews Programme, *Sunningdale Institute, National School of Government,* November, Sunningdale.

Bennett. N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J.A. (2002). *Distributed Leadership. NCSL,* Nottingham.

Benington, J. & Hartley, J. (2009). ' "Whole systems go!" Improving Leadership Across the Whole Public Service System: Propositions to Stimulate Discussion and Debate' , *Sunningdale Institute, National School of Government*, April.

Benson, J.K. (1975). 'The Interorganizational Network as a Political Economy'. *Administrative Quarterly*, Vol. 20 229-249.

Bichard, M. (2000). 'The Modernisation and Improvement of Government and Public Services: Leadership, Creativity and Change', *Public Money and Management*, April, 41-46.

Boulding, K.E. (1956). 'General systems Theory - the Skeleton Science', *Management Science*, April, Issue 2, 197-208.

Byrne, L. (2009). Radical Realism: Innovators from around the world can teach UK some valuable lessons about the transformation of public services, *The Guardian*, 22 July.

Cabinet Office (2006) Public Services Leadership Consortium, *Cabinet Office.* Source: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/workforcematters/stakeholder_fora/pslc.aspx

Cabinet Office (2008). Excellence and fairness: achieving world class public services, *Cabinet Office*, London

Cabinet Office (2009). Leadership Development Review Update, *Cabinet Office,* 27 April. (*Final report awaiting publication*)

Creswell, J.W., Trout, S, & Barbuto, J.E. (2004). ' A Decade of Mixed Methods writings: A retrospective. Accessed via: http://www.aom.pace.edu/rmd/

Cropper, S., Ebers, M., Huxham, C., & Smith Ring, P. (ed.s) (2008). *The Oxford Handbook of Inter-Organizational Relations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Crosbyt, B. & Bryson. J. (2004). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

Dudman, J. (2009). Cabinet Office Updates its capability, *Public,* 16 July.

Evan, W.M. (1965) 'Towards a theory of Interorganizational Relations', *Management Science,* August, Issue 11, 217-230.

Edwards, M.E., Ayres, R.A., Howard, C. (2003). Public Services Leadership: Emerging Issues, *National Institute for Governance, University of Canberra*, Australia.

Feyerham, A. (1994). 'Leadership in Collaboration: A Longitudinal Study of Two Inter-Organizational Rule-Making Groups', *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 5, Issue 3/4, 253-270.

Galaskiewicz, J, (1985). 'Interorganizational Relations', *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 11, 281-304

Galaskiewicz, J, Greve, H.R. & Tsai, W. (2004). 'Taking Stock of Networks and Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 47, Issue 6, 795-817.

Gash, T., Hallsworth, M., Ismail, S., Paun, A. (2009). Performance Art: Enabling Better Management of Public Services, *Institute for Government*, London

Grint, K. (2008). Wicked Problems and Clumsy Solutions: The Role of Leadership (Draft), Conference Presentation: *Learning for Success Conference, National School of Government* in Scotland, 27 November.

Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without Easy Answers*, Belknapp Press, Cambridge, MA.

H.M. Government (2009). Building Britain's Future, June, *HM Government*, London .

Hosking, D. M. (1988). 'Organizing, Leadership and Skilfull Process', *Journal of Management Studies,* Volume 25, Issue 2, March, 147-166

Huxham, C., & Vangen, S., (2005). *Managing to Collaborate: The Theory and Practice of Collaborative Advantage,* Routledge, *London*

Huxham, C., Hibbert, P., & Hearne, P. (2008). Claiming Collaborative Success: Signifiers and Caveats, *University of Strathclyde Business School and Advanced Institute for Management Research*, 2-40.

Mead, G. (2009).' Written Response to Sunningdale Institute Briefing on "Improving Leadership Across the Whole Public Service System: Propositions to Stimulate Discussion and Debate*', April.*

Moon, J. & Moon, S. (2004). The Case for Mixed Methodology Research: A review of literature and methods, *E-mel LLP,* Working Paper, June.

Murrel, K. (1997). 'Relational Models of Leadership for the Next Century Not-for-Profit Managers', *Organizational Development Journal*, Vol. 15, Issue 3, 35-42.

Oliver, C. (1990). 'The Determinants of Inter Organizational Relationships: Integration and Future Directions', *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16, 241-265

Ryan, C. (2001). 'Leadership in Collaborative Policy Making: An Analysis of Agency Rules in

Regulatory Negotiating', *Policy Science*, 34, 221-245.

Russell, J. (2009). New Labour's great mistake is to think we are all automatons, *The Guardian*, 14 July.

Seddon, J. (2008). *Systems Thinking in the Public Sector*, Triarchy Press, Axminster.

Sutherland, W., & Ley, D. (2009). The Point of View of the *'Power Elite'*, *National School of Government*, Sunningdale.

Tashakkori, A. and C. Teddlie (1998*). Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantative Approaches.*, Applied Social Research Method Series (46), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Thomas, A. (2008). Crossing the divide to tackle the 'wicked' problems, *Public Servant*, November, 19-19.

Trist, E. (1983). Referent Organizations and the Development of Inter-Organizational Domains, *Human Relations*, Vol. 36, No. 3, 269-284.

Van de Ven, A.H. (1976). 'On the Nature, Formation and Maintenance of Relations among Organizations', *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 1, 24-36

von Bertalanffy, L. (1951). 'General Systems Theory: A new Approach to Unity of Science', *Human Biology*, Vol. 23, 303-361.

Worrall, R. (2009). Leading Collaboratively, *HR & Training Journal*, Issue 6, 58-59.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research, design and methods*, 3rd ed., Sage Publications, Newbury Park