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Abstract

This thesis examines inter organisational or collaborative change. The research commenced with an investigation of organisational change in policing and then broadened to encompass other organisations in the public and private sectors, thereby enabling comparison and contrast. The intention was to explore first principles of best practice for organisations embarking upon collaborative change. The researcher was motivated to learn and develop his thinking as a consequence of professional exposure to this area of strategic management. The exponential growth in the number and complexity of collaborative schemes, coupled with a reported pan sector failure rate of 60% - 80%, underlines the topicality and relevance of this research. In the public sector, there is evidence of a new collaborative paradigm emerging, driven by ideology and austerity. Available evidence indicates that the police have been slow to embrace these changes and achieve the benefits desired.

The methodological approach commenced with systematic and targeted reviews of existing literature. Gaps and contradictions were explored and used to inform the primary research, which consisted of forty-three semi structured interviews and two electronic surveys, producing two hundred and fifty-six responses. The findings suggest that shortcomings in delivering inter organisational change were indicative of wider management failings encompassing other categories of major change. Poor leadership, inadequate resourcing, weak planning, unrealistic timescales and an over emphasis on structure and process, while ignoring the people issues, all contributed to a sub optimal outcome. Opinions were polarised about the performance of the police, where a strong organisational culture, dominant leaderships styles and poor business acumen appear to be conspiring to inhibit ambition and delivery. Ten generic key research findings are discussed, with another dedicated to policing. Collectively, they provide an evidence based foundation for developing best practice for organisations embarking on major inter organisational change.
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### Commonly used definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term used</th>
<th>Definition applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strategic Alliance       | The term ‘strategic alliance’ denotes a long term commitment to inter organisational partnering in one or more area of strategic importance. Benefits are shared whilst the independence of the contributing parties is maintained. (Developed from the conditions set by Yoshino & Rangan, 1995, p.5).  
<em>For the purposes of this thesis the terms strategic collaboration, organisational collaboration, inter organisational change and multi organisational change are all intended to be interchangeable with the definition set out above for strategic alliances.</em> |
| Intra organisational change | The terms intra organisational change, organisational change, strategic change, major organisational change and single organisational change, are all intended to denote change occurring within a single organisational entity. |
Chapter 1
Purpose and background

1.1 Introduction

This study critically assesses existing organisational change management theory and practice, particularly as they apply to strategic collaboration programmes. This topic is relevant given the increasing rate and complexity of organisational change and the consequences of failure (Beer & Norhria, 2000, p. 133; Hamel, 2013). Gaps within the existing corpus of knowledge are identified and used to inform primary mixed methods research. Policing, the wider public sector and the private sector form three distinct research pillars.

Cameron and Green (2009, p. 10), make the distinction between individual, team and organisational change and although all three groups are inextricably linked, the primary focus of this study is on change at an organisational level. Nadler and Tushman (1993, p. 24), differentiate between incremental and transformational change. Incremental change according to Hayes (2010, p. 16), involves “fine tuning and adaptation” and is, by definition, less risky and easier to implement than change of a more substantive nature. Transformational change, in contrast, involves “redefining the organisation through the fast and simultaneous change of all its basic elements” (Nadler & Tushman, 1993, p. 47). Meyerson, develops this thinking by categorising change requiring “drastic action” from change which can be induced incrementally by “evolutionary adaptation” (2001, p. 94). This study focuses on organisational change which is of a transformational nature.

The research undertaken for this doctorate both mirrors, and is driven by the researcher’s personal professional journey which involved immersion in a series of challenging and incomplete collaborative ventures, initially as a police officer.
and subsequently as a project management consultant. The researcher now enjoys a portfolio lifestyle, referred to by Handy as the “third age” (1990, pp. 7-9). Sadler’s (2006, p. 3), assertion that the third age presents opportunities for fulfilment and life long learning, resonates with the researcher’s motivation for undertaking this doctorate. The subject matter is influenced by the researcher’s professional experience and a desire to understand, learn and improve. While policing features prominently, the focus changes to his contemporary area of professional practice, which entails working with other public and private sector organisations.

The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) suggest that a new paradigm for organisations has emerged which is characterised by flux and continuous change (CIPD, 2015b), and this is marked by a corresponding increase in the growth and significance of inter organisational collaboration (CIPD, 2013b, p. 3). Arguably, in such an environment, the drive to acquire intra and inter change management knowledge and skills will gain greater traction.

Change management, according to the Association for Project Management (APM) is “a structured approach for moving an organisation from the current state to the desired future state” (2012, p. 136).

The APM is a useful first reference when considering the broad topic of change management and this is reinforced by McLeod who asserts that “projects by definition are about change, and change always involves doing things differently” (2013, p. 15).

The APM’s approach signifies a controlled, top down process that incorporates the following planned steps: assess, prepare, plan, implement and sustain. (APM, 2012, p. 136). This aligns with Lewin’s seminal planned three stage model of ‘unfreezing’, ‘changing’ and ‘refreezing’ (Lewin, 1952; Dawson, 1994, p. 3). This approach appears consistent with the scientific school of management (Taylor, 1943), which advocates goal setting, management
organisation, planning and control. Senge appears critical of the top down planned approach to change, by offering fundamentally different guidelines to managers as part of his ‘systemic model’ (1993, pp. 18-24 & 174-204). An added dimension is, that change is often triggered by an organisational crisis and is therefore reactive, ad hoc and discontinuous (Todnem By, 2005, p. 370). Projects, on the other hand, operate best when they are properly planned, adequately resourced and executed in a controlled environment (OGC, 2009).

Adopting a disciplined approach to planning change does not appear to guarantee the attainment of a successful outcome. Even the best plans struggle to control the multi-faceted and complex dynamics that arise in major change scenarios. This may explain why reported levels of failure are so high. Research undertaken by the CIPD indicates a figure of 60% (2013a). Other writers suggest a higher failure rate of 70% (Beer et al., 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6). Research undertaken by the Institute of Directors (IoD) claimed that 80% of corporate change programmes had failed within two years. Of those programmes that survived 75% had come close to being abandoned (IoD, 2012, p. 3).

A study undertaken by the Change Management Institute (CMI), sought to baseline the change maturity of organisations. Their research revealed “alarmingly low levels of preparedness for change, with most organisations lacking the skills and capacity to deliver major change” (2012, p. 2).

Arguably, the challenges when implementing inter organisational collaborative change are likely to be greater than when operating within the boundaries of a clearly defined single organisational entity. While inter organisational collaboration is discussed enthusiastically, tangible evidence of effective collaborative delivery resulting in a mutually beneficial outcome appears difficult to find, thereby echoing the sentiments of Linden, namely that “there is more talk about collaboration than actual collaboration” (2002, p. 17).
Many authors use the phrase ‘strategic alliances’ to refer to longer term collaborative ventures (Yoshino & Rangan, 1995, p. 4; Monczka et al., 1998, p. 553; Brouthers et al., 1995, p. 18; Dyer et al., 2001, p. 37). Austin states that the 21st century will be remembered as the “age of alliances” (2000b, p. 7). Linden supports this assertion by suggesting that the drive to collaborate will increase exponentially but, “alarmingly as many as 70% are destined to fail” (2003, p. 42). The Institute of Collaborative Working (IoCW) state that this figure is higher, at 80% (Hawkins, 2010 p. 4), while Sagawa and Segal (2000, p. 8), believe the figure could be 90%. A supplementary proposition is that the median lifespan of these partnerships is just seven years (Sagawa & Segal, 2000, p. 8).

The term ‘strategic alliancing' denotes a long term and significant commitment on behalf of partnering organisations (Cheung et al., 2004, p. 24). The conditions set out by Yoshino and Rangan for strategic alliances in the commercial world appear equally applicable to the public sector, in that:

• the independence of the contributing partners is maintained;
• benefits are shared by the partners; and,
• there is on-going participation in one or more strategic area (1995, p. 5).

The working definition proposed by the researcher builds upon these conditions:

A strategic alliance denotes a long term commitment to inter organisational partnering in one or more area of strategic importance. Benefits are shared, while the independence of the contributing parties is maintained.

For the purposes of this thesis the terms strategic alliance, collaboration, organisational collaboration, inter organisational change, partnering, organisational partnering and multi organisational change are all
interchangeable. The definition set out above for strategic alliances applies to all.

Similarly, the terms intra organisational change, organisational change, strategic change, major organisational change and single organisational change, are all intended to denote change occurring within a single organisational entity.

The definitions set out above are intended to embrace a broad range of organisational collaborative activity, from which a multitude of different schemes have emerged (Hawkins, 2013, p. 10). The focus for this study is on alliances deemed to be of strategic significance. Several case studies are referenced later in this thesis to illustrate the author’s application of this definition. For example, in chapter 2 reference is made to the Worthing and Adur District Council collaboration where both councils share service delivery units, including a unified senior management team (Adur & Worthing Councils, 2015). This merits classification as a strategic alliance because it signifies a lasting partnership, impacting on core business activities. In contrast the Hertfordshire Police Catering Initiative, which is also referenced in chapter 2 (Audit Commission, 2010, p. 54), does not appear to merit classification as a strategic alliance as it focuses on a relatively small scale operation that could be considered ancillary to the primary purpose of Hertfordshire Police.

The Hertfordshire Police Catering Initiative represents a form of ‘outsourcing’, albeit at a relatively functional level, where organisations obtain goods or services under contract from a third party supplier. Outsourcing represents a contemporary and popular form of collaboration (NAO, 2013a, p. 10). As will be discussed later, more ambitious and far reaching schemes such as the Lincolnshire Police and G4S contract are classified as a strategic alliance because of their scope and potential impact on the goals of both contributory partners (White, 2014, p. 4). Other noteworthy schemes include the private finance initiative (PFI), where private consortia design, build and manage facilities for major government projects, such as hospitals and roads. As the
lifespan of these contracts is typically thirty years (NAO, 2010, p. 13), such arrangements justify consideration as strategic alliances.

Hawkins (2013, pp. 11-13), helpfully provides a case study of collaboration within the UK rail industry, setting out significant improvements in performance and cost reduction by replacing an overly aggressive and litigious approach to supply chain management, to one which is more engaging and inclusive. Network Rail now claim to have embraced the Collaborative Relationship Model set out in British Standard 11000 (Network Rail, 2016). Arguably, Network Rail’s alliancing arrangements with their suppliers also merits strategic alliance classification because collaboration sits at the heart of their delivery model.

While much has been written about generic change management theory, less has been said about the specific area of collaborative change, particularly involving policing. Are generic change management models, such as those articulated earlier from the APM, applicable to collaborative change or is bespoke theory and practice more appropriate?

The APM’s 6th edition of their Body of Knowledge (BoK) only makes fleeting references to collaborative ventures and then only in the context of a proposed organisational structure (APM, 2012, p. 105). Likewise, Managing Successful Programmes (MSP), the UK Government’s recommended framework for delivering transformational programmes of change, says very little about this topic. In the case of MSP the advice on delivering cross-organisational programmes is limited to two paragraphs and one diagram (Cabinet Office, 2011a, pp. 37-38).

In 2004 the Governance Specific Interest Group (SiG) of the APM produced a booklet entitled ‘Co-directing Change: A Guide to the Governance of Multi-Owned Projects’ (APM, 2004). While setting out some helpful high level principles, the document has limitations, firstly because of the absence of supporting research and secondly by failing to address the important ‘softer’ aspects of change management.
Policing is not immune to the pressures to change and, arguably, collaboration represents an obvious method of reconciling reduced budgets brought about by a 20% reduction in the central government funding, while limiting the impact on front line service delivery (Dale, 2012, p. 45).

Inter force alliancing represents the largest area of police collaborative activity (HMIC, 2012, p. 27). Police collaboration is “not a new phenomenon” (HMIC, 2012 p. 4), and earlier research by the HMIC in 2008/09, confirmed that there was significant collaborative activity among all forces: a total of seven hundred and twenty different schemes having been identified (2009a, p. 4). Despite the attention of the HMIC (2005a; 2008; 2009a; 2010; 2011; 2012) and the production of statutory guidance for collaboration (2012), the literature and practical advice currently available appears limited (Dale, 2012, pp. 42-43).

The drive to collaborate does not appear to have abated. In 2012 the HMIC noted that every force is either “committed to realising savings from collaboration or planning to do so” (HMIC, 2012, p. 5). Despite its apparent popularity, there is significant evidence indicating that the police, or at least many of the forty-three forces in England and Wales, are not adept at collaborating (HMIC, 2012, pp. 56-57; HMIC, 2013a, p. 79; HMIC, 2014a, p. 57; HMIC, 2014c, p. 33; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 32; CBI, 2010, p. 12).

The difficulties encountered achieving collaboration within policing appear to mirror the results of broader collaborative activity in non police sectors, of which more has been written, including high failure rates. Arguably, the leaders of the police service are no different from managers in other sectors, who consistently over estimate the benefits that will be attained. The Office for Government Commerce (OGC) coined the phrase ‘optimism bias’ when describing this phenomena (2007, p. 70). As many as 80% of these proposed changes fail to deliver the benefits envisaged (OGC, 2005, p. 5).
Leadership appears pivotal for delivering transformational change (Heifetz & Linsky 2002, pp. 65-75; Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, pp. 60-71; Meyerson, 2001, pp. 92-102; Garvin & Roberto, 2005, pp. 104-114; Beer et al., 1990, pp. 158-166). While collaborative leadership skills are considered vital (Linden, 2003, pp. 41-47; Huxham & Vangen, 2000, pp. 1159-1175), the policing culture looks very different from other organisations because of the positional power enjoyed by senior officers in a quasi-military, rank-orientated, hierarchical organisational structure (Neyroud, 2011, pp. 347-354). Strategic partnering arrangements imply a commitment to building long term relationships (Austin, 2000, pp. 44-50). This may necessitate several years of nurturing before yielding results (Ohmae, 1989, pp. 143-154). This approach appears incongruent with the policing culture which focuses on “immediate, practical and pressing issues, real or perceived, operating to short timescales” (Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 95).

Collaborative leaders require different skill sets, frequently they have no authority or written job description and so must find more non-directive ways to induce change (Linden, 2003, p. 41-47). Collaborative ventures are likely to compromise management independence and leaders will need to reconcile their innate dislike of such a situation and overcome the popular misconception that total control increases the propensity for success (Ohmae, 1989, p. 150).

A picture emerges of a myriad of different theories and of organisations struggling to implement transformational change. Despite significant collaborative activity across all sectors, the problems and high failure rates appear to persist. The position of policing looks equally challenging.

1.2 Research aim and objectives

To investigate existing literature and practice for public and private sector organisations when embarking upon strategic alliances, with particular
reference to policing. The intention is to explore first principles of best practice.

The specific research objectives are:

I. To critically assess the effectiveness of change management theory and doctrine and its relevance to strategic alliances;

II. To investigate existing change management practice, particularly as applied to strategic alliances;

III. To explore the specific challenges of delivering strategic alliances in policing.

1.3 Significance of this research

A professional doctorate is an exemplification of accredited research for practitioners and should not involve research for its own sake (Drake & Heath, 2010, p. 142). Brause (2000, p. 98) believes that, in addition to demonstrating that the study will be ‘worthwhile’, the researcher must also be capable of providing a convincing case that they possess the requisite expertise to conduct the research. Topic significance and researcher suitability will now be addressed.

The pressure for change is unrelenting as organisations, in all sectors, respond to austerity, technological advancements, competitive pressures, government policy and macro economic uncertainty (CIPD, 2013a). While a new norm necessitates preparedness for perpetual transformation, many organisations are still only geared for delivering business as usual (CMI, 2012, p. 2).

In the private sector combining resources and capabilities through collaboration is often viewed as a viable means of developing new, competitive and cost
effective value propositions, reducing operating costs and risk, while enhancing market competitiveness (BSI, 2013, p. xii). Meanwhile, the public sector are being ‘encouraged’ to replicate best practice in the private sector by, for example, accelerating the creation of shared service centres, a popular form of collaboration (NAO, 2012, p.10). The NAO claim that savings, typically amounting to 20%, can be achieved by entering into collaborative arrangements for back office functions, including human resources, payroll, finance, procurement and information technology (ibid). This assertion is supported by Austin who refers to cross sector partnering as the “collaboration paradigm for the 21st Century” (2000a, p. 44). In policing collaboration is also viewed as a viable means of reconciling declining budgets (HMIC, 2012).

Much has been written about the generic topic of change management, although arguably, this still represents a relatively new area social science that contains contradictions and is yet to attain maturity status (Pettigrew et al., 2001, p. 697). Despite the emergence of contrasting ideologies, there appears to be a degree of unanimity concerning the high failure rate (CIPD, 2013; Beer & Nohria, 2000 p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2004, p. 1). Todnem By asserts that the high failure rate when implementing organisational change is indicative of “contradictory theories, unchallenged hypothesis and inadequate supporting empirical research” (2005, pp. 369-380). It is likely that languorous implementation increases the propensity for failure. Jacobs et al. supports this assertion, namely that “change programmes are prone to poor planning, disappointing results and unintended consequences that divert resources and shatter the trust of employees and business partners alike” (2013, p. 3).

As less literature exists concerning the topic of collaborative change, one is drawn to question the utility and applicability of generic change management theory for the collaborative paradigm. A small scale study undertaken by the author suggested that the dynamics and interactions required for collaborative change necessitate different approaches and different leadership skills (Dale, 2012, pp. 47-56). This merits further investigation. In addition, could the high failure rate experienced when implementing collaborative change be indicative
of gaps within the existing corpus of knowledge, both generic and bespoke? The value of this research is that it seeks to explore and understand the knowledge and practice gaps in a topical area of organisational management. The intention is to use the product from this exercise as a platform for exploring first principles of best practice.

The second test, according to Drake and Heath, centres on researcher suitability (2010, p. 142). In this respect the researcher possesses practitioner experience working in the field of collaboration, both within and outside policing. He has obtained the APM’s ‘prestigious’ Registered Project Professional Standard (RPP) and is a longstanding fellow of the CIPD. As a project consultant he has advised senior managers engaged in delivering major collaborative change. A strong track record exists of on-going researcher involvement in this area of social science.

The limitations of contemporary research, the extent of on-going collaborative activity, coupled with the consequences of failure, all combine to underline the significance of this research. Finally, the researcher’s interest, knowledge and experience in this topic serve to reinforce his claim of researcher suitability.

1.4 Design, methodology and approach

The research commences with an examination of the literature using a bespoke model, designed for this purpose. This includes a systematic review of the literature dealing with strategic alliances involving policing, before broadening to consider the wider public and private sectors. The review evolves into a targeted investigation of generic change management literature, maintained by three professional institutions, all with a declared interest in this subject area. These bodies are the APM, CMI and CIPD. The aim is to assess the utility of their generic change management literature. The decision for using the bespoke model and the rationale for shifting the emphasis from a systematic to a targeted review is explained in chapter 2.
In any study involving collaborative change, leadership and organisational culture are integral considerations and these are areas which will be examined during the course of the review and subsequent research (Hawkins, 2013). These points are reinforced in British Standard 11000 which provides a universal framework for developing collaborative business relationships (BSI, 2013).

This study seeks to target and critically assess all relevant text, particularly that of a scholarly or professional nature. Gaps and inconsistencies within the current corpus of knowledge are identified and explored. It will be argued that the professional literature is orientated towards the ‘hardware’ aspects of change, such as structures, systems and processes, while much of the scholarly literature appears to lack a hard edge practical application. These and other emerging themes are progressed to primary research.

The chosen area for study mirrors the professional journey of the researcher and involves issues of identity, personal reflection and development (Wellington et al., 2005, p. 40; Lee, 2009, p. 18; Rolfe et al., 2011, p. 31). At a micro level many collaborative organisational change initiatives have been beset with challenges of an intransigent nature. This appears indicative of problems encountered at a macro level and which apparently contribute to high levels of failure (Linden 2003, p. 42).

The researcher utilises a mixed methods paradigm, the philosophy of pragmatism (Burke Johnson et. al., 2007, p. 113). The primary research instrument consists of forty-three semi structured interviews with senior police officers, executives and change/project management specialists. This is supplemented by the use of two identical on-line surveys. The first was
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promoted via social media while the second survey targeted a controlled group within the APM. The intention of using different methods is to enable triangulation, thereby increasing the propensity of obtaining more reliable data (Grix, 2000, pp. 83-84).

The intertwining of the practitioner and researcher roles raises questions about neutrality and validity which are addressed in Chapter 3 (Malterud, 2001, pp. 483-8). The researcher sets out his position in an open and transparent manner, acknowledging that there can be ‘no neutrality’ and only a greater or lesser awareness of ones preconceptions when undertaking research (Serrant-Green, 2002, pp. 30-34; Rose, 1985, p. 77). To address this the researcher has engaged in reflexivity and maintained a learning journal in accordance with established best practice (Lee, 2009, p. 63-71; Wellington et al., 2005, pp. 40-45; Malterud, 2001, p. 438).

The format for this thesis is set out as follows:

**Chapter 2:** critically examines relevant literature using a bespoke systematic and targeted approach.

**Chapter 3:** explains the research methodology, rationale and the approach adopted.

**Chapter 4:** analyses and synthesises the research findings.

**Chapter 5:** presents conclusions as eleven key findings, anchored to the research objectives.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher sets out the approach adopted for reviewing the literature. The aim is twofold. Firstly, to provide a synthesis of contemporary literature in a structured and logical manner, including identifying different schools of thinking, contradictions and importantly, literature gaps. Secondly, to visibly demonstrate the researcher’s command of the background literature (Phillips & Pugh, 2000, p. 59; Randolph, 2009, p. 2).

A framework encapsulating an ‘inverted funnel’ is proposed. This enables a systematic examination of the literature appertaining to strategic alliances, but is then expanded to incorporate more generic change management literature. Given the enormity of literature available concerning change management, the search parameters have been restricted to literature explicitly referenced in the corpora of knowledge provided by three relevant professional bodies, all of whom have declared an interest in this subject area. These organisations are the APM, CMI and CIPD.

Undertaking a literature review is frequently the first step of a research project (Aveyard, 2010, p. 5). The term project is significant because the literature review is explicitly described, by some, as representing a project in its own right (Bruce, 1994, p. 217; Brent, 1986, p. 137). LeCompte et al., reinforce the stand alone feature of a literature review by stating that, with minor modification, the review is a “legitimate and publishable document” (2003, p. 124). To acknowledge the important and unique status of literature reviews, the researcher has sought to incorporate project management planning by blending this methodology with the sequential approach set out by Bruce of “locating, reading and evaluating the literature in order to obtain a detailed understanding
of the topic being studied” (1994, p. 217). The absence of specific actions, such as ‘synthesis’ and ‘interpretation’, as proposed by some commentators (Merriam, 1988, p. 6; Hart, 2000, p. 15; Bryman, 2008, p. 81) indicates weaknesses in this sequential approach. Using Turner’s elementary project management lifecycle (2014, p. 29), the three steps proposed for undertaking this review are:

**Definition:** Set out the objectives for the literature review.

**Design:** Set out the parameters for the review, including exclusions, rationale and the approach recommended.

**Execution:** Undertake the review in accordance with the agreed design, acknowledging that changes and workarounds may be necessary. Above all, ensure transparency (Amitige & Keeble-Allen, 2008, p. 104).

While this approach may appear unconventional, the researcher believes it is appropriate for this study, particularly as limited literature exists for the narrow field of collaborative change, especially for policing, yet an abundance of literature is available for the general topic of change management (Webster & Watson, 2002, p. 11).

### 2.2 Definition

The definition phase involves creating specific objectives for the literature review. The objectives need to satisfy the scholarly requirements for a doctoral level thesis, yet there are secondary objectives which link to wider professional practice and personal development. An elementary step must be to agree a common understanding on what is meant by a literature review. Bruce (1994, p. 217) believes that definitions are scarce. This is reinforced by Randolph (2009, p. 1) who observes that many literature reviews are flawed, possibly as a consequence of misconceptions concerning what ‘good’ actually looks like.
Aveyard’s definition of a literature review implies a “comprehensive study and interpretation of the literature relating to a particular topic” (2010, p. 5). Hart suggests that the product of the review is an effective evaluation of published and non published literature that relates to the chosen topic (2000, p. 13). Hart places great emphasis on the scholarly requirement for creating ‘integration’ or finding a new way to look at a particular phenomenon (2000, p. 8). This appears to represent a valuable condition, exceeding the requirements of the literature review set by Cooper, which is limited to “describing, summarising, clarifying and integrating the content of the work of others” (1988, p. 109).

Internalising the key points set out above, the objectives for this literature review, are framed as:

1. undertaking a systematic review of strategic alliances in policing, the public and private sectors, to inform the construct of appropriate primary research;

2. undertaking a targeted review of generic change management literature in order to assess its applicability and utility for organisations engaged in strategic alliancing;

3. providing a platform for personal and professional development as a researcher;

4. learning, considering, reflecting and constructing meaning regarding a topic of organisational relevance and considerable personal and professional interest.

The aim of this review is to produce an original and novel insight into the available literature, exploring key issues and identifying gaps within the existing corpus of knowledge.

---

2 appropriate in this context necessitates alignment with the wider research aim and objectives - see Annex ‘C’. 

Determining how to cast the ‘research net’ is a critical step in the literature review process (Randolph, 2009, p. 3). Cronin et al., warn of the risks of undertaking research into topics that are too broad in their definition (2008, p. 38). To mitigate this risk, research objective 1) limits the search parameters to strategic alliances, while objective 2), enables the researcher to consider the viability of generic change management literature which may be applicable to this thesis. Research objective 1) has been designed to facilitate a systematic literature review using clearly defined search parameters. Conversely, research objective II) enables more purposeful sampling of a broader research area, as part of a ‘targeted review’. Research objective 3) and 4) have been added for personal and professional reasons, in accordance with the commonly stated aims for a professional doctorate (Lee, 2009, p. 16; McVicar et al., 2006, p. 213).

O’Leary, (2004, p. 11), emphasises the value of ‘researching reflexivity’, which she believes should involve a “constant consideration of the researcher, the researched and the integrity of the process”. This underpins every aspect of the research, including the literature review (Machi & McEvoy, 2009, p. 19). Using Rolfe et al.’s., (2011, p. 45), ‘what’, ‘so what, ‘what next’ model of reflective practice, the researcher has applied ‘reflection on action’ drawing upon and comparing his own experiences operating in a collaborative arena (Atkins & Murphy, 1993, p. 1188).

2.3 Design

The design phase equates to the APM’s ‘definition stage’ and denotes the period when plans are created before project delivery commences (APM, 2012, p. 27). In this section the researcher sets out the search parameters and introduces the inverted funnel model to explain his approach for capturing the literature sought.
Palmer and Tornfelt distinguish between two investigative conceptual models. The first is presented as a ‘traditional funnel’ which starts with a broad investigation but then progresses to the specific. The second is an ‘inverted funnel’ which starts with a tighter focus but then broadens to the general (2013, p. 9). Another approach is to distinguish between ‘deductive’ and ‘inductive’ lines of enquiry (Hart, 2000, p. 82; Ali & Birley, 1999, p. 103; Palmer & Tornfelt, 2013, pp. 15-19). While comparatively few studies have been undertaken of strategic alliances, particularly in policing (Dale, 2012, p. 43), there is an abundance of generic change management literature which may nevertheless possess utility for this specialist area and therefore merits exploration.

The inverted funnel provides an insightful conceptual model. Initially, the focus is on the tightly, narrowly bound, literature dealing with police, then public and private sector alliances. As the funnel widens a different approach is necessary to handle significantly larger volumes of literature. Please refer to Figure 1 below:

Figure 1

Figure 1: The Inverted funnel model for searching for literature (Adapted from Palmer and Tornfelt, 2013 p.9)
Hart’s assertion (2000, p. 15) that the review should represent an analytical synthesis covering ‘all known literature’ appears problematic in the circumstances described above. Other commentators suggest a juxtaposition by proposing that relevance, not ‘comprehensiveness, should be the desired end goal (Robson, 2011, p. 51; Bryman, 2008, p. 83; Locke et al., 1999, p. 69).

The approach adopted for the targeted review is to consider literature available from the APM, CIM and CIPD. Figure 2 below, adapts Palmer and Thornfelt’s inverted funnel to depict the chosen conceptual method for this research (2013, p. 9).

**Figure 2**

*Figure 2: The Inverted funnel model for searching for literature (Adapted from Palmer and Tornfelt, 2013 p.9)*
The first layer of the model focuses on the Body of Knowledge (BoK) and associated literature produced by the APM. The APM, as the self acclaimed professional body for project managers, has been in existence for forty years and retains a membership of twenty-three thousand, including five hundred corporates (APM, 2014b). As collaborative change initiatives should be the product of project management\(^3\) this area of interest appears to sit firmly within the domain of the APM.

In 2012 the APM published the 6th edition of their BoK. This book sets out a comprehensive range of topics tackling the ‘hard’ (predominantly technical) and ‘soft’ (predominantly people) aspects of project management. In addition to referencing twenty-one core texts (APM, 2012, pp. 4-5), at the conclusion of every topic is a list of suggested reading, effectively making the BoK a gateway document. In addition to the BoK, the APM have published a series of booklets and papers, such as the Guide to ‘Co-directing’ Change’ (2007).

The second layer of the inverted funnel model is dedicated to the BoK (CIMBoK) produced by the CMI (2013). The CMI was formed in 2005 in Australia and is now expanding to create a global foothold. The CIMBoK has a similar structure and style to the APM’s BoK, in that it sets out core references and is divided into a series of ‘knowledge areas’ each acting as a gateway for further reading. In addition, to the BoK, the CIM have produced a limited number of papers detailing research undertaken.

The third layer of the literature review model is reserved for knowledge held by the CIPD. Delivering organisational change is seen as a core responsibility of human resource managers, the cohort of professionals the CIPD seek to represent. The CIPD, having been established more than a 100 years, have attained higher levels of maturity than either the APM or CMI. Membership of the CIPD currently stands at one hundred and thirty-thousand. The CIPD
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\(^3\) The APM considers the term ‘project’ to incorporate projects, programmes and portfolios.
maintain an extensive virtual library including fact sheets, podcasts, guides, policy, research papers and ‘e’ books.

The researcher maintains membership with the APM, CMI and CIPD and, as all three bodies purport to possess a professional interest in organisational change, their selection for inclusion in the targeted review is self evident. In order to build and develop stronger professional links, the researcher has actively ‘socialised’ his research and emerging findings, through on line forums sponsored by the three associations (Robson, 2011, p.57). This has included posting blogs, comments and short articles and participating in webinars and speaking at conferences.

2.4 Proposed strategy for the literature search and synthesis

The strategy for undertaking the literature search and the subsequent synthesis is now explained. The initial focus was on those tightly defined topics at the top of the inverted funnel (see Figure 1) relating to strategic alliances.

The starting point was scholarly literature searchable via the on-line university library search engine, ‘Discovery’, that also incorporates key databases deemed relevant, including Business Source Complete, Emerald, and Science Direct (University of Reading, 2014a). Separate searches were undertaken using ProQuest to identify past doctoral theses deemed relevant to this study. After interrogating ‘google scholar’ 4, the researcher examined relevant professional and government papers, popular magazines and other ‘grey’ materials. While the researcher acknowledges the dangers of citing material available on the world wide web (University of Reading, 2014b) it was decided to ‘err on the side
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4 Google Scholar is an online search engine that lets users look for both physical and digital copies of articles. It searches a variety of sources, including academic publishers, universities, and preprint depositories.
of inclusion' so that all relevant literature could be scrutinised (Stanley, 2001, p. 135).

Smallbone and Quinton (2011, p. 5) recommend creating tables to assist with the data mining process and setting out specific ‘search strings’, the databases searched and the hits achieved. This approach was followed and the relevant output shown in Annex ‘D’. Several different tools and methods have been trialled and tested, including using specialist software such as EndNote\(^5\) and NVivo\(^6\). A compelling desire for familiarity, simplicity and versatility led the researcher to opt for ‘i’ thoughts, a five star graded electronic mapping tools with pan system inter-operability. This product was used to create an extensive master mind-map where literature was recorded, analysed and classified.

Undertaking a literature review is not a ‘one off’ activity and needs to be continued throughout the period of study (Bryman, 2008, p. 83; Bruce, 1994, p. 218). This is pertinent for this contemporary topic, which is characterised as fluid and fast changing. Reference to the role social media has played in creating awareness of this research has been alluded to and this has acted as a conduit for sharing information and ideas. In addition, the researcher has set up regular keyword email alerts (Bryman, 2008, p.98), and also receives daily news summaries from Police Oracle and frequent updates from the APM, CMI and CIPD. Analysing and recording information received through these channels is an on-going, dynamic, task.

Having formulated the review objectives and designed an approach, incorporating a conceptual model, the next step is to undertake the literature search in accordance with the defined strategy.

\(^5\) EndNote is specialist software for managing bibliographies and references.

\(^6\) NVivo10 is specialist software for recording and categorising qualitative data.
2.5 Undertaking the literature review

In this section the researcher uses the inverted funnel framework (refer to Figure 1) to search and categorise literature deemed relevant. The key word searches used, the rationale and the product of the searches are explained. The search incorporates four distinct areas, police collaborations, public sector collaborations, private sector collaborations and finally generic change management using the APM, CMI and CIPD corpora of knowledge.

In a policing context ‘collaboration’ is the preferred description of inter organisational initiatives, usually designed to deliver savings and/or increased organisational capacity (HMIC, 2013b, p. 8; HMIC, 2012, p.,4; HMIC, 2011, p., 32; HMIC, 2010, p. 12). The HMIC define collaboration as “all activity where two or more parties work together to achieve a common goal which includes inter force activity with the private and public sectors including outsourcing and business partnering” (2012, p. 11).

As discussed in chapter 1, many authors use the term ‘strategic alliances’ to denote to longer term collaborative ventures (Yoshino & Rangan, 1995, p. 4; Monczka et al., 1998, p. 553; Brouthers et al., 1995, p. 18; Dyer et al., 2001, p. 37; Pucik, 1988, Cooper & Gardner, 1993, Austin, 2000a). Literature regarding strategic alliances is therefore directly relevant to this study. Of less importance, in the context of this study, are lower level collaborations that are an everyday occurrence within organisations, including “handshakes - ad hoc and informal, often short - lived, arrangements” (HMIC, 2009a, p. 5), or “collaborations between individuals unless this impacts upon broader inter organisational relationships” (Huxham & Vangen, 2005, p. 4).

Strategic alliances imply a longer term commitment, while other types of collaboration are frequently orientated towards the delivery of specific operational objectives (Cheng et al., 2004 p. 24; Augustine & Cooper, 2009, p. 37). Although similar experiences and challenges may apply to all types of collaboration, this study is primarily focused on those ventures which are longer
term in nature and which aim to deliver a range of services and products of strategic value to the participating organisations.

Intra organisational collaborative activity has been the subject of dedicated research (Hansen, 2009a, p. 2; Hansen, 2009b, p. 82; McDermott & Archibald, 2010, p. 82; Gulati., 2007, p.,98; Alder et al., 2011, p. 94). While the principles underpinning good collaboration gleaned from studies within a single organisational entity may apply to inter organisational collaboration, operating across organisational boundaries, arguably, presents different challenges. For this reason collaborations occurring within a defined single organisational entity are not of primary relevance to this literature review.

‘Partnering’ is another term used to describe organisational collaboration (Clay et al., 2004; Cheng et al., 2004; Diamond, 1996; Worrall & Gaines, 2006; Cooper & Gardner, 1993; Linder, 1999; Winkworth, 2005; Wucherer, 2006; Sagawa & Segal, 2000; Blume et al., 2006; Armistead & Pettigrew, 2004). The extent and application of this term is almost boundless, as partnering appears ranges from localised short term activity to significant joint ventures between multi national corporations. Given such a broad interpretation, practical difficulties are frequently encountered by organisations seeking to engage in partnering activities (Eriksson, 2010, p. 905).

To minimise confusion, a working definition for strategic alliances was set out in chapter 17. This term is interchangeable with those of strategic inter organisational change, major inter organisational change, inter organisational change, collaboration and partnering. Similarly, the terms intra organisational change, organisational change, strategic change, major organisational change and single organisational change, are all intended to denote change occurring within a single organisational entity.

7 Please refer to the commonly used definitions on page 15.
The first literature search area relates to police collaboration. The word strings shown in Annex ‘D’ have been developed from commonly used language denoting strategic alliances and feature the word ‘police’. The parameters have been broadened by the adoption of boolean logic. The focus at this stage is on establishing what scholarly literature exists. A number of different databases were searched to supplement the University of Portsmouth’s Discovery database. In addition, to searching the British Library’s EThOS database, the final search engine used was Google Scholar. To ensure manageability only the first one hundred hits were examined in each database for each word string. The results can be seen on Annex ‘D’.

2.5.1 Systematic review of police collaboration scholarly literature

In this section the researcher sets out the results of a systematic review of scholarly literature relating to police collaboration. In total three thousand five hundred and ninety-three articles and books were identified using nine different search engines. A total of three thousand four hundred and sixty-one articles were considered not to be relevant to this study. This left one hundred and thirty-two articles which were rated as being relevant to this study, to some degree. This number reduced further as several of these articles appeared in different databases and on multiple occasions. In total, eighty-four articles and books were subsequently logged onto a mind-map, analysed and the contents classified. While repetition may appear to have distorted the findings it does provide a level of reassurance regarding the validity of the search parameters deployed. The headline finding, however, was that only four of the scholarly articles reviewed were rated as being directly relevant to the topic of strategic alliances within policing.

The sparse availability of scholarly literature dedicated to police strategic alliancing represents a surprising outcome, particularly given the prominence of this topic. This is illustrated by the following comments:
“Most collaboration (in the police service) so far has been on an ad hoc basis, rather than the systematic response to an analysis of risk and cost”


“Forces are urged to move from a ‘transactional’ to ‘transformational’ approach as a means of realising long term benefits”


“The extent to which forces are collaborating in order to save money and transform efficiency is deeply disappointing. The pace of change is still too slow……. they (forces) cannot afford the luxury of failing to collaborate in the future”

(HMIC, 2013a, p. 18).

“Collaboration between forces, public and private sector organisations remains patchy, fragmented, overly complex and too slow”

(HMIC, 2014c, p. 33).

“In the absence of mergers, achieving the desired balance of resources will require collaboration between forces and this”


The methodological approach involved critiquing the four scholarly articles that were dedicated to the topic of police strategic alliances and then using the product of this exercise as a catalyst to investigate existing and emerging themes. The aim was to draw upon additional scholarly and professional literature in order to develop a fresh perceptive. Before commencing this task it was necessary to categorise the literature classified as being of partial interest:
(a) Literature dealing with academic / police practitioner partnerships created for the purpose of specific research

Examples included studies by Marks et al., 2010; Steinheider et al., 2012; Foster and Bailey, 2010; Wuestewald and Steinheider, 2010; Guillaume et al., 2012; Fyfe and Wilson, 2012; Birzer 2002; and linked articles from Neyroud, 2010 and Murj, 2010.

(b) Literature dedicated to other tactical or operational level collaborations

This covers a range of initiatives including police to police collaborations (Dale, 2012; Stewart, 2011; Woo, 2005), collaboration between the police and other blue light services (Waugh & Streib, 2006) and collaboration between the police and other public sector organisations (O’Connor, 2010; Puonti, 2003; Zealberg, 1992; Sully et al., 2005; Murphy & Lutze, 2009; Worrall & Gaines, 2006). While this literature sets out the barriers and enablers, the events described predominantly reference tactical or operational level collaborations. This is illustrated by the author’s small scale study of a three force collaboration between Sussex, Surrey and Hampshire Police to pool air support services (Dale, 2012). While the contractual arrangements between the participating forces implies a degree of longevity, the numbers of staff implicated are relatively small and make up less than one third of one percent of the total policing establishment for the three forces concerned. A strategic alliance, for the purpose of this thesis, implies a venture with greater relative organisational significance and impact.

(c) Literature providing relevant contextual information concerning policing but not explicitly dealing with the topic of collaboration

Police culture, leadership and the structure of policing arose as topics meriting investigation. This literature was introduced as the review developed.
(d) Literature dealing with collaborations and alliances not specifically involving the police service

Literature dealing with a range of strategic collaborative, partnering and outsourcing arrangements were reviewed. Emergent themes include cultural issues, partner selection and compatibility, leadership and inter-personal relationships. Similarly, this non police literature is introduced as the scope of the review broadens.

While policing may possess unique characteristics the, police do not operate in a social, political or economic vacuum and are therefore not immune to changes occurring in other parts of the public sector (Rogers & Gravelle, 2013, p. 116).

One prominent and contemporary area of collaborative activity relates to a concerted drive to promote ‘shared services’ within the public sector:

“*There is no longer any dispute about the fact that well implemented and organised shared service centres produce a lower cost and a better quality of service for their customers, leaving them able to concentrate on their front-line mission*”


“*Overall shared services should see a reduction in transaction costs of 25-40%*”


Blume et al. (2006, p.6), claim that cross sector partnering will constitute the “collaboration paradigm of the 21st century”.

To incentivise collaboration the policing minister, announced a boost to the Police Innovation Fund stating “every police force in England and Wales will receive a share of a £50 million Home Office fund for projects aimed at transforming policing through innovation and collaboration”


Understanding the apparent reluctance on the part of the police to collaborate with others, forms an integral part of this review. The remainder of this section is devoted to critiquing the four articles dedicated to police strategic alliances and reviewing the remaining scholarly literature identified. The primary focus is to better understand the drivers, barriers and challenges for achieving successful police collaboration.

2.5.1.1 Button, M., Williamson, T., & Johnston, L. (2007). Too many chiefs and not enough chief executives: Barriers to the development of PFI in the Police Service in England and Wales

In 2006 Button et al., conducted thirty-three semi structured interviews to investigate the penetration, success and implications for governance of the private finance initiative (PFI) in policing (2007, p. 289). The research was funded by Venson plc, an organisation specialising in outsourcing. The backdrop was that while PFI had been widely adopted across the public sector, there were only twenty-three reported schemes involving policing (p. 288). Further analysis of these schemes suggests most were highly ‘conservative’ in their aspirations and approach (p. 288). The authors cite three sets of barriers to explain the apparent hesitancy and reluctance of the police to embrace PFI partnerships.

The first is barrier relates to the police structure (p. 294). Button et al., makes cross sector comparisons between the police, where chief officer influence in PFI decisions is deemed significant and the NHS, where professional-clinical input is more limited, which enabled the ‘business savvy’ general managers
greater freedom to exert dispassionate influence (p. 295). In addition, some police authority members were identified as being obstructive, firstly as a consequence of political, ideological, opposition to PFI, but also due to their perceived lack of business acumen (p. 295). It should be noted that the dynamics of the tripartite system of accountability have fundamentally changed since the publication of Button et al.’s article, as a consequence of the appointment of PCCs for each force area. Orde, a former chief constable, described these recent structural changes to police governance as the “most radical in service history”. The juxtaposition is of Government being disappointed with the response of senior police officers, which they believe amount to obstruction of key reforms (Harper, March 8, 2015).

Several questions arise in response to Button et al.’s comments about police structure. To what extent has police structure acted as a barrier to change? Is there substance in the claims made above that the police service have obstructed or at least failed to embrace Government change? These questions are investigated before considering Button et al.’s second barrier; culture (2007, p. 296).

The structure of policing appears to have changed little during the course of the last fifty years (College of Policing, 2015b, p. 22). This is characterised by a quasi military rank structured hierarchy (Neyroud, 2011, p. 347), operating within a rigid command and control environment (Manning, 2007, p. 52). The police, like most bureaucracies, operate an elaborate system of rules, processes and procedures. Is such a structure acting as an impediment to change? This question is poignant because Chandler’s (1962), seminal work concluded that strategy should drive structure and not vice versa. The structure of policing appears suited to a stable and unchanging environment (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004, p. 509). It is worth noting that the police are not alone in maintaining their extended hierarchical structures. Comparative studies undertaken by Winsor of the British Army, Fire Service and Prison Service revealed the existence of similar hierarchies (2012, pp. 133-145). There are positive and negative consequences of a bureaucratic organisational structure,
but perhaps the greatest disadvantage is their inability to keep pace with a rapidly changing environment (Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004, p. 510-11). This assertion was supported in a more contemporary police orientated review undertaken by the College of Policing. The College concluded that “police culture, operating within the existing hierarchal structure, acted as a barrier to change by restricting effective communications, fostering unnecessary bureaucracy and disempowering junior officers” (2015b, pp. 16-22).

Morgan’s machine metaphor appears to apply to policing with scientific management techniques still prominent, including goal setting, targets, planning, organisation and control (1997, p. 26).

The Stevens Inquiry refers to a period of “tumultuous change” in policing, citing the economic downturn and the Government’s radical reform agenda as principle causes (2013, p. 13). The reform agenda incorporates three core elements: changes to pay and conditions of service recommended by the Winsor Inquiry, the creation of the College for Policing and the replacement of Police Authorities with elected PCCs. It is noteworthy, that, with a turnout averaging 15.1% at the inaugural elections of PCCs in November 2012 (Home Affairs Select Committee, 2014, p.3), the public reaction and perception of the change occurring in policing appears somewhat muted and at odds with the magnitude of change portrayed. Significantly, the evidence presented to the Home Affairs Committee investigation into the progress of PCCs, did not support Steven’s assertion that the new powers they (the PCCs) had been given would have a “chilling” impact on the decision making of chief constables (2014, p. 24). The final key observation of the Committee regarding this ‘tumultuous change’, was that it was too soon to reach a conclusion concerning the success or otherwise of the PCC initiative (2014, p. 47). This outcome tends to supports the assertion of Savage that police reform is an ‘incremental and cumulative process’ (2007, pp. 206-7) and is therefore unlikely to accord with change of a truly transformational nature (Hayes 2010, pp. 24-25, Nadler & Tushman, 1993, p. 24). While the language of transformational change may be popular in police circles, the change embarked upon is much more likely to
be of an incremental nature (Hayes, 2010 p. 25). As will be discussed later, the default response of senior officers is invariably one of incrementation and not transformation.

Button et al., by identifying the absence of central ‘guidance’ and ‘steering’, appear to be implying criticism of the Home Office; the third pillar in the tripartite system of police accountability (p. 302). It is worth noting that Button et al.’s study was undertaken during the era of a ‘new labour’ government. This was following the collapse of the centrally driven police forces merger programme, a response to the HMIC’s critical report that, the current structure of policing was ‘not fit for purpose’ (HMIC 2005b, p. 76). In ‘Sussex Wun’t be Druv’8, an aptly themed journal article, Godfrey (2007) a former clerk to Sussex Police Authority, describes ideological and political opposition to the Home Secretary’s force failed merger programme. Godfrey’s use of terms such as “blitzkrieg”, “Belfast uprising”, “resistance”, “turning of the tide”, “assassination” and “retreat”, graphically portray the level of hostility that the Home Secretary’s plans invoked (pp. 60-72). Given the strength of this defeat and the consequential impact on new labour’s agenda for policing, it is hardly surprising that in 2008 there was an absence of central ‘steering’ for controversial initiatives such as PFI.

The impact the tripartite system of governance has had on force collaboration can be viewed through an ideological lens. There are some who believe Government should be more interventionist and this debate is continuing concerning the future structure of policing (Stevens, 2013). The political vacuum following the abandonment of the police mergers programme was replaced by the Coalition Government’s neo-liberalistic, idealistic approach. The Cabinet Office reinforce this assertion stating that “too many of our public services are still run according to the maxim ‘the man in Whitehall really does know best. Decades of top-down prescription and centralisation have put bureaucratic imperatives above the needs of service users” (2011b, p. 7).

---

8 “We wunt be druv” is the unofficial county motto of Sussex. It is a Sussex dialect phrase meaning "we will not be driven".
The word ‘fiefdoms’ has been used colloquially to describe the forty-three force structure of policing and the scope for individuality this has historically afforded chief constables (Johnson et al., 2008, p. 231). Button et al. imply that the tripartite structure of policing, coupled with the political vacuum that existed in 2007, conspired to act as a barrier to collaboration.

These characteristics are not exclusive to policing and at macro governmental level, Miles and Trott refer to “baronial behaviour”, the ‘me-them’, as opposed to ‘us’ thinking, all of which have a negative impact on collaboration” (2012, p. 49).

The appointment of locally elected PCCs is central to the Conservative Government’s ideology. The study conducted by Miles and Trott indicated that shared leadership and participation at a local level was the best means of securing productive and lasting collaboration (2012, p. 35). Despite the HMIC remaining “deeply disappointed” with the progress of collaboration, it is evident that a raft of novel and imaginative collaboration schemes are been spawned locally, albeit in many cases, very slowly (HMIC 2013a, pp. 69-70). The question that remains unanswered is whether the predominantly ‘lassie-faire’ approach, seemingly adopted by the present Government, is more conductive to lasting and productive collaboration than an alternative, centralist and more directive orthodoxy.

Button et al., cited their second barrier as being ‘culture’ (p. 296). In this context culture appears to have acted as a negative force. The juxtaposition is that culture should operate as a force for positivity (Deal & Kennedy, 2000, p. 15). This was illustrated by a seminal study of ‘excellent’ organisations when Peters and Waterman (1982), highlighted the role of chief executives in nurturing and sustaining corporate values and ensuring that organisational culture remain congruent and aligned with these higher aims. Police culture emerges as a key theme in the literature review, yet it is overwhelmingly portrayed negatively and as a force acting against progressive change. Of relevance to this study, is the sub culture that purports to apply at a senior level within policing, sometimes
referred to as the police management culture (Westmarland, 2008, pp. 253-280) or the culture of ‘management cops’ (Reuss-Ianni, 1993; Skansky, 2007, pp. 19-46). Bower’s (1966), popular definition of culture as “the way things are done around here” resonates in a policing context. Reiner’s definition of police culture as the “values, norms, perspectives, myths and craft rules that inform conduct” is also poignant because it reinforces the impact that these hidden factors can have on overt and observable behaviour (2010, p. 117).

Reiner’s portrayal of “cop culture” includes words and phrases such as “action centred”, “hedonistic” “conservative”, “machismo”, “insular” and “isolationism” (2010, pp. 115-137). Brown adds “overt masculinity”, “secrecy” and “resistance change” (2000, p. 250). Dear, develops the “them and us” theme referenced by Reiner, suggesting that a “siege mentality: exists within policing” (2011, p.15). Bailey and Foster infer a “bias to ‘action” with emphasis on the here and now” (2010, p.95). Bayley refers to a dominant “blue collar ethos” (2008, p.14) while Charman et al., highlight a ‘can do’ attitude and approach (1999, p. 299). Caless, (2011, p. 118) proposes three key areas of similarity with the cop culture described earlier. Firstly, he identifies a bias towards short term operational decision making in preference to, and at the expense of, longer term strategic, organisational decision making. Secondly, he highlights a tendency for police leaders to lack interest and treat with distain, ideas which originate outside policing stating “they (ACPO officers) have little time for outsiders who have not experienced policing in some way or who do not bring valued skills to bear on a situation” (2011, p. 177). Calass reinforces the conservative culture, stating “chief officers seem no different from most of the police population: many fear change and regard it with unease, particularly if it entails the importation of rivals and competitors from outside” (2011, p. 205).

To some, the suggestion that senior executives in comparability sized organisations outside policing would approach change in such an indifferent manner, would be treated with incredulity.
Reiner believes that chief officers display the same cultural styles and characteristics as their junior officers (2010, p. 134). This assertion has face validity as the current forty-three chief constables all joined the service via a single entry system, before commencing their long career paths upwards (Charman et al., 1999, p. 285). Policing functioned, until very recently, as a ‘closed shop’ (Caless, 2011, p. 205). This implies a degree of indoctrination into a dominant culture before progressing, slowly, to the upper echelons in the organisational hierarchy. Paradoxically, the history of policing appears littered with examples of pioneering chief constables, referred to by Savage as “policy entrepreneurs and visionaries” determined to drive change from within (2007, p. 128).

Button et al., (p. 288), identifies a deeply conservative ‘top cop’ culture with a low appetite to risk taking. This suggests little has changed since Reiner’s earlier seminal study of chief constables, “driven to preserve the steady state and wary of political initiative and influence” (1991, pp. 218-19). Gibson and Villier’s describe police leaders as “overly prescriptive, inappropriately traditional, expedient, pragmatic and deeply influenced by an insular culture” (2007, p. 16).

The quality of organisational leadership within policing emerges as a central theme within this review and is a topic the researcher will revisit (Dale, 2012, pp. 41-60; HMIC, 2014a, p. 19; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 4).

Punch appears more optimistic, suggesting there has been a cultural shift in policing. He describes police culture as being “more open, less conservative and more professional” (2007, p. 108). Punch attributes this change, in part, to the significant increase in the number of recruits holding educational degrees. (2007, p. 126). Three points merit consideration. Firstly, Punch is referring to police culture generally and not specifically ‘top cop culture’ which Button et al. see as the principle barrier to change. Secondly, chief officers, with very rare exceptions, start their policing careers as patrol constables, so it will take many more years before the “smart cops”, Punch refers to, are able to exert influence.
at the highest levels within policing (Punch, 2007, p. 126; Caless, 2011, p. 11). To support this assertion the researcher draws upon Government statistics which show that the mean length of police service for candidates appearing before the Senior Police National Assessment Centre is twenty-two years, six months (NPIA, p. 3). Thirdly, while academic qualifications are not essential for promotion to chief constable, Caless’ description of the mandatory Police Strategic Command Course, suggests that a high level of mental agility and academic acumen are required on the part of aspiring chief officers:

“The course is a demanding programme of study, involving 400 hours of formal learning spread over 45 days, plus the same again in private study and active research”. “In addition most will have embarked in a parallel academic programme to obtain a post-graduate diploma or master’s degree on a policing related or business topic” (2011, pp. 30-31).

Caless’ study revealed that nearly every chief officer possessed an educational degree (2011, p. 6). The take-up with higher education reported by Caless represents a significant uplift from Reiner’s 1991 study, which reported that only 25% of chief constables in England and Wales were recipients of an educational degree (1991, p. 59). It seems unlikely, given Caless’ latest assessment of academic achievement, coupled with the demands placed upon delegates participating in the strategic command course, that a lack of academic prowess or educational achievement are likely causes, per se, for the reported ‘top cop’ culture being as resistant to change as has been highlighted.

Button et al.’s suggest that resistance to change among senior officers was a principle cause for the low take-up of police / PFI partnerships (p. 296). Caless, while describing the ‘overwhelming’ number of his interviewees as being “thoughtful, judicious and intellectually curious, decisive people” still acknowledged the continued existence of a ‘risk averse’ culture among chief

---

9 This is the gateway to the Police Strategic Command Course, a requisite requirement for all officers seeking appointment to Assistant Chief Constable and above.
officers (2011, p. 235). This assessment appears consistent with Crank’s earlier assertion that “police culture represents the biggest obstacle to change” (1998, p. 6). Such an unhealthy state of affairs, if it exists, can partly be attributed to the collective perception that they (the senior police officers) are not ‘business people’ and are, in some way, “unique among chief executives” (p. 297). Gill develops this argument by suggesting that some senior officers viewed business with suspicion and even with disdain (2013, p. 6). While police culture may espouse particular traits it is neither monolithic or unchanging (Punch, 2007, p. 108; Reiner, 2010, p. 116), and it would be too simplistic to attribute an apparent reluctance to embrace PFI to this reason without further study and comparison with other organisations, all of whom, it is said, have their own cultural characteristics (Deal & Kennedy, 2000, p. 4; Schein, 1996, p. 9; Schultz, 2014, p. 42). Public choice theory suggests there are likely to be distinct cultural differences between the ‘bureaucrats’ working in the public sector and those who espouse the principals of the free market (Davids & Hancock, 1998, p. 43).

It is worth considering why the ‘top cop culture’ has developed in the manner portrayed. The question of indoctrination caused as a consequence of single point entry and an extended career path to chief constable could, arguably, lead to the adoption of broader cop culture characteristics, such as ‘conservatism’ and ‘skepticism’ of ideas and initiatives spawned outside policing (Young, 1993, p. 84). The reader could also be forgiven for attributing the phenomena of ‘short termism’ to the introduction of fixed term contracts for chief officers in 1995, which now, under the current arrangements last for a period of five years, extendable for a further three years (House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee 2014, p. 26). In evidence to the Home Affairs Select Common one witness, in sharing his concerns about the creation of PCCs, likened the current status of chief constables to “one of football managers reliant on the confidence of the club boss, their PCC” (House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee 2014, section 3 para. 66).
Two points are worthy of note. Firstly, the Home Affairs Committee found little
evidence to support the football manager’s analogy (2014, p. 24). Secondly,
PCCs were not created until November 2012, and therefore, cannot reasonably
be blamed for a bias towards ‘short termism’ or any the of the other facets of
senior cop culture alluded to. The research undertaken by Reiner, some
twenty-five years ago, indicated that just 37% of chief constables remained in
post for more than five years, thereby dispelling the myth that fixed term
contracts are responsible for the dominant reported mindset and the reluctance
of chiefs to engage in longer term decision making (Reiner, 1991, p. 87). The
extended police organisational pyramid\(^\text{10}\), shortened careers, typically only
spanning thirty years, coupled with the nature of police funding, are likely to
provide a more convincing explanation of a reluctance to embrace longer term
planning. Short termism is not just a police or public sector phenomena.
Pascale and Athos’ seminal study of western and Japanese management
cultures highlighted contradictory styles and approaches, with many western
organisations orientated towards short term targets and performance indicators.
In contrast, the Japanese placed emphasis on building a long term
organisational vision, reinforcing shared values and strengthening consensus
(Pascale & Athos, 1981). As western organisations are still, apparently, driven
by short term goals it seems unjustified to castigate police leadership for

Closely linked to short termism, but not referenced by Button et al., is the
metaphor of the “butterfly’ manager” which is reported as being a feature of
policing (Caless, 2011, p. 118; Reiner, 1991, p. 79). The butterfly manager is
someone who fitters from post to post and force to force, in pursuit of individual
career objectives, sometimes at the expense of broader organisational goals.
They are driven by a desire for promotion. Young’s colourful assessment is
more direct. He concludes stating that “top management can never really care
for the troops in the field for they are merely ships that pass in the night on their
journeys to even more glorious ports of call” (1993, p. 84).

\(^{10}\) The Metropolitan Police has 11 ranks spanning from constable to commissioner while
other forces have 9.
Button et al.’s article suggest fault lines exist in the strategic capabilities of many senior officers. They cite the performance culture as a further contributory factor (p. 298), suggesting that focusing on short term goals inhibits an ability to engage in strategic planning. Neyroud, a former chief constable, cites an paradox within policing, which places emphasis on ‘transformational’ leadership as the preferred style, while at the same time using predominantly ‘transactional’ frameworks based on target achievements (2011, p. 349). While the performance culture in policing has received a mixed press and may appear somewhat cumbersome, a fundamental premise of the ‘transactional’ and ‘transformational’ paradigms is that they should co-exist. The challenge lies in balancing strategic management, including the creation of a corporate vision, with a focus on targets and results (Burns, 1978). To claim that one approach excludes the other suggests a misunderstanding of the philosophy of management.

The third category of PFI resistance cited by Button et al., is the catch all, ‘miscellaneous grouping’ (2007, p. 298). They suggest that the restrictive nature of some PFI contracts coupled with the prohibitive costs of seeking variations acts a significant impediment. Ideological opposition from Unison¹¹ was another barrier, as were concerns regarding liability, risk transfer and costs. A lack of procurement expertise among senior police personnel represented another relevant factor (Button et al., 2007, p. 297; Gill, 2013, p. 8). Finally, it was implied that pursing PFI was perceived by some senior officers, as being too time consuming and complicated. While these may all represent valid assertions, none are unique to policing and arguably, apply across the public sector, where the take-up and enthusiasm for PFI remains considerably higher (HM Treasury, 2013a, p. 11). The conclusion, is that police structure, culture and leadership, appear to be shaping an apathetic appetite for PFI, a valid example of inter organisational change.

¹¹ Unison is the UK's largest public service trade union, claiming a membership of 1.3m.
While at a macro level the desire of police leaders to embrace PFI may appear muted, there is still evidence of ambitious schemes in operation. For example, the longstanding Sussex Police and Reliance plc PFI Custody Scheme merits referencing as a case study. This £90m, thirty year contract, involves modernising and maintaining the force’s custody estate. Reliance plc now manage six custody and investigation centres. They employ custody assistants to work alongside police personnel. A review undertaken jointly by HM Inspectortate of Prisons (HMIP) and the HMIC praised the “long term strategic investment” while citing “good relationships” and “strong leadership” (HMIP & HMIC, 2011).

Button et al., conclude their article by highlighting an apparent paradox that exists within senior police management. This relates to a willingness to embrace proactive, risk based, decision making in operational spheres, while remaining unduly risk adverse and diffident in the area of strategic and organisational decision making. One potential flaw in Button et al.’s article is the implied assumption that a willingness to embrace PFI represents ‘good’, while an apparent reluctance to reject this contemporary aspect of new public management, is considered ‘bad’. (2007, p. 302). While hindsight may be an unjust science, it is apparent that since the publication of this article, PFI has received a predominantly unfavourable press. This culminated in a highly critical assessment from the Public Accounts Committee (2011), and the subsequent investigation by the NAO, (2011). Given this backdrop, was the hesitancy, conservatism and concern expressed by senior police officers evidence of a reluctance to embrace change for the sake of change, or was it indicative of a circumspect group of professionals responding with a healthy degree of scepticism?


These linked scholarly articles are treated as a single entity. In the first article, White analyses the Lincolnshire Police - G4S strategic partnership, spanning 18 service areas, with a reported total cost of £229m. The second article explores broader issues relating to outsourcing and the police. White has continued to contextualise his findings in an evocatively titled blog, “Five reasons why it is difficult to privatise the police” (2015b).

White’s research is considered germane because it provides an insight into a new and evolving paradigm shift in police service delivery. In this regard the Lincolnshire / G4S alliance could be considered to be pioneering and may represent the path other forces will follow (2014, p. 1002). This initiative provides a valid contemporary case study of an on-going strategic alliance between the police and the private sector.

The limitations of White’s research is that it involves a single case study, which implies inherent risks when assuming representation of a wider population. Regardless, the findings appear to demonstrate face validity, remaining broadly consistent with the work from Button et al. (2007), and the other literature analysed in this review.

Drawing upon the HMIC statistics (2012, p. 5), White considers a reluctance on the part of the police to engage with private sector partners. He cites free market logic, which he states is “dangerous, alien and incomprehensible” to many police personnel (White, 2014, p. 4). White, highlights outsourcing inexperience on the part of police, which he claims acts as a barrier to change (2015b). He also references indifference and outright opposition by the police to the concept of outsourcing (2015b). While there are similarities with the
earlier PFI case study, it merits noting that the Conservative Government appear more ideologically and philosophically committed to this particular form of public-private sector partnering (Plimmer, 2014). This is, despite accusations of overcharging, contract failure and even fraud (NAO, 2014). The NAO, (2013a, p. 10), estimate that in excess of £90b per annum is spent on outsourcing, double the figure recorded four years previously (Plimmer, 2014). Significantly, more than 60% of contracts in 2012 came from local authorities, underpinning ministers’ determination to shift the service paradigm from service providers to that of service commissioners (Plimmer, 2013). Such a model is consistent with Johnson et al.’s depiction of state sponsored pluralism where Government relinquish the ‘rowing’ tasks to the private sector while continuing to ‘steer’ the boat (2008, p. 229).

While senior managers in other areas of the public sector may have reconciled their ideological differences regarding public versus private sector values and appear ready to engage in strategic partnerships with the private sector, the same cannot be said of policing (HMIC, 2014a, pp. 65-66). The police, it would appear, are positioned towards the back of this particular change curve (Rogers, 2002, p. 990).

White references the ‘Olympics fiasco’, caused by the inability of G4S to meet their security contractual obligations (2015a, p. 2). In addition to damaging the reputation and profits of G4S, this ‘incident’ appears to have wider ramifications for outsourcing within the police. The consequences included popularisation of anti privatisation campaigns at the inaugural PCC elections, effectively blocking major outsourcing deals (2015a, p.2). White implies that this amounted to scare-mongering and a disproportionate response. Irrationalism, popularism, fear and an absence of business acumen collectively act as impediments to change (2015b).

Recent indications suggest that the drive to outsource in policing is slowly regaining traction, with austerity acting as the primary driver (White, 2015, p. 5). On January 6, 2015, Mackey, the Deputy Commissioner of the MPS, in a
curiously apologetic statement, announced the intention of the Met’s Management Board to outsource back office functions including procurement, finance and HR business support services, “a decision made with some regret” (Weinfass, 2015). Mackey’s comments are curious on two counts. Firstly, they should be considered in the context of the Government’s enthusiasm for shared services centres, articulated unequivocally in their 2012 strategic plan, namely that “shared services present the best immediate opportunity to make a real difference to how cross-departmental services are delivered and reduce the cost to the taxpayer” (H.M. Government, 2012, p. 6).

Secondly, Mackey’s statement appears to contravene emerging change management thinking which emphasises the significance of ‘positivity’ when crafting communications (Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6). This represents a key emerging theme that will be explored in greater detail later in this thesis.

The police service were once castigated as “the last unreformed area of the public sector” (Savage, 2007, p. 219). While it is inconceivable to suggest that austerity and police reform have not created significant contemporary challenges for the leaders of the Service, the apparent prolonged indifference on the part of the police to engage with potential private sector partners may be evidence of a wider malaise towards organisational change.

The reluctance of forces in England and Wales to replicate the transformational change embarked upon by Lincolnshire Police could be indicative of the ‘perilously dire financial situation Lincolnshire found itself in’ (White, 2015, p. 8; HMIC, 2013a, pp. 36 & 136). White argues that Lincolnshire, were already incredibly ‘lean’ and there was simply “no more fat to trim”. It would appear that the incremental approach for achieving change, normally preferred by police managers, was simply not an option in this case.

While fiscal pressures represent the primary driver for outsourcing within the public sector (Sako, 2014, p. 28), achieving other ‘collaborative advantages’ should still be a consideration (Huxham, 1996, pp. 14-17). Becoming more
efficient, access to world class expertise and enabling the management of the host organisation to focus on their core business activities are proposed as supplementary advantages of outsourcing (Cox et al., 2011, p. 193).

G4S successfully secured the Lincolnshire contract through cost reduction and their expertise in business process mapping (White, 2014, p. 10). Adopting a ‘whole systems’ approach as part of a transformational change initiative is recommended as the best means for delivering service improvements (Audit Commission, 2010, p. 22; Miles & Trott, 2012, p. 16). Reference is made in White’s evaluation to the application of business process outsourcing logic and the resultant improvements that have been secured (2014, p. 16).

Culture is discussed by White, both at organisational and micro levels. G4S staff spent many months on site working alongside and gaining the trust of police personnel. At an organisational level, White infers that a degree of cross cultural infusion has been achieved, thereby ‘blending together a mix of public good and market rationalities’ (2014, p. 10). This implies a level of mutualism and the development of positive symbiotic relationships. Conversely, opposition to the partnership was aired by many police staff who, paradoxically are now employed by G4S. Some experienced a sense of betrayal while others were more philosophical about the changes. Many staff enjoyed TUPE12 protected rights and remained in post. White alludes to frustration on the part of the contractor and suggests that an inability to change personnel may present another barrier to outsourcing (2015b).

White’s findings are, in the main, positive, and appear to counteract the warnings expressed by the Independent Commission of Policing (Stevens 2013, p. 161-180). Of particular interest is the infusion of cultures inferred and the potential benefits of cross learning. How this develops and the effects on police culture remains to be seen. White’s study has reinforced the impact that austerity has had on driving change. While there are limitations with this case
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12 TUPE refers to the Transfers of Undertakings Protection of Employment Regulations.
study, White’s research is considered timely and helpful because it provides an evaluation of a novel and groundbreaking inter organisational alliance involving the police.

2.5.1.3 Gill, M. (2013). Senior police officers' perspectives on private security: sceptics, pragmatists and embracers

Gill explores the views of senior police officers towards private security companies. He asserts that police officers are pivotal to the implementation of police and private security partnerships, thereby reinforcing the earlier findings of Button et al. (2007). Gill’s principle contribution is in identifying different groupings of police actors, assessed and ranked according to their receptiveness to change.

Poignantly Gill, while acknowledging the existence of plurality in policing, achieved through workforce modernisation schemes, portrays a popular perception of the commercial sector as being a “problematic outsider” (2013, p. 277). The use of the word 'outsider' is noteworthy, because historically the term ‘workforce modernisation’ in a policing context, was limited to “determining and effectively managing, the optimum mix of officers and police staff in order to deliver the increasingly complex services required of a modern police organisation” (HMIC, 2004 p. 29). Paradoxically, given the growing popularity of outsourcing in other sectors, in 2010 the Audit Commission, cited Surrey Police as an exemplar, urging forces to achieve transformational savings by changing the workforce mix, specifically by increasing the number of non warranted posts and thereby achieving a corresponding reduction in the numbers of police officers (Audit Commission, 2010, pp. 35-39). While the Audit Commission also cite examples of outsourcing within policing, such as the Hertfordshire Police Catering Initiative (2010, p. 54), as has been discussed earlier, these initiatives do not appear to constitute change of a transformational nature or merit labelling as strategic alliances.
This and other worthy, albeit ad hoc examples of good practice cited by the Audit Commission, (2010), may be indicative of a vision for policing being constrained by the limits of what is known in policing or what is deemed as acceptable to a senior police audience tasked with leading change.

Despite the frequent calls for transformational change made by the Audit Commission (2010), workforce modernisation schemes that merely adjust the police officers and employee mix, together with the outsourcing of catering services, suggest change that is incremental in nature. Others use similarly vivid descriptive language to discuss the changes occurring within policing. For example, McLaughlin et al., refer to two decades of sustained change and reform (2001, p. 301), while Mawby et al., describes a of state of “permanent revolution” (2009, p. 35). Savage concludes his narrative by reminding us that reform represents a component part of the fabric of policing (2007, p. 219). While acknowledging that significant change has been achieved, the researcher asserts that this is frequently the consequence of the cumulative impact of incremental change, operating within established systems. Hayes refers to this as the “gradualist paradigm” (2010, p. 35). Arguably, while there is often talk of urgent, large scale change in policing, the forces for continuity, a powerful stable hierarchal structure and small ‘c’ conservatism, all collectively act to dilute the populist depiction of transformational change (Kotter, 1999; Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004; Tichy & Devanna, 1986; Burke & Litwin, 1992; Hayes, 2010). This is reinforced by Hayes who states that “transformational change involves a break with the past. It may undermine core competencies, and question the very purpose of the enterprise. This type of change involves doing things differently rather than doing things better” (2010, p. 25).

It is the researcher’s contention that, despite the rhetoric used by managers and commentators, instances of transformational change in policing are extremely rare. If this assertion is valid what is the impact of inappropriate change language? While little appears to have been written about this topic, Reichers et al. (1997, p. 49) are of the opinion that workforce cynicism to organisational change can be conditioned by an organisation’s history. An organisation with a
track record of ‘getting it wrong’ in this arena is more likely to prompt a cynical response from its workers (Reichers et al., 1997, p. 49). Does the language of perpetual, relentless and transformational change, apparently so popular among police leaders, foster cynicism within the workforce when little is actually seen to have changed? Furthermore, does such a state impact on the ‘appetite’ of staff for future change?

Gill suggests that incompatible organisational goals and principles between the public and private sectors could represent a source of ‘relationship difficulty’ (Prenzer & Sarre, 2007, p. 55). This claim supports earlier assertions concerning the lacklustre approach apparently adopted by some police actors and their penchant to limit collaboration to other members of the police family, rather than exploring new, potentially risker but more beneficial, pan sector partnerships. A re-occurring theme in Gill’s research was the reported perception among senior police officers that they were pursuing higher value public service goals, while private sector leaders operated to a narrower, profit driven agenda (2013, p. 281). A limited awareness of the complexities of managing a public company may act as an inhibitor when seeking to exploit the synergies potentially available from this type of strategic alliance. Distrust and inexperience, coupled with the high profile faux pas on the part G4S at the 2012 Olympics, blend to create a cocktail of suspicion and hesitancy on the part of several senior police managers (Gill, 2013, pp. 281-84). Despite the negativity reported, a minority of senior officers appeared more receptive and were able to identify the benefits of outsourcing (Gill, 2013, pp. 284-85).

Gill’s categorisation of senior officers as being either sceptics, pragmatists or embracers provides a simplistic, but intuitively attractive model. However, the absence of clear definitions, coupled with the small scale nature of this research, exposes limitations. While the contextual information about policing is helpful and supports earlier research by other academics, arguably Gill’s categorisations can be applied to any group of actors from any sector. Regardless, Gill still provides a useful insight into senior police culture, particularly of the suspicions that some officers still harbour.
2.5.1.4 Mawby, R., Heath, G. & Walley, L. (2009). Workforce modernization, outsourcing and the “permanent revolution” in policing

The backdrop for the article by Mawby et al., is the National Workforce Modernisation Programme managed by the NPIA until the Agency’s demise in 2010. The focus was on evaluating a small scale pilot to deploy custody assistants, thereby releasing warranted staff for operational police duty. While the study was operationally focused and small in scale, arguably, the problems encountered may have resonance at a macro level.

Mawby et al. (2009, p. 40) discussed the merits of creating an ethnically diverse police workforce (MacPherson, 1999, p. 375). Although only a marginal impact was noted in this study, it is relevant to consider the wider beneficial consequences that outsourcing may have by creating a workforce that better represents the wider population it serves, particularly in policing, which still maintains a strong white, male, dominance (Home Office, 2013, s. 5).

One emerging issue, relates to inequalities of pay and conditions of employment. While cashable savings were achieved (2009, p. 42) contract staff harboured a sense of grievance due to pay and service condition inequalities. There is a risk, the authors suggests, of creating a new underclass of police workers (2009, p. 44).

Mawby et al. summarise their understanding of police culture as ‘insular, suspicious and containing a distrust of outsiders’ (2009, p. 41). Their other findings were generally more upbeat, suggesting the successful attainment of integration between permanent and contract staff.

---

13 On 31 March 2013, 73% of all police officers were male. Only 5% of all police officers were of an ethic minority background.
Mawby et al. propose that the introduction of outsourcing to the workforce modernisation agenda represents a paradigm shift, a new model incorporating an amalgam of warranted officers, non warranted staff plus outsourced workers (2009, p. 49). While this may, at face value, appear to represent a valid assertion, Gill’s argument contains two potential flaws. Firstly, policing has always co-existed alongside outsourced services, albeit they are ancillary and non core. Catering and cleaning represent widely adopted examples and in both areas a ‘mixed economy’ workforce appears as an established feature within policing. Secondly, inequity is a widely known consequence of police organisation, which offers different rates and pay and conditions of service to its warranted and non-warranted staff. Examples include staff performing identical roles as emergency call handlers. Added to this is the volunteering, no pay, service dimension provided by special constabularies. When considered in this context, the staffing paradigm of policing already appears as multi dimensional and multi faceted.

While acknowledging the cost benefits achieved through outsourcing, Mawby et al. warn of the dangers of fragmentation in this new ‘market led model’, albeit this not explained (2009, p. 44). It is worthy of note that no such issues were reported from the subsequent Lincolnshire Police / G4S case study (White, 2014). Policing should not, however, operate in a vacuum (Rogers & Gravelle, 2013, p. 116) and while outsourcing may only currently exist at an elementary level, to overstate the dangers of this model of service delivery is to ignore the existence of established frameworks of greater complexity in sectors outside of policing.

2.5.2 Review of additional scholarly police collaboration literature

While more has been written about the broader topic of police collaboration, it is worth re-emphasising that the systematic literature review was only able to identify four scholarly articles that directly tackled the topic of strategic alliancing involving the police. These articles focused on police and private sector
alliancing, arguably the most contentious form of collaboration. Of the different types of police collaboration categorised by the HMIC, schemes involving the private sector represents the least popular (HMIC, 2013a, p. 73). So what of the other types of collaboration, namely inter-force and locally based partnerships with other public sector bodies of which no scholarly literature was to be found? This is pertinent, as these are also aspects where, according to the HMIC, progress has been “deeply disappointing” (2013a, p. 79). This section is devoted to providing a synthesis of the remaining scholarly literature.

Collaboration between the police and academia is a topic where more has been written, normally as a conclusion to a joint study or research enterprise (Marks et al., 2010; Steinheider et al., 2012; Foster & Bailey, 2010; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2010; Guillaume et al., 2012; Fyfe & Wilson, 2012; Birzer, 2002). While a successful outcome was reported, this primarily appears as a qualitative judgement, reported by one or both of the instigating parties and not supported by hard quantifiable data. Paradoxically, several key themes emerge which are relevant to this thesis.

Organisational culture appears as a dominant theme with two very different models being reported. Numerous references are made to ‘cop culture’, reinforced by the action orientated nature of policing, operating to short term timescales, which, it is said, is very different from the world of academia (Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 95). Culture appears to permeate every facet of organisational life and this is reinforced by Steinheider et al., who reference widely contrasting philosophies, operating systems, values and perspectives (2012, pp. 357-58). There appears to be universal agreement on how to reconcile this cultural mis-match, summarised by Marks et al., who emphasise the ‘softer’ aspects of relationship building that can only be developed at a personal level with empathy, understanding and a willingness to shift positions (2010, pp. 113-17). Trust, openness and honesty are all key qualities, together with an ability to challenge in a constructive and appropriate manner (Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 101). Recalibrating expectations and striving for a ‘slow burn’ approach, aimed at achieving an incremental step change is advocated by
Marks et al., (2010, pp. 117-19). The quality of leadership emerges as another critical success factor, thereby supporting established change management doctrine which emphasises the part played by senior management (CMI, 2013, p. 29).

Operational collaboration between police forces, other blue light services and the wider public sector, is the next category considered. The study by Dale of a ‘successful’ three force initiative to create a joint air support unit highlighted significant cultural differences between seemingly homogenous police organisations (2012). The term success in this context merits qualification for what was deemed successful to some stakeholders was considered a failure by others (2012, pp. 47-48). In this context the terms success and failure are too polarised. Leadership re-emerged as a prominent theme (2012, p. 44). The traditional command and control style, prevalent in the police service, appears less suited to a collaborative environment, where position counts for little, motivations are unclear, power is blurred and relationships diffuse. In Dale’s study one interviewee refers to the ‘hideously painful and slow pace of change’ (2012, p. 48), thereby reinforcing the significant time and effort required to develop collaborative ventures. The findings from this case study merit testing with a wider population.

The work of Murphy and Lutze (2009), concerning a US based police-probation partnership, is helpful on multiple counts. Firstly, the researchers begin by articulating tangible benefits for the initiative (2009, p. 66). Developing such a clear understanding of the requirements and expectations of participating parties provides the ‘metaphoric glue’ to bind the partnership together when the going gets tough, as is bound to happen. Secondly, there was an explicit acknowledgement that bringing together professionals from related, but different organisations, will inevitably create tension (2009, p. 73). This level of maturity is likely to prompt the development of robust dispute resolution processes. Finally, they introduce the concept of ‘mission distortion’ where individuals engaged in the collaborative venture begin pursuing goals which are not
necessarily compatible with those of their own organisation (2009, p. 67). This is sometimes referred to as ‘going native’ (Kanuha, 2000, p. 439).

Benson and Cullen (1998, p. 206) remind us that the problems of police collaboration is not exclusively a British phenomenon. They highlight the problems caused by ‘turf battles’, the consequential wasteful deployment of resources that occurred and the negative publicity this attracted. Puonti’s case study of a collaborative venture between the police and tax authorities highlights similar issues. She believes that the development of shared values and goals represent a valuable means of reducing these tensions (2003, pp. 132). Puonti also references ‘boundary spanners’ (2003, p. 143), individuals prepared to drive inter-organisational collaboration. Williams suggests that the leadership role these individuals perform is catalytic and facilitative. Negotiation, mediation and conflict resolution skills are key (Williams, 2013, p. 24). As the drive to collaborate gathers momentum this once new paradigm of collaborative behaviour begins to evolve as the new norm. It is debatable whether the police possess the skills necessary to exploit the opportunities presented by this new collaborative world.

2.5.3 Review of police collaboration non-scholarly literature

The researcher now considers professional and other non scholarly literature dedicated to the topic of police collaboration. The principle source of professional literature is the HMIC who have produced thematic reports on the state of collaboration in policing (2008 & 2009) and then included collaboration as a central theme during a series of austerity progress reports (2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014b & 2014c). The intention of the HMIC is to highlight and disseminate good practice. Usefully, reviews have been published relating to two examples of good practice cited by the HMIC (2014b, p. 11); the Warwickshire and West Mercia Strategic Alliance and the East Midlands Police Collaboration Programme (Flannery & Graham, 2014; HMIC 2013b). The literature is supplemented by ad hoc studies undertaken by the Audit

The availability of considerable, contemporary, professional literature tackling the topic of police collaboration is indicative of its topicality. Collaboration is not a new phenomenon (HMIC, 2012, p.4) and the police have an established track record of responding to operational incidents, using established protocols for providing mutual aid (College of Policing, 2015a). According to Williams (2013, p. 17) “working collaboratively across professional, organisational and sectoral boundaries is now an established feature of UK public policy”. Collaboration came to prominence in policing following rejection of the HMIC’s plans for wholesale reorganisation, including the creation of ‘super-forces’ (2005). Subsequent changes in legislation now impose a statutory duty on PCCs and chief officers to ‘keep collaboration opportunities under review and to collaborate where it is in the best interests of the efficiency and effectiveness of their own and other police forces’ (Home Office, 2012, p. 13). Paradoxically, despite the existence of such an explicit driver, the police appear to have been slow to engage in organisational collaboration, particularly given the popularity of this approach in other sectors (Williams, 2013, p. 18). Schemes noted, include the creation of ‘super councils’ through the deployment of shared services, joint operations, collaborative appointments and outsourcing’ (Williams, 2013, p. 18). These initiatives are not new. In 2004 Dowling et al. assessed the pressure on organisations to collaborate as being ‘overwhelming’ (p. 309).

While partnership is promoted as being desirable within policing, there appears to be little empirical research to support the assertion that collaboration actually delivers savings and efficiencies. This mirrors similar observations made regarding the wider public sector, for while it is acknowledged that collaboration is intuitively attractive, hard evidence of success appears somewhat thin (Ling, 2000, p. 82; Dowling, 2004, p. 310; Williams, 2013, p. 18). Despite the absence of hard evidence the UK Government’s support for shared services remains undiminished (HM Government, 2012, p. 7). Given the Government’s
mantra that all centrally funded public spending proposals must be supported by a ‘compelling’ and ‘valid’ business case, this situation appears somewhat anomalistic (HM Treasury, 2013b, p. 8).

The professional literature reviewed relating to policing appears to exalt the virtues of collaboration. This is illustrated by remarks made by HMIC (2013a, p. 18) and Audit Commission (2011, p. 59) criticising the ad hoc nature of collaboration and urging the police to do ‘much more’. The CBI were equally unequivocal, stating that, “if the police service is to meet its operational and financial challenges, forces must collaborate much more widely and in a more coordinated fashion” (2010, p. 12). Policy Exchange proposed a similar stance stating “PCC’s must forge partnerships with private business” (2012, p. 44). The clear inference is that collaboration needs to be embraced.

It is worth reflecting on generic literature that tackles the concept of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ collaboration. Hansen (2009b, p. 83) challenges conventional wisdom that collaboration leads to improved performance. He reminds us of the significant opportunity costs involved in creating collaborative ventures and warns of the dangers in becoming too pre-occupied with process rather than outcome (2009, p. 88). This assertion is supported by Dowling et al.’s review of partnerships in the health care sector. Here, the researchers found that when evaluations were undertaken, they were overwhelming orientated towards the process of partnership rather than the results achieved. Furthermore, the measures used were primarily qualitative (Dowling et al., 2004, p. 312). To encourage a more dispassionate and quantifiable assessment of collaboration Hansen proposes using the following formula to assess the ‘collaboration premium’ or outcome, namely, “projected return - opportunity costs - collaboration costs = collaboration premium” (Hansen, 2009, p. 85).

Hansen’s formula will be familiar to project managers when developing a business case using APM methodology which stipulates that the “benefits > costs + risks + timescales” (APM, 2012, p. 94).
Huxham’s earlier work reached a similar conclusion. He uses the term ‘collaborative advantage’ to denote the synergy created between collaborating organisations (1999, p. 14). His, Hansen’s and Dowling et al.’s contributions are significant because they illustrate the value of adopting a discerning approach and focusing only on collaboration that achieves a synergistic outcome rather than collaborating merely because it is an innately good thing to do.

As alluded to earlier, the evidence shows that the police have been slow to embrace organisational collaboration (HMIC, 2012, pp. 56-57; HMIC, 2013, p. 79; HMIC, 2014a, p. 57; HMIC, 2014c, p. 33; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 32; CBI, 2010, p. 12). Notably, the HMIC has not provided evidence to support their assertion that the level of police collaboration remains “deeply disappointing”. They do, however, acknowledge the existence of barriers and enablers to collaboration, albeit this list appears generic and elementary (2012, p. 49). To assist forces the HMIC and NAO jointly produced a ‘guide’ focusing on private sector partnering with the police, although this is presented primarily as a theoretical framework (2014) and appears lacking of practical, real world, advice and application.

The approach of taken by the HMIC has been to promote good practice by referencing collaboration schemes currently under development; albeit these are not presented as in-depth case studies where learning can be gleaned. Fortunately, two of the schemes highlighted have been the subject of evaluation and therefore merit closer examination.

The first scheme relates to the ongoing collaboration by the five forces of the East Midlands Region. A collaboration programme was originally instigated between these forces in 2006 in response to criticisms from the HMIC concerning their collective abilities to provide protective services\(^\text{14}\) (2005 p. 15). Direct funding was provided by the Home Office to create the East Midlands

\(^{14}\) Protective services include major crime, serious organised crime, counter terrorism, civil contingencies, critical incidents, public order and strategic roads policing.
Special Operations Unit (EMSOU, 2012, p. 3). This collaboration has now developed to encompass business and operational support functions where efficiency savings were calculated as being achievable.

The review, which was conducted by the HMIC, paints two very different pictures. Firstly, they are complimentary about the development of the EMSOU and the additional capability it provides (2013b, p. 10). They praise the leadership and the processes of collaboration, including governance. Conversely, they are critical of the approach to ‘austerity collaboration’, particularly the absence of a vision, a poorly constructed business case and the existence of major unresolved differences between the collaborating partners. At the time of conducting their review none of the planned efficiency savings had been realised (HMIC, 2013b, pp. 11-13).

The East Midlands programme illustrates two different types of collaboration. In the case of the EMSOU the intention was to create a new policing capability, initially using a grant provided by Government. In the subsequent area of collaboration examined, the driver was cost reduction. Austin refers to this type of collaboration as an “austerity alliance” (2000b, p. 9). This raises the question of whether austerity collaboration is inherently more challenging than developing a new joint ‘greenfield’ service and if so, what can be done to increase the propensity for success.

The East Midlands Collaboration Programme represents an example of a multi force strategic alliance. The alliance fulfils the requirements of the definition set out earlier. It has been in operation for more than ten years and can therefore be considered long term. The scope of the programme now extends to a wide range of core policing and back office functions, thereby satisfying the ‘strategic’ threshold. Furthermore, the independence of the five contributing partner forces has been maintained.

The second collaboration programme examined, involves an ongoing initiative to create a strategic alliance between Warwickshire and West Mercia Police.
In terms of exploiting joint working, the Warwickshire and West Mercia alliance represents one of the ‘most ambitious’ examples of contemporary inter police collaboration, a “beacon that others can learn from” (Flannery & Graham, 2014, p. 4). The reviewers were clearly impressed with the progress of the programme, which they praised at every level. Arguably, this collaboration represents one of the most advanced and far reaching contemporary examples of inter police strategic alliancing. Unfortunately, the methodological approach adopted by the reviewers is not adequately explained, although their focus appears to be directed to the process of collaboration, which they praise without reservation. The softer collaborative aspects of leadership, commitment, a willingness to engage honestly, learn and compromise are all referenced. Alignment of the seven ‘S’s from the McKinsey model is promoted, albeit the reviewers do not furnish any practical guidance setting out how this can be progressed (2014, p. 20). Outcomes receive scant attention and no quantitative measures of output are provided. Success appears to be implied by the fact both forces are continuing to maintain business as usual while operating to significantly reduced budgets. Additional data supplied by the HMIC suggests that both forces intend allocating in excess of 90% of their combined net revenue expenditure to collaborative activity (HMIC, 2014c, p. 92). The HMIC infer that this is a positive finding, albeit the output of this 90% is not explored. This illustrates again, that the process of collaboration appears to receive a disproportionate level of attention, frequently to the detriment of outcome measurement. Another surprising omission is a failure to reference the original business case. Undertaking a benefits realisation review should be an integral component of the Government’s project methodology including measurements of the benefits envisaged. This should be set out in the original business case. Ultimately, the attainment of these benefits will determine project success or failure (OGC, 2008, p. 12-13). Despite the researcher’s reservations concerning the rigour and robustness of this evaluation, Flannery and Graham’s report still provides a helpful insight into an ongoing inter force austerity programme.
It is worth noting that the HMIC conduct periodic reviews of each force focusing on the progress made managing austerity. A simple traffic light colour coding system is used. Despite the predominance of green (good) gradings and the proliferation of collaboration schemes now in existence\textsuperscript{15}, only 10% of the austerity savings demanded by Central Government are anticipated as consequence of collaboration (HMIC, 2014c, p. 92).

According to the HMIC, 70% of all police collaboration activity is of an inter-force nature while a further 21% of collaboration, exclusively remains within the public sector. The number of collaboration schemes between the police and the private sector appears low, at just 9% (HMIC, 2012, p. 5). These figures reinforce the reluctance and scepticism on the part of many police actors to engage with the private sector, as noted by White (2014, p. 4) and discussed earlier in this thesis. The hypothesis proposed, is that police collaboration is seen as being safer and easier to pursue, albeit hard evidence of benefit realisation is weak and unconvincing. If police collaboration offers the simplest model, then arguably, a two force collaboration, such as the Warwickshire and West Mercia alliance, is less challenging than a multi force initiative, such as the five force collaboration in the East Midlands. Could different models of collaboration offer a better means of achieving the outcomes desired? While Warwickshire and West Mercia are graded by the HMIC as being ‘outstanding’ because of their “ambitious and innovative alliance” and the measures now in place to reduce costs, it merits noting that the combined police officer strength for both forces now amounts to three thousand three hundred and sixty-four, significantly fewer than the figure of four thousand set in 2005 by the HMIC, as being the minimum number deemed necessary to create a strategic sized force capable of coping with the anticipated future demands of policing (HMIC, 2005, p. 8; HMIC, 2014d, pp. 5; HMIC, 2014e, p. 16).

Research undertaken of collaborations in other sectors highlighted the existence of multi dimensional complexities. This is illustrated by a study by

\textsuperscript{15} In 2012 the HMIC reported a total of 206 collaboration schemes in England & Wales with a further 337 in the planning phase (2102, p. 5).
Dyer et al. of large multi national corporations (2001, p. 37). Each organisation managed an average of sixty separate ‘major’ collaborations. Illustrative examples of multi national and multi dimensional strategic alliances can be found in the airline sector. Carriers, such as British Airways, pool services as part of a global partnering approach. The three largest strategic alliances are currently Star Alliance, Sky Team and One World. While airlines seek to collaborate for ticketing and routing, they are simultaneously forging separate alliances to improve their supply chain, reduce costs and improve services. In this context collaboration represents a viable means for achieving specific strategic objectives, thereby reinforcing an outcome orientation. While the HMIC (2014c, p. 33) consider police collaboration to be ‘overly complicated’ and ‘fragmented’ the collaboration paradigm preferred by large corporations, such as British Airways, appears to be more faceted and complex. Apparently, outcome not process, is the primary driver in the private sector.

Achieving economies of scale by increasing the number of participating partners working together represents a key consideration. This was highlighted by the HMIC (2013, p. 80) who praised the shared service centre operating on behalf of the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP). They noted that ‘upper quartile efficiencies’ had been achieved. In order to achieve similar economies of this scale all or most of the forty-three forces in England and Wales would need to work together, an unlikely scenario given the ‘hands off’ approach adopted by the Government and absence of any central coordination. Achievability has to be considered. While different models of collaboration may yield greater benefits, if organisation issues are prohibitive and insurmountable they offer nothing. The Warwickshire and West Mercia alliance model merits praise because, unlike the majority of other police collaboration initiatives, it has been established and is operating with the clear commitment of both parties.

This section has focused on the non scholarly literature devoted to police collaboration. Much of this literature has been produced by the HMIC to encourage more collaboration, particularly as a response to austerity. Different
types of collaboration activity have been noted, albeit forces appear to prefer the inter police collaboration model. While acknowledging pressures to collaborate, particularly as a response to austerity, collaboration in policing, when compared with other sectors, appears limited in both scope and attainment.

Conclusions of the police collaboration literature review

The literature review commenced with a systematic search of nine separate academic databases identifying three thousand five hundred scholarly articles, although only four of these articles were dedicated to the topic of police strategic alliances or collaborations. These were all devoted to police and private sector collaboration, the grouping where least collaboration occurs. The conclusion has to be that police collaboration is an area where limited empirical research has been undertaken.

Scholarly literature relating to police collaboration is supplemented by ‘state of the nation’ reviews undertaken, primarily by the HMIC. While these reviews provide a barometer of collaborative activity, the focus has been on encouraging more collaboration rather than providing advice about the benefits of different approaches and delivering practical guidance to reduce the risk of failure. Collaboration is promoted as being universally good. Disappointingly, the existence of, and consequences of, pursuing ‘bad collaboration’ or failing to achieve a ‘collaboration premium’ does not feature in any of the policing literature reviewed.

Two evaluations of existing police collaboration schemes are critiqued. Both concentrate on process while evidence of tangible outcomes achieved, to assess either success or failure, is limited. No explicit references are made to the business benefits or the application of project management.
Collaboration appears to be demanding and challenging. While the potential yield from more audacious schemes, such as the Lincolnshire Police and G4S alliance appear significant, most forces appear content to limit their ambitions. While, arguably being disappointing, this is understandable given the absence of any central coordination, advice or direction.

The organisational culture of policing, influenced and conditioned by the manner in which it’s leaders are groomed for senior positions, has been explored. The perception among many staff is that policing is different, operating to higher values of public service. Paradoxically, policing is perceived to be insular and excessively cautious in outlook. This state is apparently compounded by the lack of business acumen on the part of many senior officers. This hesitancy, coupled with a predilection for the short-termism, acts as a powerful barrier. Added to the mix is the uncertainty and shifting power dynamics created by the appointment of PCCs.

The degree of change within policing, spanning several decades, has been discussed. While the police service is constantly evolving, change appears to be incremental and cumulative in nature. Although there is much talk of transformational change, the evidence from this review suggests otherwise. Given the hierarchal, command and control structure of policing and the dominant organisational culture that exists, achieving transformational change is likely to be challenging and risky. Leadership emerges again as a core theme and it is arguable, whether existing police leaders are equipped with the skills necessary to operate successfully within a collaborative environment, particularly if it involves the private sector.

References have been made to collaboration in other sectors. For some organisations these schemes are multi faceted and dimensional, operating to high levels of complexity. Despite the exponential rise in the popularity and number of collaborative initiatives being pursued, the success rate appears unacceptably low. How success is defined is a moot point meriting further investigation. The drive to collaborate is not simply a private sector
phenomenon and we have discussed a new emerging paradigm in the public sector where government now commission services and the private sector act as service providers. This is evidenced by significant increases in outsourcing. The literature reviewed suggests that the police must either embrace or be pushed into operating this new paradigm.

2.5.4 Review of public sector collaboration literature

Using the inverted funnel framework set out for the literature review, the scope now broadens to encapsulate literature tackling collaboration within the wider public sector. Several comparisons have already been made to public sector collaboration, which, now appears to be an established and prominent feature of organisational life (Williams, 2013, p. 18; Dowling et al., 2004, p. 309; Armistead & Pettigrew, 2004, p. 571). Agranoff (2007, p. 124) uses the term “collaborarchy” to describe this new paradigm. Markedly, the systematic review of police collaboration identified literature referencing the public sector. The researcher plans to investigate this and other literature in order to create a holistic appreciation of the current state of collaboration, including exploring current issues, developments and pitfalls.

There is a predominance of literature relating to cross sector collaboration involving public and private sector organisations (NAO, 2011; NAO, 2012; NAO, 2013a; NAO, 2103b; NAO 2013c; House of Commons Public Accounts Committee, 2011; NHS, 2013, Paagman et al., 2015; Sako, 2014; Cordella & Willcocks, 2010; Cox et al., 2010; Burnes & Anastasiadis, 2003; Indridason & Wang, 2008; Dowling et al., 2004). Evidence referencing the depth and breadth of public and private sector collaboration appears extensive. This is illustrated by NAO reporting that £93.5b was spent on outsourcing (2013a, p. 10).

Paagman et al., (2015, p. 110), and Plimmer, (2014), believe the growth in outsourcing, which they state has doubled in value during the four year period.
from 2010, is in direct response to the Government's austerity programme. Others suggest that political ideology is acting as a driver (Sako, 2014, p. 29; Cordella & Willcocks, 2010, p. 82; Cope et al., 1997, p. 448; Linder, 1999, p. 35). The term ‘hollowing out of the state’ was used by Cope et al. (1997, p. 448) to describe the mixed economy market place for service delivery. The analogy of ‘rowing’ and ‘steering’ described earlier is another illustration of a new paradigm of service delivery, where a slimmed down State focuses on its new principle function of commissioning services provided by others.

Outsourcing is not a new phenomenon. In 2003 it was acknowledged “as one of the fastest growing and most important areas of business activity” (Burnes & Anastasiadis, 2003, p. 355). Most outsourcing arrangements between the private and public sectors typically fall within the strategic alliance category set for this thesis, as a consequence of their value, significance and extended contract times. Outsourcing gained traction during the New Labour years of government. Subsequent Governments appear equally enthusiastic, particularly as a method for responding to austerity (HM Government, 2012, p. 8). The language used to promote private sector partnership is unequivocally supportive. This is illustrated by the Government's Strategic Plan which advises of “savings of £400m-£600m per annum from shared service centres” (HM Government 2012, p. 9). Wells, in his foreword to the NHS Partnering Guide appears equally fervent, stating, that he was “convinced that the effective procurement and operation of multi-provider services will significantly improve the range, capacity and quality of the services to patients while at the same time providing good value to the taxpayer” (NHS, 2013, p.1).

Cordella and Willcocks (2010, p. 82), remind us of the ideological position of successive governments who promote market forces as an inherently positive concept. In this regard outsourcing adheres to the long established principles of new public managerialism (NPM), by asserting the superiority of the market over the State, thereby encouraging greater competition and efficiency (Cope et al., 1997, p.449).
Despite the enthusiasm for public and private sector partnering, evidence of tangible success appears limited (Ling, 2000, p. 82; Dowling et al., 2004, p. 310; Williams, 2013, p. 18). This is illustrated by Dowling et al.’s research into the health sector, where they identified that very few schemes had been evaluated. Where reports were available these were primarily orientated towards the process of collaboration and not the outcomes achieved (2014, p. 312). In another report published by the NHS, while still promoting the benefits of partnership, the authors concede, with candour, that:

“It is still difficult to uncover real examples of savings made and outcomes achieved from partnerships. This is in part because results take time to materialise. However, there also seems to be a reluctance to reveal results, perhaps through fear of how they may be perceived. Our panel hopes that NHS trusts and their partners will start to be more open about both achievements and challenges”

(NHS, 2013, p. 6).


The NAO undertook several studies of Government outsourcing (2012, 2013a, 2013b & 2014). Significant issues were alluded to in the 2013 reports, prompting the following press release from the Head of the NAO:

“Contracting with private sector providers is a fast-growing and important part of delivering public services. But there is a crisis of confidence at present, caused
by some worrying examples of contractors not appearing to treat the public sector fairly, and of departments themselves not being on top of things”
(NAO, 2013c).

During a subsequent investigation of outsourcing, the NAO, (2014, pp. 7-8), highlighted systemic issues relating to sub-standard contract management. This included the astounding headline figure that significant flaws were apparent in more than 50% of contracts selected for random examination. The net result was substantial over-payment (2014, p. 7). These findings suggest that outsourcing, a relevant form of strategic alliancing, is for some, complex, risky, costly and challenging.

Following concerns about performance, value for money and the size of the ‘big four’ major providers of outsourcing services, the NAO (2013a, p. 10) launched an investigation with the stated aim of “stimulating public debate in order to improve Government contracting” (2013a, p. 13). The big four are Atos, Capita, Serco and G4S. Collectively they report a global annual revenue of £23.5b, of which £9.2b is generated in the UK (NAO, 2013a, p. 5). G4S, the largest of the big four, is reported as managing six hundred and twenty major contracts and employing 625,000 staff globally (Hill & Plimmer, 2013). Littler and Leverick (1995, p. 64), emphasise the significance of achieving equality when creating strategic partnerships and this is reinforced by Lynch (1990, p. 7), who underlines the value of achieving a ‘win win’ outcome. Does the size of the ‘big four’, coupled with allegations that Government are not receiving value for money (NAO, 2013a, p. 10), suggest that issues of perceived inequality may be at play? Does too much power rest with these suppliers? Is the evidence of an asymmetric power divide harmful to the effective delivery of partnership? While the answers to these questions may not be clear cut, evidence presented by the NAO indicates that the public sector needs to develop their skill base and become a more ‘intelligent customer’. This action is necessary to re-balance the existing power dynamics.
Achieving a ‘cultural fit’ when selecting partners is highlighted by several commentators (Littler & Leverick, 1995, p. 61; Steinheider et al., 2012, p. 357; Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 96; Schein, 1990, p.117; Ohmae, 1989, p. 154). Littler and Leverick (1995, p. 61), warn of the “costly implications of divorce”. Schein (1990, p. 117), reinforces this theme with his notion of ‘cultural indigestion’. Ohmae (1989, pp. 143-154), while promoting the benefits of inter organisational collaboration, provides a cautionary note, stating that “two organisational cultures rarely mesh well or smoothly”. Arguably, the cultural differences will be greater in cross sector collaborations. Sink (1996, p. 107), warns of ‘extraordinary challenges’ that require bridging. To support this assertion he describes public administrators as “bureaucrats, constrained by a risk adverse culture”. These characteristics, he says are likely to be very different from those of their counterparts in the private sector (p. 102). He continues claiming that “bureaucrats, even enlightened ones, have less incentive to participate in collaborations” (p. 102). While this stereotypical description may have had historical credence, and could still be relevant to some police forces, arguably, the sheer scale of collaboration involving the wider public sector is indicative of a paradigm shift, thereby indicating that many the Sink’s ‘bureaucrats’ have adopted a more progressive and enlightened outlook towards collaboration.

While much of the public sector literature reviewed relates to outsourcing, there are other models of collaboration that merit referencing, such as PFI and collaboration within the public sector. Despite the apparent loss of popularity, including criticisms levelled by the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee (2011, p. 1), there are still more than seven hundred schemes operating across the UK public sector with a further sixty-one schemes in the process of being procured (House of Commons PAC, 2011, p. 1). Williams (2013, p. 18) reminds us of the existence of intra public sector collaboration, including jointly funding key posts and shared services. One such example is the pooling arrangement between Worthing and Adur District Councils, which they describe as “ground breaking” and “the first of its kind nationally”. This partnership, a further valid illustration of a strategic alliance, appears more far
reaching than the Warwickshire and West Mercia Police Strategic Alliance with both councils sharing service delivery units, including a single unified senior management team (Adur & Worthing Councils, 2015).

Conclusions of the public sector collaboration literature review

This aspect of the literature review suggests that the wider public sector have achieved higher levels of collaborative familiarity, activity and maturity than currently exists within the police service, particularly when engaging in pan sector collaboration. This has been driven partly by austerity but also political ideology and popularity for the commissioning service and service provider’ partnering paradigm. This is evidenced by the exponential increase in the number and monetary value of outsourcing contracts awarded.

While the Government’s support for outsourcing appears unabated and their rhetoric espousing potential benefits remain undiminished, tangible evidence of success is not easily discernible. Reports by organisations such as the NAO suggest that many public / private sector strategic alliances are fraught with difficulty. Many of the issues that beset policing appear to have arisen in the wider public sector, including inadequate contracting, a lack of business acumen and a reluctance to admit failure or share lessons learned. Despite best efforts of organisations such as the NAO, there appears to be a scarcity of real world literature explaining how to overcome the pitfalls identified.

Creating a cultural fit emerges as another theme, as does perceived power and size inequalities among partners. This and other findings will be explored in further detail as the literature review progresses.
2.5.5 Review of private sector collaboration literature

The targeted review indicates the availability of considerable literature relating to collaboration in the private sector, albeit several commentators prefer the phrase ‘strategic alliances’ (Yoshino & Rangan, 1995, p. 4; Monczka et al., 1998, p. 553; Brouthers et al., 1995, p. 18; Dyer et al., 2001, p. 37; Pucik, 1988; Cooper & Gardner, 1993; Austin, 2000a, p. 7).

Reference has already been made to the ever increasing number of inter organisational collaborations and Austin’s assertion that the 21st Century will be remembered as the “age of alliances” (2000b, p. 7). Other writers support this argument by proposing that the pressures and drive to collaborate will continue to increase (Linden, 2003, p. 42; Hawkins, 2010, p. 10). Hughes and Weiss, estimated a 25% annual increase in the number of corporate alliances and suggest that these partnerships accounted for nearly 33% of many companies’ revenue and value (2007, p. 122). Research by the CIPD supports this assertion stating that “the world we’re operating in is becoming increasingly networked and collaborative. In particular, more and more organisations are engaging in strategic partnerships” (2015a, p. 2).

Price Waterhouse Coopers (PWC) stated that 75% of CEOs surveyed rated partnership as either ‘important’ or ‘critical’ to their business (PWC, 2009, p. 3). According to Linden, “alarmingly” as many as 70% are destined to fail (2003, p. 42). Others suggest this figure may be even higher, at 80% and even 90% (Hawkins, 2010, p. 4; Sagawa & Segal, 2000, p. 8). Supplementary data provided by Sagawa and Segal (2000 p. 8), estimated that the median lifespan of these partnerships is just seven years.

While headline failure rates are readily accessible, quantification of the term failure presents a more formidable undertaking. The word failure is indicative of a clear and absolute outcome, such as not achieving a specific goal. Arguably, many collaborations involve multiple objectives, some of which may be of an intangible nature (Ling, 2000, p. 82; Dowling et al., 2004, p. 310; Williams,
In such circumstances, success and failure sit at the extreme ends of a continuum where the likely outcome, if it could be measured, would be multifaceted and represent degrees of success and failure. This is consistent with earlier research undertaken by Dale where respondents discussed the attainment of sub-optimal outcomes (2012, pp. 47-48).

Hawkins sets out a spectrum of activities which he believes constitute acts of organisational collaboration. Familiar terms such as alliances, joint ventures and outsourcing appear on the list, although reference is also made to small to medium enterprise (SME) clusters and supply chain optimisation. These activities are more prominent in the private sector. He also references collaboration with the third sector and touches upon mergers and acquisitions, providing anecdotal evidence of an equally alarming 85% failure rate (Hawkins, 2010, pp. 4-5). It is reiterated that the focus of this research is on those longer term strategic inter organisational initiatives where benefits are shared, but the independence of contributing partners is maintained.

Hawkins’ generic eight step cycle, branded as the ‘BS 11000 Collaborative Relationship Management Model’, provides a logical method for approaching, engaging and then exiting from a collaborative venture (Hawkins, 2010, p. 82 - see Annex ‘E’). The model appears to have gained traction in the UK rail industry where Network Rail have created and published a strategic level objective for improving collaboration with their supplier and contractor communities (Network Rail, 2016). Hawkins (2013, pp. 11-12) cites Network Rail as an exemplar case study and while the partnering arrangements that now exist provide a useful illustration of strategic alliancing, the absence of an evidential underpinning merits noting. The principal issue relates to Hawkins’ decision to apply professional judgement and not scholarly methodology. This raises questions about the rigour of the benefits claimed, namely a 20% reduction in operating costs, improved risk management and a 15% savings through supply chain aggregation (Hawkins, 2013, p. xiv). Arguably, despite this apparent shortcoming, BSI 11000 still represents an intuitive and repeatable process, that appears to demonstrate high levels of face validity.
Similar models have been designed and presented, including the Alliance Lifecycle Model of Dyer et al. (2001, p. 40), and the Single Alliance Process of Kale and Singh (2009, p. 48). Setting the parameters for collaboration and the associated ground rules at the onset is of paramount importance (Littler & Laverick, 1995, p. 58; Hansen, 2009a, p. 15). This avoids having to resort to the “seat of the pants” approach when problems are encountered or having to “learn the hard way” (Lynch, 1990, p. 7). Pisano and Vergant (2008, p. 80) reiterate the value of investing in the design of a robust ‘collaborative architecture’.

Significant literature exists, emulating primarily from prominent US Business Schools. The work of leading management scientists such as Linden, Huxham, Austin, Hansen and Ohmae has already been referenced. The focus now is on identifying and synthesising additional themes considered relevant to this study.

The multi faceted and multi dimensional nature of collaboration, operating among conglomerate organisations, merits re-emphasis. Avoiding conflict of interest, resourcing and achieving collaborative synergy all appear to represent a major challenge for these large corporates. Dyer et al. (2001, p. 40) suggest appointing a dedicated alliance team as part of a structured portfolio management approach. Another key success factor links to the development of metrics in which to measure and provide feedback regarding the progress and achievements of the alliance (Dyer et al., 2001, p. 41).

Littler and Leverick, (1995, p. 68), emphasise the significance of fairness when creating strategic partnerships and this is reinforced by Lynch (1990, p. 7), who believes that every contributing partner must gain, or at least take a fair share of the pain. The paradox is that partners are rarely equal contributors (Papadopoulos et al., 2008, p. 153). Never-the-less developing a ‘win win’ scenario built on trust, appears as an important condition (Lynch, 1990, p. 7). Any perception of inequality will, arguably, undermine collaborative endeavours.
Hansen’s research, undertaken with large US corporates, sets out a series of ‘collaboration traps’ of which optimism bias features heavily (2009a, pp. 11-14). This reinforces his mantra for ‘disciplined collaboration’ (2009a, p. 15) and his assertion that poorly constructed collaboration can be counter-productive. Hansen goes further by claiming that “poor collaboration is a disease afflicting even the best companies” (2009, p. 2).

Hansen’s work, while focusing on collaboration, reinforces established project management principles that emphasise the primacy of the business case as the raison d’être for the project. Tackling optimism bias when estimating benefits has been acknowledged as a long standing problem when embarking on major change. This was illustrated by Jenner’s scathing, but poignant description of ‘benefits fraud’ (2009, p. 16). Jenner attributed the problem to “spurious claims and the over estimation of benefit impact”, “double counting of benefits”, “the inconsistent valuation of benefits” and the claims of “phantom benefits” (2009, pp. 14-16). For Government projects, HM Treasury have provided detailed and specific advice on counteracting ‘optimism bias’ in supplementary advice to their influential ‘Green Guide’ (HM Treasury, 2013b).

Measuring the progress of collaborations is considered vital, given the apparent propensity for sub optimal delivery. Poncelet (2001, p. 19) referred to a culture of ‘non-confrontation and conflict avoidance’, suggesting that oppositional behaviour is mistakenly taken as an ‘anathema to collaboration’. Collins talks of ‘red flags’, (2001, p. 78), and reminds us that leadership involves “creating a climate where the truth is heard and the brutal facts are confronted” (2001, p. 74). Hawkins proposes creating a relationship management plan to provide a framework for these “grown-up conversations” (2010, p. 107). He also recommends the early development of an exit strategy, reinforcing the point that “nothing will last for ever” and that all business relationships will eventually reach a conclusion (2010, p. 83).

Earlier research undertaken by Hansen and Norhria, (2004, pp. 24-26), identified barriers for effective collaboration, which focused on the humanistic
traits of key actors, including a reluctance to engage, help, learn or seek expert advice. Kanter (1994, p. 99), believes that alliances should be treated as living entities and uses metaphors such as ‘courtship’ and ‘romance’. An image of a living organism arises susceptible to human emotions and frailties. In such a context over emphasis on control systems is likely to prove disruptive and counter-productive.

Collaborative leadership represents a theme that imbues all sectors. Linden (2003, p. 42) describes collaborative leadership as “leading as a peer rather than as a superior”. Arguably, collaborative leadership qualities will vary according to position and role. These aspects will now be explored.

Many researchers focus on collaborative leadership at an executive level (Ibarra & Hansen, 2011, pp. 3-8; Austin, 2000b, pp. 53-55; Avery, 1999, pp. 36-40; Vangen & Huxham, 2003, pp. 61-76; Judge & Ryman, 2001, pp. 71-79; Getha Taylor, 2008, pp. 103-119). Judge and Ryman’s (2001, p.73) research of the US healthcare sector reinforced the critical role played by executives in determining the outcome of the alliance. The authors identified essential leadership traits, including a willingness to commit to a shared, holistic, view of the collaboration, a clear focus on value creation and a desire to innovate (2001, pp. 74-76).

While top managers may act in an enabling capacity, as ‘alliance authorisers’, emphasis is also directed to relationship building and the ability to develop and inspire others (Austin, 2000b, p. 53). Linden promotes the advantages of creating a ‘pull’ (inspirational) rather than a ‘push’ (coercive) effect (2002, p. 156). Similarly, Vangen and Huxham talk of ‘embracing, empowering, involving and mobilising’ (2003, p.66). Ohmae suggests a paradigm shift in the mindset of managers, arguing that “managers must overcome the popular misconception that total control increases the chances of success” (1989, p. 147).
Getha-Taylor reinforces the importance of ‘softer’ leadership skills. At the fore are empathy, bridge building, cooperation, resource sharing, teamwork and conflict resolution. All of these traits must be underpinned by a clear vision and the adoption of an altruistic perspective (2008 p.116).

Other commentators, such as Hawkins (2011, pp. 57-68), Darby (2006, pp. 153-155), deal with the topic of leadership as a generic entity, appearing not to make any allowance for positional status.

Reference has already been made to the role of ‘boundary spanners’ (Punonti 2003, p.143), and the researcher has considered the skill sets for this group of collaboration actors (Armistead & Pettigrew, 2004, Banford et al., 2003; Yoshino & Rangan, 1995; Williams, 2002). Williams (2002, p. 112) makes the distinction between ‘modern’ and ‘postmodern’ leadership, the later style being more suited to working in a non hierarchal collaborative environment. Alliances are likely to create conflicts and paradoxes (Williams, 2013, p. 25; O’Leary & Bingham, 2009, p. 11). Managing uncertainty may not suit all personality types, some of whom are likely to prefer more stable and established working environments. While Williams usefully proposes three categories of boundary spanners, incorporating leaders, managers and dedicated front line professionals, he does not expand his thinking, nor does he provide any supporting commentary, apart from recommending coaching, mentoring and the establishment of academic programmes dedicated to this topic (2013 p. 27).

While commentators have explored positional and role competences, minimal literature has been dedicated to the situational requirements of collaborative leadership, which, arguably, metamorphose as the alliance develops. For example, using Lei et al.’s (1997, p. 2006) different stages of partner selection, planning and negotiating and alliance implementation and control, it is reasonable to assume that different skills sets will be required for each of these distinct phases.
The risk of ‘going native’ is discussed (Lei et al., 1997, p. 2007; Hamel et al., 1989, p.138). Williams links this scenario to feelings of isolation and the risk of ‘maverick’ behaviour; ‘real or perceived’ (2013, p. 27). Such a scenario, if not checked, may lead to ‘mission drift’ (O'Leary & Bingham, 2009, p. 144). Arguably, isolation and the misalignment of goals could be indicative of collaborative activity being treated as an ancillary, rather than organisational mainstream, activity. ‘Boundary spanners’, like all workers, require appropriate recognition and support.

Conclusions of the private sector collaboration literature review

Evidence concerning the extent of collaborative activity in the private sector is expansive and wide-ranging. Business collaboration is clearly not a new phenomena, albeit, the drivers for greater and more ambitious programmes appear to be universally compelling. A similar picture emerges of an activity which is time consuming, difficult and challenging. Although failure rates are glibly presented, a dearth of supplementary quantification or explanation suggests weaknesses in the current literature. While many strategic alliances may appear unsatisfactory in the eyes of some stakeholders, the term failure suggests an absolute position that is likely to ignore the nuggets of success and learning that may have been created. Despite the availability of scholarly and professional literature setting out the pitfalls involved when embarking upon collaborative ventures, similar problems of poor partner selection, inadequate planning and monitoring are all apparent. Optimism bias, poor leadership and a failure to address the humanistic aspects associated with collaboration, continue to represent pitfalls. While collaborative leadership is discussed, only limited appreciation appears to have been given to the situational requirements which are likely to vary depending on positional power and the levels of collaborative maturity attained.
2.5.6 Targeted Literature Review

The final part of the review focuses on literature available through three professional bodies, the APM, CMI and CIPD, all of whom are committed to developing a repository of change management knowledge. The intention is to undertake a targeted review the literature available, critically assessing its suitability and applicability for organisations engaged in collaborative change.

The first base layer on the inverted funnel model is dedicated to the APM. As has been shown, the APM’s BoK, version 6, defines change management as “a structured approach to moving an organisation from the current to the desired future state” (2012, p. 234).

The APM’s definition and approach emphasises the hard skills of planning and control, implying a top down process which includes the stages of assessment, preparedness, planning, implementation and sustainability as sequential steps (2012, p. 136). This philosophy aligns with Lewin’s three stage model of ‘unfreezing, changing’ and ‘refreezing’ and is consistent with a top down, planned paradigm of change (Lewin, 1952; Dawson, 1994, p. 3). Similarities exist with the scientific school of management (Taylor, 1943), that advocates goal setting, organisation, planning and control. Morgan aligns this approach with his machine metaphor where control is exerted at the top by the ‘chief engineer’ (1997, pp. 10-33). Morgan (1997, pp. 6-7) indicates that alternative change management paradigms exist, however, these are neither referenced nor implied in the APM’s literature.

No other specific references are made to change management within the 6th edition of the APM’s BoK, albeit a section has been devoted to referencing the behavioural, or softer, skill topics, such as communication, conflict, delegation, influencing, leadership and negotiation. These subjects also feature in the APM’s Competence Framework (2008).
Additional literature tackling the topic of collaboration has been produced by the APM’s Governance Specific Interest Group (APM, 2007). Their guide reinforces the planning and control paradigm by proposing a series of high level principals tackling governance and process matters. Criticisms regarding the absence of an evidential base has led to a revised guide being commissioned. This is currently awaiting publication.

In 2014 the APM approved the creation of a volunteer committee entitled the ‘Enabling Change Specific Interest Group’. The SiG have referenced and endorsed three different change management models (APM, 2015). These include the Association for Change Management Professionals Standards (2015), the Implementation Management Associates (2015), AIM method and Change Management in the Public Sector, colloquially known as CHAMPS 2 (Birmingham City Council, 2010). All three methods provide a logical and repeatable stepped approach for delivering change, that is broadly consistent with Kotter’s (2008) iconic eight steps. The focus, however, remains on delivering change adhering to the principles of the familiar top down, planned paradigm, referenced earlier in this thesis.

Senge (1993, pp. 18-24) is critical of the top down planned approach to change, offering fundamentally different guidelines to managers as part of his ‘systemic model’ (1993, pp. 174-204). Cameron and Green (2009, pp. 97-137) stress the complexities involved in delivering change and warn of the limitations of the planned change paradigm. While there are many alternative approaches, two new generic models appearing to gain traction include the ‘emergent’ and ‘contingency’ approaches (Todneum By, 2005, pp. 369-380). An added dimension is that change is often triggered by an organisational crisis and is therefore reactive, ad hoc and discontinuous (Todnem By, 2005, p.370). The limited change management literature available from the APM does not embrace these discussions, nor does it talk of culture, resistance to change or consider strategies to overcome them. The APM’s view is that projects operate effectively when they are planned, resourced and executed in a controlled environment, regardless of change dynamics.
The second base layer of the model focuses on the contents of the CMI BoK (2013). The publication of the BoK follows primary research which highlights deficiencies on the part of many organisations when delivering change. The CMI concluded that “unfortunately, many companies are designed for business as usual, for a time when there is no change. Change is often viewed as something to be overcome, controlled and a disruption to this known world, rather than the new ‘norm’ that needs to be managed” (2012, p. 2).

Markedly, the CMI BoK does not tackle collaborative change despite the preponderance of schemes now in existence. Instead their focus is on referencing existing generic theory and practice that may be of use to personnel performing a change management role. A general failure rate of 70% is cited for organisational change, without apparent qualification. This figure, according to the CMI, appears to have remained constant for the last twenty years (2013, p. 21).

The CMI’s advice is orientated towards the top down paradigm of change. This is evidenced by the prominence given to Kotter’s Eight Steps and Lewin’s Three Step models (CMI, 2013, p. 26) and is further reinforced by regular references to the role of the CEO in crafting and delivering the desired change (CMI, 2013 p.45). Resistance to change is discussed, as is the use of established tools, such as Force Field Analysis (CMI, 2013, p. 41; Lewin, 1951) as well as methods to understand organisational culture (CMI, 2013, p. 32). The change curve receives prominence and generic strategies to quantify and handle resistance alluded to (CMI, 2013, pp. 23-24; Kubler-Ross, 1969; Block, 2011). The role of the change manager as a facilitator is discussed and guidance provided (CMI, 2013, pp. 135-143). There is an overlap with topics raised in the APM’s BoK as the CMI also incorporate benefits, stakeholder and risk management, leadership, team building, negotiation and conflict.

The CMI BoK provides an elementary guide to change management. Many models and theories cited, while remaining useful, could be classified as
established, seminal, but dated. The BoK does not appear to adequately address the different types of change already discussed. Noteworthy is the absence of discussion concerning proactive versus reactive and incremental versus transformational change perspectives (Nadler & Tushman, 1993, p. 24; Hayes, 2010, p. 26). This links to weaknesses in established change management doctrine, as exposed by Senge (1993, pp. 18-24). While the reasons for resisting change and strategies to overcome them are discussed, (Kotter et al., 2008), the conditions of change overload, the survivor syndrome, scepticism and cynicism to change are not explored (Duck, 1993, p. 63; Reichers et al., 1997). This is poignant as cynicism to change may be the consequence of organisational history (Reichers et al., 1997, p.50). In light of the high failure rates and the perception that many change programmes under deliver, a level of scepticism is understandable (Duck, 1993, p. 63). This assertion is supported by contemporary research undertaken by the CIPD suggesting that the level of distrust between management and workers is increasing (2013c, p. 2). Another area not discussed relates to the potentially harmful consequences of using negative change drivers (Cooperrider et al, 2008). Appreciative Inquiry (AI), for example, makes use of a different paradigm by valuing ‘what is’ as the basis for change (Cooperrider et al., 2008, p. 16). Establishing the right change narrative appears imperative. Finally, the topic of culture, or the use of assessment tools, such as the ‘cultural web’, are not adequately explored (Johnson et al., 2008, p. 297). Arguably, this aggregated knowledge is germane to the topic of collaboration.

The next knowledge repository for analysis belongs to the CIPD. Fortuitously, the CIPD has created and maintain an extensive on-line library. A series of search strings were deployed using terms such as; ‘change management, ‘leading and/or leadership and change’, ‘resistance to change’ and ‘organisational culture’. Linked literature was also reviewed.

The CIPD acknowledge the growth and significance of inter-organisational collaboration (CIPD, 2013b, p. 3). They suggest that risk management, governance and building capacity for learning and knowledge present principle
challenges when building collaborations (2013b, p. 4). While the CIPD’s research reinforces earlier discussions, two additional points merit exploration. Firstly, the CIPD promote the value of intangible benefits, thereby appearing to dilute Hansen’s ‘collaborative premium’ (2009, p. 8) and adherence to strict business case doctrine (APM, 2012, p. 94), that emphasises a hard edged cost/benefit ratio. The CIPD argue that it may not be possible to place a monetary figure on ‘value added’ of collaboration and suggest flexibility when constructing a business case (CIPD, 2015a, p. 15). Secondly, as the development path for collaboration is often nebulous, communications require even greater attention (CIPD, 2015a, p. 15). By inference, many employees will feel unsettled or threatened by the uncertainty associated with collaboration.

The CIPD infer that a new paradigm of continuous change exists where organisations are in a state of ‘flux: changing their focus, expanding or contracting their activities and rethinking their products and services’ (2015b). Their research suggests that less than 40% of organisations met their stated objectives, which is commonly bottom line improvement (CIPD, 2015b). They propose the consequences of poor change management are a “loss of market position, removal of senior management, loss of stakeholder credibility, loss of key employees (CIPD, 2015b). Arguably, the above is equally applicable to intra and inter organisational change.

Several reasons are proposed for the high levels of failure. These include poor project management, weak leadership and inadequate communications (CIPD, 2015b). The CIPD are critical of an over emphasis on the structural elements of change, particularly when detrimental to supporting systems (CIPD, 2015b). This could be addressed by considering all of the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ aspects set out in the McKinsey Seven 'S' Framework (2008). Incorporating this or similar approaches as part of a balanced scoreboard merits further investigation (Kaplan, 2005, p. 41).

The CIPD assert that many leaders misunderstand the dynamics of change management and the resultant impact their behaviour has on the workforce.
Nadler and Shaw (1993, pp. 3-14) argue that management must raise their game and improve their understanding and application of change leadership. Reference has already been made to the enduring nature of change and the state of flux many organisations now find themselves operating in, (CIPD 2015b) yet, according to the CIPD many senior managers persist in the misguided belief that restructuring was the end point of change rather than the beginning (2014b, p. 5). For the purposes of this thesis the researcher will refer to this phenomenon as ‘change myopia’. Given that many of the popular models of organisational change suggest phases of planning, delivery and conclusion, such misconception on the part of many managers appears understandable. This is best illustrated using Lewin’s seminal Three Step Model of ‘unfreezing, moving and re-freezing’, where the final stage of ‘re-freezing’ implies lock down to create a new steady state (Lewin, 1951). The notion of ‘strategic drift’ appears to be symptomatic of change myopia. Strategic drift, according to Johnson et al., occurs when organisations fail to keep pace with external changing environments. Eventually a crisis occurs which results in urgent and ill planned transformational change, or cessation of that business (2008, pp. 179-180). Others refer to the ‘punctuated equilibrium paradigm’ or ‘discontinuous change’ to describe the fluctuating rate at which organisations operate (Gersick, 1991, p.12; Hayes, 2010, p. 17; Nadler et al., 1993a, p. 23). While not referenced by the CIPD, Beaudan’s change implementation curve provides a helpful depiction of the different stages of change. The energy and momentum created at the beginning of the programme reaches a ‘stall point’, usually in response to unexpected developments or prolonged resistance (Beaudan, 2006, p. 2). Successful programmes demand renewed energy and effort while unsuccessful ones decline and wither. Collectively, these discussions suggest an absence of change management knowledge and stamina on the part of key actors. One remedy is to promote change leadership as a core competency (Nadler and Shaw, 1993, pp. 3-14).

The second leadership issue raised links to unsatisfactory organisational learning because of the high turnover of executive management (CIPD, 2014b,
This accords with the ‘butterfly syndrome’ and, arguably, is compounded by a failure or reluctance to capture and learn lessons from past endeavours.

The third aspect of leadership relates to unsatisfactory staff engagement (CIPD, 2015b; 2014b, p. 5; 2013c, p. 13). This supports Kotter’s assertion, (1993, p. 10), that managers under-communicate by a factor of ten and Augustine’s mantra that managers must ‘communicate, communicate, communicate’ (1993, p. 184). A consequence of poor engagement is distrust (CIPD, 2013c, p.2). This assertion is supported by the findings of Gallup, where 87% of workers were categorised as being “not engaged” or “actively disengaged” with their employers (2013, p. 12). Gallup also identified a direct correlation between low levels of engagement and higher instances of customer complaints, staff turnover, absenteeism, pilfering as well as lower levels of productivity (2013, p. 21). The CIPD distinguish between ‘emotional and transactional’ levels of employee engagement:

“Emotionally engaged people rate their task performance and citizenship behaviours highly, consider they do not engage in deviant behaviours and have low intentions to leave the company. Transactionally engaged employees, however, have low scores on all the performance dimensions”

(CIPD, 2012, p. 27).

The CIPD’s advice about communicating change is to do so optimistically (Balogun et al., 2015, p. 6). They question the top down driven approach by emphasising the value of “ambiguity and purposeful instability”, suggesting that “a change vision should be designed so individuals can actively question and attempt to make sense of their situation”. This facilitates a break from the past and encourages new thinking (Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 13). Collectively, this approach represents a paradigm shift from the traditional, paternalistic, top down driven model of change.

The CIPD literature tackling engagement is helpful because it expands upon the somewhat glib, by widely used phrase of securing staff ‘buy in’ (Duck,
1993, p. 63). The CIPD suggest that staff need to be advised of the “implications for them” as well as “what is being asked of them” (2014b, p. 8). They emphasise the emotional aspects of change and promote a relationship centric leadership style that is more likely to achieved the desired ‘pull’ rather than ‘push’ effect (CIPD, 2014b, p. 20; CIPD, 2015b). In this context ‘pull’ implies energy, excitement and exploration, while push is indicative of coercion and consequences.

While emphasising employee engagement, the CIPD do not appear to have considered the specific impact of intra versus inter organisational change. Similarly ‘change fatigue and overload’ are not referenced within their literature.

The topic of resistance to change is the final phenomenon to be considered. Established thinking suggests that resistance to change is a natural reaction (Lewin, 1951; Lawrence, 1954, p. 49; Beckhard et al., 1987, p. 98; Strebel, 1993, p. 140; Morris et al., 1993 p. 48). The CIPD question this orthodoxy, by proposing that “the actions of employees who raise concerns about change should not be labelled as resistance, but instead reframed and reinterpreted in terms of legitimacy of employee voice” (2015b).

This supports the view of Gloss et al., who refer to ‘harnessing contention’ (1993, p. 106). Acknowledging the legitimacy of an opposing voice encourages leaders to move from a broadcast style of communication to a meaningful two way dialogue. This approach appears to have equal, if not greater utility, when embarking upon collaborative change.
Conclusions of the targeted literature review

This targeted review has focused on generic change management literature maintained by three relevant and contemporary professional bodies. The aim has been to investigate the utility of knowledge for organisations embarking on inter organisational change. While literature from the APM and CMI appeared limited, elementary and dated, considerably more value added knowledge and practice was available from the CIPD.

The headline failure rates for delivering organisational change are indicative of significant challenges and poor delivery. Unfortunately, the absence of supporting evidence and a failure to adequately explain terms used, creates obstacles when seeking to investigate this phenomenon. This appears as a recurring theme in the literature review and merits exploration as part of the primary research.

The literature available from the APM and CMI focuses on the top down, planned, paradigm of change. Different frameworks and methods are offered to assist managers to assess and tackle resistance. Emphasis is directed towards creating a vision of the ‘to be’ state and then developing detailed plans to shift the organisation to this position. While this approach represents the most popular and commonly used means of delivery, limitations are apparent. Firstly, this method assumes change has remained episodic and that organisations are operating in a stable and predictable environment. This traditional intellection no longer aligns with the new change paradigm which is characterised as being asymmetric and relentless. Secondly, delivering inter organisational change is likely to involve higher levels of uncertainty and greater political sensitivities, particularly relating to governance. This may inhibit the creation of a future partnership vision.

Propitiously, the CIPD were able to offer a greater insight into shifting change dynamics, evolving thinking and alternative approaches. While reiterating the importance of leadership, the CIPD question the continued suitability of top
down driven change by emphasising the value of ambiguity to reduce dependency and stimulate meaningful staff participation and involvement. In addition, they also propose adoption of a more enlightened and sympathetic approach to staff who question change.

Arguably, there is no favoured model or best method to deliver change, merely a set of guiding principles to consider. Much of the literature reviewed appears dated and of questionable utility given the shifting nature of organisational change. There are apparent contradictions, glib assertions, unsupported headline statements and clear gaps. Despite these limitations the literature reviewed appears to possess universal utility in that it is relevant to both intra and inter organisational change. The absence of literature dedicated to inter organisational change is remarkable given the increasing popularity of this mode of working and the unique pitfalls and challenges alluded to earlier in this review. The intention is now to investigate the gaps and contradictions through primary research.
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

In this section the author sets out his approach for undertaking primary research. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods have been chosen and the rationale explained. Pragmatism and opportunity exploitation, both feature as important considerations in the selection of chosen research methods. In order to confront researcher bias, a reflective account, arguably a component aspect of the professional doctoral journey, is presented at Annex ‘F’ (Lee, 2009 p. 42; Scott et al., 2004, p. 56). Knowledge gleaned from the literature review is used to formulate the research strategy. The aim is to undertake relevant, value added research that contributes to existing theory and practice.

An analogous approach was adopted for the qualitative and quantitative research design, which began looking at major change occurring within a single organisation and then progressed to explore major collaborative organisational change. During the semi-structured interviews, those with a policing background were asked profession specific questions considered relevant to research objective no. III. A thematic reporting approach was adopted to facilitate maximum flexibility.

The research eventually consisted of forty-three semi-structured interviews and two identical self completed questionnaires. Survey 1 was publicised using social media while survey 2 was circulated to a controlled sample group within the APM. Additional information is supplied regarding the completion rates as well as details of the profiles for each of the participant groupings.
3.2 Research Strategy

In this section the researcher discusses alternative methods and sets out his preferred approach and rationale. The overriding principles applied are of pragmatism and practicality.

The research aim and objectives (see Annex ‘C’) have undergone progressive revision to mirror the professional journey undertaken. The impact has been to place greater emphasis on change occurring outside policing. These adjustments were considered necessary for two key reasons. Firstly, the research would appeal to a wider audience and secondly, it would facilitate cross sector comparison. Robson (2011 p. 56) suggests that an important criterion before finalising objectives and plans is to ‘go public’ and ‘socialise’ the evolving research and approach. This constitutes an important aspect of reflexivity, and in pursuit of this goal the researcher submitted papers for publication, spoke at APM conferences and wrote blogs. In addition he created and developed a profile on social media. This approach has enabled the researcher to create symbiotic relationships with others from very different backgrounds and parts of the world, but all of whom profess an interest in the topic of collaboration. ‘Socialisation’ has greatly assisted the on-going task of keeping abreast of new literature and other developments.

The methodological approach has to be “doable” (O’Leary, 2004, p. 12). The approach chosen for this research seeks to utilise a mixed methods paradigm, the philosophy of ‘pragmatism’ (Burke-Johnson et. al., 2007, p. 113). A pragmatist views different methods as simply a collection of techniques (Firestone, 1987, p. 16). Using different research methods maximises personal learning opportunities; an objective of undertaking a professional doctorate. In addition, this acts as an enabler for ‘triangulation’, an important test of validity (Eisner, 1991 p. 110; Grix, 2000, pp. 83-84; Robson, 2011, p. 158; Bryman, 2008, p. 379).
Access to professionals with experience of strategic collaboration was of paramount consideration. Although the window of opportunity to link up with professionals within policing was slowly closing, new and exciting ones were emerging. Timing the research was of critical importance in order to capture the views of past acquaintances in policing, while at the same time leveraging advantage from the researcher’s current position and status within the APM. Reaching out to sections of the APM membership was critical if the research was to encompass a survey.

Practicality and do-ability were the key considerations when formulating the research design. Robson proposes three approaches for flexible research design which, includes case studies, ethnographic and grounded theory studies (2002, p. 178). The ethnographic option was the easiest to dismiss because arranging participant observation was not a viable option and was unlikely to yield the depth of research data sought. A case study approach, where the purpose of the study is, to shed light on a larger population (Gerring, 2007, p. 20), was also deemed unsuitable. Firstly, there are inherent risks and dangers in seeking to extrapolate the findings from a case study to a much wider population (Abercrombie et al., 1984, p. 34; Diamond, 1996, p. 6; Eisenhardt, 1996, p. 534; Drake et al., 1998, p. 279). Secondly, undertaking a case study may necessitate entering into an arrangement with the client organisation which could compromise either the research objectives and/or the timescales. In any event the researcher had undertaken case study research at an earlier stage in his doctoral journey and was keen to explore different research methods (Dale, 2012, p. 45). A grounded theory approach that seeks to derive a theory from empirical raw data appeared the best means of achieving the research aim and objectives for this thesis (Locke, 2001, p. 106).

A flexible design for qualitative research enables the researcher to adjust and make improvements as the research progresses. The researcher was keen to use semi-structured interviews and was confident that skills honed over many years as an investigator, interviewer and assessor, adequately equipped him for this role (Yin, 2003, pp. 58-61). Some interviews were held ‘face to face’,
although the majority were conducted either on the telephone or by video conferencing. While acknowledging the drawbacks of not conducting all the interviews face to face (Robson, 2011, p. 290; Bryman, 2008, p. 457) contemporary doctrine supports the assertion that telephone interviews in qualitative research represent a valid approach (Struges & Hanrahan, 2004, p. 107). Furthermore, the advantages of accessing a significantly greater number of professionals, who would otherwise not be able to contribute, coupled with reduced costs, provided compelling considerations.

It was decided at an early stage to record all the interviews using a digital voice recorder and for the interviews to be transcribed (Bryman, 2008, p. 450; Bucher et al., 1956, p. 339). The use of computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) to assist with data collection and categorisation was trialled but was discounted because of software limitations and compatibility issues. Fortunately, the mind-mapping software used for the literature review was still available and this provided a reliable and user friendly alternative. This decision was reinforced by the findings of Pope et al., who warn of the disadvantages of using specialist research software, particularly when applying statistical generalisability to non representative sampling (2000, p. 115). While handling qualitative data may be a “messy affair” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 33), the process of mind-mapping the transcripts, grouping emerging themes and then manually applying codification, categorisation, analysis and theorisation proved to be both viable and practical (Pope et al., 2000, p. 116). The method deployed was logical, easy to follow and transparent.

The researcher has previously undertaken facilitator duties at different forums and was keen to experiment with a focus group arrangement, should the opportunity arise (Robson, 2011, p. 293; Bryman, 2008, p. 476). A key advantage is that group dynamics, when harnessed productively, can generate a synergistic energy (Robinson, 1999, pp. 909; Robson, 2011 p. 294). Fortunately, during the course the design phase, an opportunity arose to facilitate a focus group involving members of the APM’s Enabling Change SiG. Details of the participants and the approach adopted can be found in Annex ‘G’.
As it was only possible to arrange one focus group it was decided to use the output of the session to inform and shape the design of the primary research questions.

The empirical research planned, focused primarily on semi-structured interviews. This would be supported by two identical surveys involving different participant populations, thereby enabling triangulation. This is depicted in Figure 3 below.

It is acknowledged that triangulation can be achieved by other means and given the depth of the literature review set out in the previous chapter, this could, for example, incorporate documentary analysis (Robson, 2011, p. 348). This idea was dismissed, principally because other research methods were available that were likely to yield reliable and robust findings (Bowen, 2009, p. 31; Yin, 1994, p. 80).
The interviewees were divided into three research groupings or pillars: those with experience of collaborative change in policing, those with experience in the wider public sector and those with experience from the private sector. This enabled comparisons to be drawn and contrasts made, as appropriate. The interviewees were drawn from associates who had experience of organisational collaboration in one or more of the three research pillars and who the researcher deemed were capable of making an informed contribution. While a comparative research design, intended to generate theoretical insights, (Bryman, 2008, p. 692), appears intuitively attractive, a potential issue arose because of the non analogous nature of the three chosen research pillars. Table 1, below, highlights the disparity in size of the different pillars. Policing, the first pillar, represents a group within the wider public sector, the second pillar. There is a significant difference between the relative sizes of the UK public and private sectors (Office for National Statistics, 2012, p. 2). An alternative approach of choosing another equally sized group within the private or public sector to enable comparison with policing was considered but dismissed as being both limiting and impractical. Robson’s view (2011, p. 266) that the “exigencies of carrying out real world research can often make the requirements for representative sampling impossible”, acted as a guiding principle. The researcher concedes that homogeneity across the chosen pillars was neither realistic or achievable.

![Table 1](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of staff</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>5,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rather than considering this as a weakness, the researcher has sought to broaden the scope and appeal of this research by exploiting the unique professional standing he now enjoys.

Bryman, (2008, p. 168), warns of the risk of sampling bias when selecting interviewees. Inviting participation from three distinct pillars mitigates this risk. Regardless, with real world research sometimes it better “not to naval gaze but, just do it” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 83). This is the approach adopted for this thesis. Reflexive practice, capturing emerging themes and undertaking interim analysis were both component features of the chosen approach (Pope et al., 2000, p. 114). Further details can be found in the author’s reflective account at Annex ‘F’.

Guest et al. (2006, p. 79) suggests that, among a group of relatively homogenous individuals, twelve interviews should suffice. This was the target for each research pillar.

The second research method proposed applies quantitative methods. While acknowledging the existence of different quantitative research instruments, this assignment utilises the most popular of these methods, self completed questionnaires (Bryman, 2008, p. 216). Access to the database of members of the Programme Management SiG was approved by the Chair. Following discussions with the APM’s CEO, it was agreed to compare and contrast two different approaches. The first approach involved active promotion of an electronic questionnaire via ‘linked in’ social media websites. While the survey was targeted at professionals within the project and change management communities, access could not be restricted or therefore controlled. To provide some safeguard and minimise the risk that unsuitable persons would seek to participate, gate / entry questions were included in the survey together with appropriate exit points. The second approach involved a direct email invitation, using the same questionnaire, to the three thousand two hundred and fifty two members of the Programme Management SiG. This grouping is made up of members of the APM and others who select programme management as an
‘interest area’ when registering a subscription to the Association’s website (further details of this group are provided in chapter 4). Although the APM’s response rates are historically low, partly due to survey overload and misuse, (Gillham, 2000, p. 1), it was still hoped that more than thirty substantive responses would be attained, thereby enabling some, albeit elementary, statistical analysis to be undertaken (Hannan, 2007, p. 5).

A test questionnaire was designed using SurveyMonkey\(^\text{16}\) and piloted (Bryman, 2008, p. 469; Williams, 2003, p. 246). Initially, it was intended to incentivise completion (Armstrong, 1975, p. 111; Dillman, 2007, p. 26) but this was discounted on the advice of the University’s Research Ethics Committee. The survey was constructed building on the lessons learned from earlier small scale research undertaken in 2012 which indicated that a balance of open and closed questions would be preferable (Brace, 2004, p. 86; Hannan 2007, p. 4) as well as inclusion of Likert’s scale (Dale, 2012, pp. 52-54).

A full submission was made to the University’s Research Ethics Committee. Approved was granted on 25 September 2013 (see Annex ‘A’).

An analogous approach was adopted for the qualitative and quantitative research design, which began looking at major change occurring within a single organisation and then progressed to explore major collaborative organisational change. During the semi-structured interviews, those with a policing background were asked profession specific questions considered relevant to the research aim and objectives. A thematic reporting approach was adopted to encourage flexibility and maintain alignment with the research analysis. The results of both surveys, together with the output from the semi-structured interviews already alluded to, are now discussed in greater detail.

\(^{16}\) SurveyMonkey is an online software application for designing, administering, analysing and publishing surveys.
3.3 Qualitative research (1:1 interviews)

The primary research instrument involved semi-structured, 1:1 interviews, undertaken from July 2013 to May 2014. In total forty-three persons were interviewed, thirteen at a face to face meeting and the remainder by telephone or video conferencing. Each interview lasted thirty to ninety minutes, with the average time taken being forty-eight minutes. All persons consented to be named as research participants. Recordings were made of forty-one interviews and transcripts produced. The reason for not recording two interviews was because of venue unsuitability. In both cases the researcher prepared detailed contemporaneous written notes.

A schedule of the persons who participated in 1:1 interviews is available at Annex ‘H’. The interviewees were all selected by the researcher due to their position, experience and knowledge acquired working for organisations engaged in collaboration. Many of the interviewees were current or former senior managers and the list includes one retired major general, one former president of ACPO, one former PCC, one former deputy PCC, sixteen senior project/programme managers, recognised by the award of the APM’s Registered Project Professional (RPP) status or fellowship of the APM, or both, eight current or former members of ACPO, including a serving chief constable and two deputy chief constables and seventeen current or former company directors. The majority of people interviewed were middle aged males of white, european origin. While a greater gender and ethnic balance would have been welcome, the make-up of the interviewees is broadly indicative of the wider research population. Despite best efforts, the researcher was only able to secure the engagement of four females, one black and one asian participant.

The participants were grouped into three cohorts: those with experience of collaborative change in policing, those with experience of collaborative change working in/with the public sector and those with experience of collaborative
change working in the private sector. Table 2 categorises the interviewees into the three chosen research pillars.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of collaborative change in policing</th>
<th>Experience collaborative change in the public sector</th>
<th>Experience of collaborative change in the private sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four of the interviewees were able to demonstrate collaborative experience operating in all three research pillars, while sixteen interviewees had experience in two pillars. Twenty-three interviewees had experience in one pillar only.

The interviews began with questions relating to major change within a single organisation before exploring collaborative change. Questions were also posed to investigate different experiences within the three chosen pillars. The inclusion of a fourth pillar to encompass the ‘third’ or voluntary sectors was considered but discounted due to scale and extent of the research already planned.

Using a semi-structured approach afforded the researcher opportunities to test, probe and explore the answers provided. Annex ‘I’ sets out the skeletal guide used. In practice the researcher adopted a situational questioning style in order to build and maintain rapport with the interviewee and as a consequence the pre-planned sequencing of questions was not always adhered to. An example, of when it was deemed prudent to adopt a more flexible style was when interviewees switched from talking about single organisational change to collaborative change and then back again. A key finding was that although the researcher had addressed single organisational and multi organisational change separately in the plan, many interviewees saw their approach as being essentially the same. To many the knowledge
and skills required for successful intra organisation change were the same as those demanded for collaborative ventures.

3.4 Quantitative research (Survey 1)

Electronic links to survey 1 were posted on the researcher’s personal ‘Linked-in’ social media web pages and professional groups that he subscribes to\(^\text{17}\). The APM’s and CMI’s practitioner sites were principally targeted. The survey was available from August to December 2013. While access to survey 1 was not controlled, the introductory text and preamble posts, explained the purpose and scope. In addition, two gateway questions were incorporated. This guided respondents to the end of the survey in the event that they indicated that they did not possess personal experience of either major intra or inter organisational change.

\(^{17}\) ‘Linked-in’ is an online social network for business professionals.
One hundred and eighty-four persons opened survey 1. Figure 4 provides a breakdown of the completion levels:

- **Fully completed the survey (78)**
- **Exited the survey without providing any material / substantive responses (53)**
- **Exited the survey before answering all of the questions posed. Provided some substantive responses (53)**
Details of the roles performed when engaged in major organisational change were provided by one hundred and twenty-six respondents, as shown in Figure 5 below:

Figure 5

- Directors (8) 13%
- Senior Management (just below board level) 33%
- Middle Management (30) 18%
- Junior Management (4) 6%
- Non Managerial (3) 2%
- Change Agents (8) 3%
- Programme / project team (23) 24%
- Consultant (6) 26%
The format of the surveys followed the approach adopted for the semi-structured interviews, with the first section focusing on major change within a single organisation and then moving to explore inter organisational or collaborative change (See Annex ‘J’). Consideration was given to developing a third version of the survey and limiting the respondents to those with experience of organisational and collaborative change in policing. This was abandoned due to the restrictions encountered accessing constabulary IT security firewalls.

3.5 Quantitative research (Survey 2)

The format and questions posed in the second survey were identical to survey 1. While access to survey 1 was not restricted, survey 2 was targeted at a sample group, the three thousand two hundred and fifty-two members of the APM’s Programme Management SiG. Further details of this group, including a demographic breakdown and the requirements for joining can be found at Annex ‘K’.

A link to the survey was emailed to every member of the group in December 2013. A total seventy-two persons opened the link and commenced answering the survey. While this only represents a response rate of just over 2% it accords with the APM’s general standard. An added dimension is that many project practitioners were already aware of the existence of survey 1, given the extensive profile achieved via social media.
Figure 6 provides a competition breakdown for the seventy-two respondents who commenced survey 2:

- Fully completed the survey (28)
- Exited the survey without providing any material / substantive responses (26)
- Exited the survey before answering all of the questions posed. Provided some substantive responses (18)
Figure 7 provides details of the roles performed by the forty-seven respondents, who provided details of their role when engaged in major organisational change:

**Figure 7**

- Directors (2)
- Senior Management (just below board level) (13)
- Middle management (10)
- Programme / project team (12)
- Consultant (6)
- Junior Management (2)
Comparative analysis of surveys 1 and 2 demonstrate broadly similar levels of respondent profile, while the competition and attrition data suggest marginally higher levels of participation in survey 1.

### 3.6 Conclusion

In this chapter the research strategy and approach are explained. Initially the focus was on strategic alliances within policing but this has now evolved to produce research of wider interest and utility. Pragmatism and achievability represent overriding considerations. The researcher has exploited his positional status to access a diverse range of organisational leaders and change management practitioners within policing and across the broader public and private sectors.

The primary research instrument chosen utilises qualitative methods and involves an extensive series of semi-structured interviews. This has two principle advantages. Firstly, it is a technique the researcher is competent using and secondly this approach is likely to yield the richness and depth of data necessary for doctoral level interrogation and exploration. This primary research method is, however, supplemented by two complimentary surveys targeted at a wider cohort of project and change management professionals. The principle benefit of this mixed methods approach is to enable triangulation, thereby increasing the reliability and validity of the findings.

It would be folly to suggest researcher neutrality. Understanding researcher positionality through reflexivity is considered necessary and this is addressed in the author’s reflective account.
Chapter 4: Research and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to consider the results of the research. The dominant focus is on the qualitative research findings, albeit regular references are included to both surveys. Significant areas of consistency and commonality arise, regardless of the research instrument used. This adds weight to the validity and reliability of the findings. In total six dominant themes have been identified. Three principal categories are dedicated to generic change, collaborative change and policing. The additional categories relate to the linked areas of change effectiveness and weaknesses in both knowledge and knowledge application, referred to respectively as the change knowledge and change knowing and doing gaps. The final category focuses on proposals for improving change capacity and delivery and seeks to build upon the constructive suggestions provided by the research participants. It should be noted that the findings do not appear in priority order. Using a flexible research methodology has enabled the adoption of an organic approach which has not been constrained by the rigours of overly prescriptive practice.

4.2 Research Findings

It would be helpful to outline the method deployed for identifying the core research themes. This began during the recording phase when the product from each interview transcript was deconstructed into component statements that were copied onto a master electronic mind-map. Remarks were attributed to named individuals using a simple numeric coding system known only to the researcher. This was to ensure that comments could not be attributed to named individuals, an ethical consideration deemed paramount.
Several areas of commonality emerged during the development of the master mind-map. Relationships were created and the data re-ordered to catalogue the responses. Different colour codes were used to capture positive or negative lessons, to identify issues only appertaining to collaborative change or when handling sector specific comments.

Simple manipulation of the responses captured in SurveyMonkey enabled elementary numerical analysis of the quantitative data. Handling the data rich free text replies necessitated manual intervention and the same approach deployed for handling the interview transcripts was followed. These free text responses can all be referenced back to the master spread-sheet provided by SurveyMonkey which numbered every participant and shows their responses to each question. As no personal details were sought from the survey participants steps to ensure anonymity were unnecessary.

A second classification exercise was undertaken entailing all the research responses. Some were set aside as being ancillary to the specific research aims and objectives for this thesis, while the remainder were grouped into the following core research categories:

(i) Exploring the generic challenges of delivering change;
(ii) Assessing the unique challenges of delivering collaborative change;
(iii) Assessing the effectiveness of organisations when delivering change;
(iv) Assessing the change knowledge and change knowing/doing gaps;
(v) An examination of the police sector;
(vi) Proposals to improve inter and intra organisational change preparedness and delivery.

It noteworthy that the research categories listed above and their constituent findings arose through a process of osmosis. As grounded theory was the chosen methodological approach it was crucial that no attempts were made to pre-judge the analysis or allow personal preconceptions to distort the
outcome. This necessitated a degree of self discipline to ensure the processes of codification, categorisation and analysis were adhered to.

4.2.1 Core research category (i): Exploring the generic challenges of delivering change

This section examines the research findings that address the generic challenges of delivering change. A high level of consistency was noted when examining the findings, regardless of the research instrument used, thereby reinforcing the validity and reliability of the chosen research strategy. It became apparent that the generic change management theory and practice referenced, appeared to possess universal utility, in that it was equally applicable to both intra and inter organisational change. That having been said all the interview respondents agreed that collaborative change involves additional and unique challenges requiring bespoke responses. This aspect is explored later in this chapter.

Participants were asked to comment on the pace and drivers for organisational change. All twenty-two participants with experience of policing, declared that austerity was a principle driver for intra and inter organisational change, thereby reinforcing assertions discussed in the literature review (White, 2015, p. 5; HMIC 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014b & 2014c). Similarly, austerity was cited as the foremost change driver by the seventeen respondents with public sector experience, supporting a similar claim from the CIPD (2013a). The thirty respondents with experience of the private sector also referenced ‘retrenchment drivers’, such as competition, globalisation and declining markets. ‘Opportunistic drivers’ such as new technology, expanding markets, an educated dynamic workforce (featuring the ‘Y’ generation18) and improved customer service were also considered key.

18 Refers to the generation of people born during the 1980s and early 1990s. It is said that the Y generation had unprecedented exposure to technology and are more demanding of change in the workplace.
Interviewees 20, 28 and 38 referred to over reliance of a ‘lazy narrative’. This situation occurs when leaders rely on poorly constructed and predominantly negative change communiqué, rather than investing time and effort in constructing a robust and positive message of change. Excessive use of the “burning platform” (Interviewee, 38), represents an illustration of the ‘lazy narrative’ (OGC, 2007, p. 48). Interviewee 28 contrasted the lazy narrative with a vision of a “golden horizon” where time and care is taken to explain how the change will “make everybody’s life easier and better”. Research commissioned by the CIPD (2012, p. 27) emphasised the importance of positivity when formulating communications and this links to Kotter’s earlier observations concerning management shortcomings in this area (1993, p.10). Arguably, use of opportunistic drivers presented in a positive communiqué, is more likely to engender more support and commitment than the “change or die” approach reported by several interviewees. Positivity when framing communications should not, however, imply blind optimism and numerous examples were cited in both the interviews and surveys of managers being discredited because of spurious claims and unbalanced communications. Interviewees reiterated that they did not expect senior managers to know all the answers. They called for more openness, candour and honesty and less hype and embellishment. The researcher suggests this phenomena represents a call to communicate ‘judiciously’. These findings build upon the research of Balogun and Hope Hailey (2015, p. 13) who appear dismissive of the historic, paternalistic, managerial approach where actors claimed to be in control and purport to know all the answers.

Linked to excessive use of the ‘lazy narrative’ is the potentially harmful consequences of managers being overly critical of past practices and behaviours. “Trashing” previous organisational conduct can, according to three survey respondents, foster “cynicism” (Gallup 2013, p. 12). Cooperrider’s Appreciative Inquiry seeks to avoid negativity by valuing ‘what is’ as the starting point for change (2008, p. 16).
Discussing the challenges of delivering organisational change was a prominent aspect of the interviews. Questions were also framed in both surveys to identify areas that ‘had gone well’ and ‘not so well’. In survey 1 a total of three hundred and seventeen comments were added to the ‘gone well list’, while exactly the same number were proposed as ‘not having gone well’. The figures for survey 2 were one hundred and thirteen and one hundred and six, respectively. Many of the areas identified contained generic characteristics and were equally applicable to intra and inter organisational change categories. In addition, many of the issues raised appeared on both lists and were prefaced with the words ‘good’ or ‘poor’. This is the principle reason for describing the points listed, as ‘challenges’, regardless of whether the survey respondent considered them to be either favourable or inimical. By implication addressing the challenge positively increases the propensity for a favourable outcome. Conversely, a failure to adequately address the challenge increases the likelihood of an unwanted outcome.

The principle groupings are:

✦ Time, quality and resourcing challenges
✦ Project, change and benefit management challenges
✦ Leadership challenges
✦ Communication and engagement challenges

Each will now be discussed in a sequential order.

*Time, resourcing and quality challenges:*

Time, resourcing and quality are commonly depicted as the ‘iron triangle’ or the ‘project manager’s trilemma’ (APM, 2004, p. 7). The association with ‘dilemma’ ‘is magnified because established doctrine infers that achieving the right balance in all three dimensions represents one of the most demanding
challenges in project management. Resourcing, time and quality featured prominently in the interviews and surveys.

“Rushing in”, “unclear objectives”, “absurdly ambitious timescales”, “unrealistic timescales”, “optimism bias”, “seeking a quick fix”, “driven by a misguided sense of urgency”, “time is running out”, “I need to make a mark”, “there is no time for niceties”, “arbitrary, non sensical timescales”, “driven by a dangerous cocktail of optimism bias and irrational exuberance”, “not understanding the implications”, “amateurish” and “machoism”, were all terms used to explain the reasons for setting unrealistic timescales (Interviewees, 2, 5, 6, 8, 15, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 & 35). Interviewee 35 referred to Kotter’s seminal Eight Steps (2008) for delivering change saying “I actually think an overly simplistic application of this particular model is harmful. Let’s take step 1 ‘creating a sense of urgency’. For some of the changes I’ve been involved in, frankly, urgency is the last thing that is needed. Taking time to consider what needs to be done and the likely consequences is often jettisoned because something has to be seen to be happening immediately. The results can be disastrous. Rushing in, poor planning, creating havoc is often the consequence of this urgency mindset. I’ve seen it many times and in a hierarchal organisation it can be very destabilising particularly when the guy at the top is driving everything. It creates shock waves throughout the organisation. The next thing is lots of people are running around clueless. I know Kotter differentiates between a real and false sense of urgency but this is lost on many of our compatriots. Frankly, I would take Kotter’s model with a large pinch of salt”

The issue of inadequate time was reinforced in the free text survey responses reviewed. Additional comments meriting referencing include “unfair external pressures from Central Government resulting in unrealistic timescales” and “over promising at the outset”.

The juxtaposition was, that when the timescales were deemed to realistic, achievable and capable of being flexed, these conditions acted as enablers. Illustrative comments noted include “an ability to adjust timescales by having...
adult conversations”, “being inclusive” and “actively seeking, encouraging, listening to and acting upon feedback” (Interviewees, 2, 18, 22, & 33). Inclusivity was presented as advantageous for securing ‘buy in’.

Resourcing and quality are inextricably linked to time. Reduced timescales is likely to necessitate additional resourcing. Alternatively, quality could be compromised as a consequence of conceding to pressure to reduce timescales. Resourcing (APM, 2012, p. 154), or the lack of it, was raised many times. Interviewees, 5 and 14, for example, referred to a “misguided” belief on the part of senior management that project teams could function on a “cost neutral basis”. The inference proposed was that for some, project management represented an ‘add-on’ to the day job. Simply not having enough staff was a commonly raised complaint, as was a perceived skill and experience gap, particularly in specialist roles such as project management, planning, human resource management and procurement.

Policing was not immune from criticism when discussing resourcing. Interviewee 5 said they had experience of project teams being used as a “dumping ground” for staff not wanted elsewhere in the organisation, while interviewees 16 and 42 warned of the practice of “pigeon holing” police officers into project roles that they had neither been trained for and were ill suited to perform. Interviewees 31 and 42 developed this argument by implying that project work was inferior to “proper policing”. The disparaging phrase, “rubbish work”, was apparently used by some police officers to describe the activities of project/change management teams (Interviewee, 42). In explanation this interviewee referred to the appointment of a serving detective sergeant who was currently on restrictive duties as the project manager for a major force centralised custody project involving a multi million pound new build. The officer concerned had no project management qualifications or experience of working with external contractors. The project ran into severe difficulty resulting in significant additional costs. This interviewee also commented on the inappropriate attitude and lack of commitment of the senior police officer appointed as project sponsor. S/he rarely read project papers, often cancelled
project board meetings at short notice and was heard publicly to say that s/he had been handed the ‘short straw’ in their appointment as the SRO.

The flip side to these resourcing issues, is that adequately funded, well resourced, trained and capable project and change teams can make a substantial and positive contribution.

Quality (APM, 2012, p. 188) represents the third aspect of the iron triangle. Interviewees raised concerns about the quality of key deliverables (Interviewees, 10 & 26). Interviewee 26, for example, vividly explained how arbitrary and unnecessary time pressures led to the delivery of sub-standard products. Interviewee 10 bemoaned that the metrics were so poor it was impossible to assess quality. Some interviewees suggested a level of exaggeration and “spinning” to make the outcomes look better than they really were (Interviewees, 10, 15 & 26). The researcher uses the term ‘change hyperbole’ to describe the apparent widespread practice of overstating either the case for change or the outcomes achieved. This appears to link to the Government’s description of ‘optimism bias’ discussed in chapter 2 and Jenner’s more forthright assertions of spurious project benefit claims (2009, p. 16). Many more complaints were alluded to, concerning either poor product quality or the delivery of unsatisfactory outcomes (Interviewees, 2, 7, 10, 16, 27, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 42 & 43). Conversely, two aspects of good practice relating to quality were cited. The first relates to the Government’s Gateway Project Review Scheme. This was referenced by interviewees 35 and 40 as providing a credible and independent assessment of project delivery. The second area of good practice was the establishment of ‘red teams’ to undertake honest, independent, reviews at key stages in the project lifecycle.
Project, change and benefit management challenges

Project, change and benefits management were cited by many as representing key success factors for both intra and inter organisational change. The inference is that good project, change and benefits management increase the propensity of delivering the desired outputs, while poor project, change and benefits management all contribute to the likelihood of a sub optimal outcome being achieved.

An “amateurish approach”, (Interviewee, 26), “lacking the right skill set” (Interviewee, 31) and “indiscipline” (Interviewee, 9) are examples of some of the problems experienced with project management. A “weak business case”, “no or poor option analysis” were additional reasons referenced (Interviewees, 7 & 12). Conversely, a robust business case articulating a compelling case, had a significant and positive impact (Interviewees, 2, 37 & 29). This supports Jenner’s research (2009) and advice provided by HM Treasury in their Green Guide (2013b).

Interviewees 2 and 37 praised the role undertaken by a project office in maintaining standards and ensuring consistency. Interviewee 18 referred to the advantages of project templates, supported by a clear organisational project method, or “organisational way”. This accords with APM published best practice for organisational project academies (APM 2011, pp. 4 - 5).

Benefits management forms an integral aspect of the business case (APM, 2012, p. 124). Interviewee 29 warned of the dangers of adopting an overly prescriptive approach shaping and developing benefits took considerable time. This view was supported by interviewee 16 who warned of the dangers of “killing off a good ideas by insisting that a business case be presented at a point that was too early within the project lifecycle”. “Negativity”, “risk aversion” and “nay-slaying” were other practices used to “strangle” good ideas (Interviewee, 2). Interviewee 9 emphasised the value of clear metrics and recommended the inclusion of project, benefits and change management, as

Numerous examples of project, benefits and change management ranging from outstanding to diabolical were provided. One survey respondent lamented “dreadful project management”, another referred to the unfortunate project manager as a “headless chicken”, while others talked of “scope creep”, “a piecemeal approach”, “poor requirements management” and “poor resource allocation”. A commonly cited complaint was an over emphasis on the process of change, while ignoring the people issues. Others referred to meaningless “reshuffling”.

In survey 1 ‘strong programme/project management’ was ranked as the fourth most important success factor when delivering major intra organisational change. A similar outcome was achieved in survey 2. See Annex ‘L’ and ‘M’ for further details.

The conclusion, given the frequency and depth of the research responses, is that the disciplines of project, benefits and change management all contribute to the successful delivery of organisational change, regardless of the context.

Leadership challenges

Leadership, or the absence of it, represented another recurring theme (Heifetz & Linsky 2002, pp. 65-75; Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, pp. 60-71; Meyerson, 2001, pp. 92-102; Garvin & Roberto, 2005, pp. 104-114; Beer et al., 1990, pp., 158-166). While specific additional leadership qualities are required to deliver inter organisational change, this section focuses on those generic leadership qualities, deemed relevant to all categories of change. Three areas of leadership were specifically referenced:

- change courage, pacing, resilience, and sustainability;
weak and inadequate leadership or a failure to act was cited by a significant minority of respondents. The researcher refers to this category as ‘change courage’. Some interviewees referred to “fence sitting”, “the ostrich head in the sand syndrome”, “tinkering”, “playing politics” and “game playing” (Interviewees, 7, 8, 16 & 20). Others implied a lack of morale fibre and courage to get to grips with change. Interviewee 37 talked of “change denial” and an “unwillingness to face the brutal facts” concerning the necessity for change. Interviewee 8 referred to “procrastination and talking shops” instead of tangible action. Several examples of “playing safe” were cited. When, after being force to act, interviewee 12 referred to the default position of “salami slicing” rather than pursuing the transformational option demanded. Even when the need for change was acknowledged, interviewee 35 noted that “actions did not necessary accord with the talk of transformational change”. Their belief was that while senior managers and leaders espoused the language of transformation, the non policing organisational environment they were referencing, operated in a predominantly transactional manner. In this context language can be significant and talk of transformational change which amounts to very little does, in the opinion of interviewee 35, lead to disillusionment and can act as a barrier to future staff engagement. This could be interrupted as ‘change hyperbole’. It is important to emphasise that weaknesses of leadership was a dominant theme in the literature review (Heifetz & Linsky 2002, pp. 65-75; Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, pp. 60-71; Meyerson, 2001, pp. 92-102; Garvin & Roberto, 2005, pp. 104-114; Beer et al., 1990, pp.,158-166).

Others talked about a lack of resolve or stamina on the part of leaders which culminated in the initiative concluding prematurely (Interviewees, 25 & 15). The researcher refers to this phenomena as ‘change sustainability’. “Getting bored”, “loosing interest” and “moving on” were all contributory factors towards a tendency for ‘change flip’ (Interviewees, 17 & 24). This situation occurs when

- authenticity and style; and,
- crafting a compelling vision of change.
the sponsor switches their attention to other areas, effectively curtailing the project before it has the delivered the outcomes sought.

The free text survey responses revealed a richness of data supporting the position set out in the previous paragraphs. Illustrative comments include “the sponsor had a short attention span”, “they got bored”, “they were clueless”, “they lost focus”, “they were game playing with no serious intent”, “they lacked conviction and stamina” and “they were risk adverse”. “Hidden agendas”, “lying”, “falsification”, “fabrication” and “exaggeration” were other words used. Frailties of change courage were also referenced, including a failure to deal with the ‘nay-slayers’ or an unwillingness to confront ‘managers who decided to opt out’. The net result, according to one respondent, was that “we all became fatigued by cynicism”.

While many interviewees talked of a hesitancy and reluctance of leaders to embark upon change, a significant number of interviewees suggested a diametrically opposing viewpoint. One interviewee alluded to the “powerful seductive forces of change” and continued by referencing the “hubris of senior management” (Interviewee, 3). Interviewee 3 continued by describing a reluctance of management to look “outside the box”. They (the managers) appeared “locked in a mindset”, “driven to do something” regardless of the consequences. This appears consistent with the analogy of Gloss et al.’s ‘reinvented roller coaster’ (1993, p. 91). “Rushing ahead”, “not considering the options”, “seeking change without understanding the as is”, “not setting out the benefits”, “absurdly ambitious timescales”, “seeking a quick fix” were some of the illustrative comments recorded (Interviewees, 1, 2, 3, 4, 15 & 28). The net result was “cynicism”, “change overload”, “negativity” and “destabilisation” (Interviewees, 1, 24, 37, 39 & 40). This aligns with the findings of Reichers et al. (1997, p. 49). Several free text survey comments reinforced the harmful consequences of moving too quickly. While it is not intended to repeat these comments, a different dimension was alluded to by one respondent who referred to the “damaging legacy of historic failed change initiatives”. They talked of “irrational negativity, even when presented with
compelling evidence to the contrary”. Arguably, failure leaves a legacy which can damage the prospects for future change.

Interviewees 6 and 10 raised excessive masculinity as a potential cause of poor change delivery. Instances of a ‘macho management style’ were referenced, while it was argued that greater attention to feminist leadership traits such as inclusivity and consensus building is likely to yield more sustaining outcomes. This assertion aligns with the research of Galloway, et. al. (2015, pp. 683-692).

Evidence of “insincerity”, an inability to “walk the talk”, doubts regarding “authenticity” were more failings identified in change leadership (Interviewees, 12, 16, 28 & 40). Closely linked to weaknesses of authenticity and style (the second leadership group identified by the researcher), is the suggestion that “short termism”, “personal agendas”, “butterfly management” and the “desire to leave a lasting legacy before moving on” all played a part in undermining the change (Interviewees, 2, 6 7, 8,18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 39 & 42). It is worth noting that although ‘butterfly management’ was discussed during the literature review within a police management context (Caless, 2011, p. 118; Reiner, 1991, p. 79; Young, 1993, p. 84), ‘short termism’, according to Pascale and Athos has a much wider application afflicting many organisations in western society (1981).

The free text survey responses refer to “poor leadership” and a “misunderstanding of the psychological aspects of change”. “Inconsistent behaviour”, “not walking the talk”, “an absence of empathy” and “not being people orientated” were all reasons provided. This appears consistent with the findings of the CIPD concerning the importance of achieving ‘emotional buy in’, rather than engaging in more superficial transactional levels of engagement (CIPD, 2014b, p. 20; CIPD, 2015b).

Interviewees 24 and 37 referred to the perceived inequalities of change. This related to a perception that change was disproportionately and unfairly directed towards those at the bottom of the organisation, while the lives of top managers
remained comfortable and untroubled. Interviewee 37 illustrated this situation when, referring to a major private sector change s/he had been engaged in, s/he stated “while the directors feathered their own nests the pain was passed down to the guys at the front end of service delivery. To compound matters they (service delivery) didn’t understand the reasons for the change because nobody had bothered to tell them. In any event the benefits were all to be gained by another area of the business. The service delivery guys were overwhelmed. They became disillusioned and with good reason. Many of the good staff voted with their feet. Those that were left were cynical and mistrusting. Customer service plummeted and complaints went through the roof. The damage and costs were horrendous”. This example of poorly delivered change appears to reinforce the research of the CIPD (2012, p. 27) concerning the significance of emotional, higher level, staff engagement activities. Equally, it demonstrates the importance of investing in communications (Kotter 1993, p. 10; Augustine, 1993, p. 184). Explaining what could have been done, interviewee 37 stated that the starting point should have been on improving service delivery in line with the stated values and objectives of the organisation. In addition, the staff affected should have been told how their working lives will improve as a consequence of the proposed change”.

Instances of good leadership were also referenced. “Visibility”, “commitment and drive”, “trust”, “listening”, “flexibility”, “collaborative”, “nurturing”, “focused”, “situational”, “consistent”, “empathetic” and “authentic” were all words recorded to describe the positive traits of change leaders. Three interviewees talked about a “new breed” of more “emotionally engaged” leaders (Interviewees, 3, 7 & 24) while many more referenced the value of “people centric” leaders. This is illustrated by interviewee 7 who talked of “a new generation of managers who can harness technology and understand what makes a collaborative leader tick. They are schooled and tutored differently. We (referring to the researcher and interviewee 7) were brought up in a different era. We were told that accountability necessitates full control, which of course, was never the case. We were told to be strong, hide our emotions and conceal our weaknesses. We were defensive and for good reason. This new generation are different. They
are more open and willing to learn. They handle contradiction and ambiguity in a way we could never do”. Interviewee 7 alludes to an apparent shift in the mindset between new contemporary leaders and those of a more traditional disposition which, arguably, supports the earlier work of Ohmae (1989, p. 150) and his construct that managerial control does not necessarily equate to effectiveness.

Interviewees 2, and 27 referred to leaders who used “story telling” as a technique to secure commitment (Cameron & Green, 2009, p. 147). Taking time to explain the reasons for change, listening, responding to feedback were also cited as positive traits. While engagement and involvement was crucial, it was stressed by many that leaders should not endeavour to find all the answers. This appears to support critics of the planned paradigm of change discussed in chapter 2. Of particular relevance are the alternative change models proposed by Senge (1993, pp. 18-24 & 174-204) and Todnem By (2005, p. 370).

Interviewee 22 described the “tight on the what but loose on the how” approach. Interviewee 27 referred to the positive practice of ‘making staff part of the solution rather than implying they are the cause of the problem’. This aligns with the approach of Balogun and Hope Hailey (2015, p. 6), which contradicts the traditional paternalistic and protective leadership style associated with the planned paradigm of change. Examples of positive change leadership were referenced in both surveys, with ‘buy-in’, ‘trust’, ‘openness’ and ‘transparency’ all featuring prominently.

The final dimension of leadership relates to vision formulation (OGC, 2007, p. 41). For intra organisational change a key role of senior leadership, according to the overwhelming majority of interviewees, is in crafting, or at least signing up and committing to a vision which describes an end state. The vision needs to be clear, convincing, compelling and capable of robust defence. Interviewees 1, 4, 5, 12, 24 and 25 were critical of “weak, unconvincing, or poorly constructed visions”. Interviewee 5 raised “an absence of testing and scrutiny” and talked of an “uncomfortable reaction to questioning” which was unfairly treated as
“subversive activity”. Goss et al. appear to make similar assertions when they reference the ‘unspoken code of silence’ in organisations and the inherent risks involved when the ‘undiscussable’ is raised (1993, p. 105). Excessive reliance on negative drivers for change, rather than investing time developing a positive outlook, was categorised as poor leadership by interviewees 27, 28, 36 and 38. “Staff needed something tangible to believe and buy in to” (Interviewees, 4 & 12), and “a clear understanding of how their working lives are going to be made easier” (Interviewee, 28). The positive free text survey responses included the following phrases/words, “a benefits laden vision”, “winning hearts and minds”, “inspirational”, “focused on the end state”, “clarity”, “consistent” with “clear linkages to the design blueprint”. This emphasis on vision creation reinforces traditional doctrine set out in Government methods, such as MSP (OGC, 2007, p. 41).

Change leadership (Cameron & Green, 2009, pp. 138-180) was reinforced in the answers received in both surveys. Firstly, strong ‘senior management support and visible leadership’ was ranked as the first and foremost success factor (see Annexes ‘J’ & ‘K’). During this particular exercise respondents were asked to rank ten given success criteria to reflect their order of priority. The list had previously been chosen from areas cited in the literature as being relevant to the delivery of change. Leadership was found to account for 60% of the first choice selection for survey 1 and 46% for survey 2 (see Figure 8).
Both charts illustrate the importance of having a clear vision of the ‘to be state’. This was the first selection for thirty-two respondents in survey 1 and nineteen respondents in survey 2. In both surveys 87% of respondents cited ‘vision’ as a top three choice.

**Communication and engagement challenges**

The final change challenge relates to communication and engagement and builds upon crafting a compelling vision, discussed earlier under the heading of leadership (OGC, 2007, p. 41). An integral part of communication is handling
resistance to change (OGC, 2007, p. 48). This, an important dimension of communication and engagement, will be investigated.

The statement ‘clear communications’ was selected by 47% of respondents in survey 1 and by 52% of respondents in survey 2 as a top three choice from a given list of ten success criteria specified as being relevant to the delivery of organisational change (please refer Annexes ‘J’ & ‘K’). Arguably, this aligns with the contemporary emphasis placed on improving the quality of change communications (Hayes, 2010, p. 174; Cameron & Green, 2009, pp. 205 - 209; APM, 2012, pp. 52 - 55).

The message from the interviewees was unequivocal, namely, shift from “broadcast” communications to one of “listening and engagement” (OGC, 2007, p. 51). Interviewee 14 talked about the use of “out-dated and ineffective methods of communications” which only served to highlight the generational gap between the leaders and their staff. The inference is that staff from the ‘Y’ and “X’ generation act and behave very differently from a typically older cohort of senior management. Interviewees 6 and 10 referred to the act of “going through the motions” in order to “tick” the communications box (OGC, 2007, p. 51). The inference from these comments is that process appeared more important than the quality of the output. This is illustrated by interviewee 6’s observation regarding a senior executive she had worked with, in that “s/he was apparently more concerned about completing the checklist of project document templates than the eventual outcome.

Tailoring the message and investing time in crafting appropriate communications were not, evidently, important considerations in these cases. These findings align with the assertions of Hayes, who warns of the limitations of top down communication and the risks involved with ‘filtration’ (2010, p. 174). Similarly, the role of middle management received special attention in the surveys, having been cited in free text responses on twelve separate occasions. This is illustrated by the following remarks from a respondent to survey 2 who said “organisational change is won or lost on the middle management
battleground. It is these folk who are the key stakeholders. Sadly, they are often treated as being incidental”.

While it was acknowledged that middle management ‘buy in’ was critical, this group frequently found themselves on the outside. As a consequence message from “on high” was either being blocked or distorted (Hayes, 2010, p. 175).

References to the psychological aspects of the communication process was cited by several interviewees (Interviewees, 8, 10, 11, 17, 20, 21 & 25). The point made is that it takes time to assimilate a message and to formulate a reaction; something not necessarily appreciated (Kuber-Ross, 1969; Cameron & Green, 2009, p. 32). Instead of providing time to ‘digest’ the message, more communications were unleashed. The term ‘change indigestion’ describes this situation. Several interviewees described the consequences of inadequate communications as “mistrust and cynicism”. Interviewee 8, referred to a culture “of keeping your head down” while the acronym BOHICA\textsuperscript{19} was used by interviewee 11. “Communications overload” was cited in the free text survey responses along with “muddled”, “confused”, “contradictory”, “misleading” and “exaggerated” messaging. Arguably, these comments build upon the more limited advice contained in MSP where the authors discuss the challenges associated with adopting a mechanistic communications approach (OGC, 2007, p. 51).

There were several examples of good communications provided. Using the vision and benefits as the cornerstone of the communications plan was seen as critical. A “picture of a better future”, “being ambitious and audacious”, creating “the wow factor” and “focusing on winning hearts and minds” were some phrases used (Interviewees, 7, 9, 27 & 28) (MSP, 2007, pp. 41-43). This contrasts sharply with interviewee 33 who relayed remarks made by his/her CEO “don’t worry about hearts and minds. Take hold of another part of the anatomy and the head and heart follow easily”. While these comments may

\textsuperscript{19} BOHICA stands for ‘bend over here it comes again’.
appear jocular the underlying portrayal was of a disciplined and hierarchal organisation where the word of the CEO is final. This appears to accord with Morgan’s organisational machine metaphor and of the connotations he implies (Discussed in Annex F; Morgan, 1997, p. 11).

Interviewee 40 stressed the need for “impartiality” when framing communications. “Appealing to rationality”, “relying on the power of the argument, not positional power” were phrases used (Interviewees, 2, 6 & 31). This supports Strebel’s findings concerning the role of senior executives in crafting the ‘context to change’ (2009, p. 153).

Engagement is a consequence of two-way communication and numerous examples were illustrated in the interviews and surveys. Face to face communication appears to be the most effective (OGC, 2007, p. 53). While cascade briefings were popular, there is a risk of message distortion. “Road shows” and “town hall meetings” were praised. Tailoring the message and expanding communication channels by incorporating social media was seen as advantageous, together with open and regular engagement sessions with unions and staff associations. Arguably, the aim should be to reduce the risk of message distortion that can occur with the practice of cascade briefings, when ‘gatekeepers’ are employed to interpret and screen information before transmitting it to others (Hayes 2010, p. 176).

The style of the engagement was discussed by several interviewees. “Empathy” was a recurring word. Interviewees 15, 20 and 21 referenced the “propagation delay” or “time-lag” involved in receiving, assimilating and understanding a message (Kuber-Ross, 1969; Cameron & Green, 2009, p. 35) Interviewees 20 and 21 discussed the need to acknowledge that individuals react differently due to circumstance, personality type and previous change experience. Interviewee 20 developed this theme by explaining how she/he had used the ‘change curve’ (Kuber-Ross, 1969) to assist staff come to terms with the impact of downsizing and by emphasising the “positive benefits available to staff who wanted to move on”.
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The survey responses reinforce the remarks made above. One respondent made the distinction between “genuine” and “false engagement” (Covey, 2004, p. 153). Leadership “authenticity” and “honesty” were cited. Feedback, it was argued, must be sought, listened to and acted upon in the spirit of improvement. Collectively, these findings suggest that a flexible or agile leadership approach is best suited to an environment of change. In addition, proactive communications necessitate a significant investment in thought, time and money; points frequently overlooked in the heat of delivery. This appears consistent with the ADKAR change model which promotes creating a collective ‘desire to change’ (Hiatt, 2006, p. 17).

A key element of engagement is handling opposition, dissension or contrary views. This is commonly categorised as ‘resistance to change’ (CMI, 2013, p. 41; Lewin, 1951; Kubler-Ross, 1969; Block, 2011). All forty-three interviewees were asked whether, from their experience, they agree with the statement that staff resistance to change is a normal reaction. Figure 9 provides a breakdown of the answers received.

Figure 9
Some of those who agreed that change would meet with resistance referred to the ‘psychological aspects’, suggesting that “people don’t like change because it infringes on their comfort zone”. This is illustrated by the comments below:

“It is human nature to dig your heels in. It is what humans do”

(Interviewee, 14).

“Inertia sets into all our lives. You are asking us to do something we are not accustomed to. Why would you expect a different response? That would be irrational”

(Interviewee, 19).

“There will always be antipathy. Expect it. Plan for it. Handle it. Move on”

(Interviewee, 9).

“People will feel threatened and will react accordingly. It is an inbuilt defence mechanism. Change is viewed differently. For example, senior managers may view change as an opportunity both organisationally and personally. Organisationally, because of the bottom line benefits achieved and personally because of opportunities for personal career advancement. Others will see things from a different perspective. For them the change is neither sought nor welcomed. It is unsettling and disruptive”

(Interviewee, 11).

“We are all conservative with a small ‘c’. Most people seek stability and certainty in their lives”

(Interviewee, 7).

“Yes - its human conditioning”
“It is built into the human DNA to resist change and it is natural to want to protect what we have strived hard to achieve”

Collectively, these comments support the hypothesis promoted by Strebel concerning the opposing views of executives and employees to organisational change. There are, he argues, two philosophically opposing lenses. While the top view is one of positivity, the contrary position is often that of disruption and resistance (1996, p. 139).

Fifteen interviewees sought to qualify their answers. The principle proposal was that it was wrong to generalise and while some staff may resist change others would be supportive. Interviewee 29, referred to a younger generation of employees who had become frustrated by the limited ambitions and pace of change. This was reinforced by interviewee 2 who referred to different personal ‘appetites’ for change. The message from this second group of interviewees is that a far reaching and targeted communications and engagement strategy is called for, that both appreciates and serves the very different wants and aspirations of staff.

The third group of eight interviewees said categorically “no” to the question of resistance to change. Their rationale appears premised on the belief that the reaction of staff was a symptom of inadequate communications and/or low levels of confidence in management to deliver change effectively. Each of these areas will now be explored.

Interviewees 18, 21, 26 and 35 referred to the time taken to ‘digest’ and internalise major change. Hayes labels this as the ‘personal transition process’ (2010, p. 208). Frequently, staff were not being provided with the time, space or opportunity to seek clarification. This led to the false assumption that people were opposing change when all they required was a little more time
to consider the implications. Interviewee 35 used to term “assimilation time” to describe this phenomena arguing that, “many managers are emotionally inept. They don’t understand the dynamics of the change curve. They don’t appreciate that it takes time for staff to process major change messages. Staff need time and space to get their heads around what is happening. They need assimilation time”.

Interviewees 4, 12, 13, 20, and 25 all referred to the failure of senior management to communicate or engage. Given these failings a less than enthusiastic reaction is to be expected.

Interviewee 25 alluded to a different dimension stating that, “we are the most curious of animals. Our natural instincts are to become involved and engage. The onus is on leadership to facilitate this opportunity”.

The final strand identified links to organisational history and the damaging consequences of previously ‘failed’ change endeavours. This was illustrated by interviewee 28 who said “staff had every right to be suspicious given the appalling track record of management”. This sentiment was reinforced in the surveys with respondents describing a state of “fatigue” and “disillusionment” caused by inadequacies in management. Disillusionment and change fatigue of this nature could, arguably, lead to higher levels of ‘employee cynicism’. This situation arises when staff adopt a pessimistic outlook towards their association with their employer. The consequences are commonly disgruntlement, disengagement, negativity and higher levels of distress (Dean et al.,1999, p. 141; Yasin & Khalid, 2015, p. 570).

Communication and engagement represent the fourth major change challenge (Hayes, 2010, p. 174) and this was reinforced in the transcripts and the survey responses. The research findings underline the time, effort and resources required to achieve effective communications. Communication is a two way process that is closely associated with stakeholder engagement (OGC, 2007, p. 47). Achieving effective engagement implies adopting a flexible mindset. This
is not necessarily conducive with a top down planned change paradigm operating within a traditional organisational hierarchy, as implied by the APM’s approach to ‘stakeholder management’ (2012, p. 116). The research findings regarding resistance to change indicate the emergence of new thinking, necessitating a higher level of sophistication than simply ramping up the drivers for change, as proposed in Lewin’s (1947) seminal work relating to force field analysis.

4.2.2 Core research category (ii): Assessing the unique challenges of delivering collaborative change

This core research area explores the unique challenges of delivering inter organisational change. While acknowledging the validity, relevance and applicability of generic change management theory and practice, delivering inter organisational change involving one or more partners is likely to contain particular complexities and challenges. This point emerged during the literature review and has been reinforced during the primary research. It merits restating that of the programme and project methodologies favoured by the UK public sector, such as MSP, PRINCE2 and CHAMPS2, there was only a cursory reference to inter organisational change and then only in a structural context (OGC, 2007, p. 37).

Different topics were identified during the research as being specifically relevant to inter-organisational change. These ‘challenges’ have been categorised under the following headings:

a) The collaborative leadership challenge;
b) The challenge of partnership selection;
c) The challenge of creating a partnership framework; and,
d) Relationship challenges following the creation of the partnership, including exit.
Each of these challenges will now be investigated.

All forty-three interviewees spoke of the significance of collaborative leadership, thereby reinforcing earlier assertions in the literature review (Linden, 2003, pp. 41-47; Huxham & Vangen, 2000, pp. 1159-1175). The ability of one boss to “knock heads together” frequently does not exist in a collaborative set up (Interviewee 3). Collaborative leadership skills focus on relationship building, both personally and professionally. Values of honesty and trust were explicitly referenced by twenty-five interviewees. Collaborative leaders must be prepared to act holistically for the greater good. This features a disposition to compromise and consider different viewpoints (Interviewee 39). Interviewee 33 referred to a willingness to “lower the flag”. “Fine words must be backed up with action” (Interviewee 41). Collaboration is a “marriage”, and requires “give and take” (Interviewees 3 & 11). “Bravo, masculine and macho management traits” are likely to represent an anathema to collaborative working (Interviewees, 6 & 10). “Short termism”, is also likely to act as a barrier to collaboration (Interviewees, 15, 16, 24, 28 & 29).

Differences arose between the perceived mindsets of private and public sector leaders. It was suggested that managers in the public sector were so risk adverse that this severely curtailed the ambition and progress of the collaboration (Interviewees, 29 & 30). Policing was not immune from criticism in this area and the suitability of senior police officers to perform collaborative roles is the subject of divergent and polarised views. This reinforces a prominent theme from the literature review (Button, et al., 2007, pp. 218-19; White, 2014, p. 4; Gibson & Villers, 2007, p. 16; Dale, 2012, pp. 41-60; HMIC, 2014a, p. 19; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 4). It transpired that interviewees with police only experience expressed significantly more positive opinions than those with experience of policing and at least one other sector. This finding is examined later in this chapter.

Several interviewees, while remaining critical of the collaborative leadership qualities of many of their colleagues, alluded to an apparent paradox
concerning the performance measures upon which they were assessed. The juxtaposition is that while leaders were encouraged to engage in the longer term activity of collaboration and operate for a greater good, the performance regime which assessed them was, competitive, inward looking and immediate. “The tyranny of short term KPIs”, “performance culture works against collaboration”, “short term objective drive unwanted behaviour” and “leads to perverse and unintended consequences” were some of the illustrative comments from the transcripts (Interviewees, 7, 8, 20 & 33). Some current and former chief officers were particularly critical of the performance regime that the police service had historically operated and the unintended consequences this had on organisational development. The argument espoused was that an over emphasis had been placed on short term operational targets which then acted as an inhibitor to longer term strategic planning (Interviewees 7, 16, 33 & 41).

Scores of positive traits were offered when the interviewees where asked to describe a good, or ‘alpha’ collaborative leader, including:

“Authentic” (Interviewees, 2 & 13).
“Empathetic” (Interviewees, 1 & 2).
“Listens” (Interviewee, 39).
“Emotional intelligence” (Interviewees, 3 & 24).
“T’ leadership qualities. Comfortable operating with ambiguity”. It was explained that T’ leaders are individuals with the skills and confidence to manage within a traditional organisational hierarchy, namely the vertical element of the ’T’, while simultaneously leading and contributing to group activities as a peer but in a collaborative context. This explicitly refers to the horizontal aspects of the ’T’ (Interviewee, 29). Other labels, such as ‘boundary spanners’, have been used to describe individuals performing these two distinct but different roles (Punonti, 2003, p. 143).
“Situational” (Interviewees, 7 & 11).
“Great with soft skills” (Interviewee, 9).
“Participative” (Interviewee, 2).
“Political awareness” (Interviewee, 7).
“Propensity to cope with ambiguity” (Interviewee, 31).
“Rely on the power of argument not position” (Interviewee, 8).
“Courageous - willling to tackle difficult issues”. Interviewee 5 developed this theme when he referenced a reluctance by managers to resolve difficulties through “adult conversations”. “This had serious ramifications”. Positions became “entrenched with the issue becoming a question of contractual law”. “There are no winners when lawyers start poring over contracts”.
“Openness” (Interviewee, 14).
“Risk taker” (Interviewee, 29).
“Willing to admit mistakes and learn” (Interviewee, 20).
“People orientated” (Interviewee, 26).
“Networked” (Interviewee, 30).
“Socially adept” (Interviewee, 14).
“Resiliant” (Interviewee, 24).
“Strategic” (Interviewee, 33).
“Holistic” (Interviewee, 34).
“An ability to handle ambiguity” (Interviewee, 33).
“Honesty” (more than 10).
“Trustful and trusting” (more than 10).
“Reliable” (greater than 10).
“Committed” (greater than 10).

While many of the traits described above are relevant to all leaders, collaborative leadership arguably, require greater people centric qualities and a higher degree of ‘softer’ skills. Arguably, these findings reinforce Hawkins’ claim that, “when leaders resort to the use of power they inevitably create friction and a lack of trust that undermine the potential benefits and development of opportunities” (2013, pp. 57-58).

Partnership selection represents the second collaborative challenge (Hawkins, 2013, p. 117; Lendrum, 2003, p. 160). This was reinforced in the surveys where ‘finding organisations with compatible values and culture’ was identified as a top three requirement, along with ‘senior management commitment’ and an ‘ability
to achieve complimentary goals’. Interviewee 5, for example, argued that “finding the right partner should not be left to chance. Too often the selection was a matter of default, based on a long term relationship. Just because someone has been a long and established supplier does not automatically make them the partner of choice for a strategic alliance”. Achieving cultural compatibility when seeking an alliance partner was explicitly referenced by twenty interviewees. While these may appear laudable intentions only three interviewees were able to provide examples of specific processes and tools being used, such as Johnson et. al’s cultural web (2008, p. 297), or of these tools being used to understand and assess culture, be that of their own organisation or that of their prospective partner. For most suitability was determined using non cultural matrices and with the softer aspects of suitability being left to senior management intuition and judgement. Interviewee 7 believes that organisations need to “develop a more sophisticated understanding of culture and of strategies to resolve differences”. Reconciling the disparities in private and public sector ideologies appears to present a symbolic challenge. While differences will clearly exist it was suggested that organisations need to “raise their game” and do more to understand and acknowledge these cultural issues in order that the alliance can move forward purposefully (Interviewee, 20).

For some the pressure to collaborate was intensifying, particularly as a strategy to handle austerity. Interviewee 33 summarised what many said, namely that, “collaboration is currently a hot topic”. Interviewee 7 referred to the “seduction of collaboration”. “Rushing in”, “unclear objectives”, “speed dating”, “a lack of scrutiny”, “inadequate due diligence”, “an unclear vision”, “incompatible cultures” and “an unconvincing business case” were additional illustrative comments (Interviewees, 4, 12, 15, 20, 24, 26, 25, 37 & 42). A contrary, albeit less stated viewpoint, was that some senior leaders were “playing politics with no serious intent” (Interviewee, 7). “Shadow boxing” was another phrase used to present an “illusion of activity” (Interviewee, 12). The inference is that while it may be politically expedient to talk of collaboration their was no ‘heart’ or serious intent among leadership to pursue this option. These comments
appear pertinent to the demise of the South East Policing Alliance (HMIC, 2005, p. 70).

Creating a vision for the strategic alliance appears to have been problematic for many organisations, particularly within policing and other parts of the public sector. Interviewees 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 22, 23, 41 and 42 all referenced “political sensitivities” connected to a “perceived loss of sovereignty” that collaboration could entail. Two interviewees said that had to conceal the real intended outcomes from governance oversight. This was necessary, they argued, because the Government had no appetite for voluntary mergers, the natural consequence of closer inter force collaboration. This was compounded by the appointment of PCCs who had a vested interest in maintaining control in their nominated area. Even when political sensitivities were less pressing, crafting a vision that described the ‘to be’ position (OGC 2007, p. 41) frequently presented inherent difficulties. Frequently, the goals of the collaborating parties were not compatible, thereby making the creation of a shared vision problematic (Interviewee, 13). Interviewees talked of embarking upon the collaboration journey with “no clear understanding of the end destination” (Interviewee, 22, 23, 33 & 36). Interviewee 36 said that senior managers needed to be “accepting of ambiguity” as “clarity of intent would eventually metamorphosise to become clarity of outcome”. Interviewee 33 called for “flexible clarity”. The argument proposed is that collaboration necessitates significant exploration and development and it may take a considerable time before an adequate business case is constructed. Even after forming the alliance, it may not always be possible to predict a final desired outcome. This presents challenges when following existing MSP doctrine which places great emphasis on an end vision and blueprint development (OGC 2007, pp. 41 & 81).

A potential solution to the challenges of vision development, is to consider building a ‘step or staged vision’. This approach was alluded to by interviewees 22, 23 and 42 who referenced the political sensitivities concerning the eventual outcome of their alliances and the unpalatable consequences for organisational sovereignty. This proposal provides natural breakpoints for reflection while
enabling vision development for the next phase of the alliance. The approach appears congruent to the iterative method of scheduling, where project managers seek to minimise the ‘cone of uncertainty’\textsuperscript{20} (Little, 2006, pp. 48-54), or operate within the constraints of the known ‘planning horizon’\textsuperscript{21} (Daskin et al., 1992, p. 125).

Creating a framework for collaboration represents the third key challenge (Lendrum, 2003, p. 316). Several interviewees believe their organisations lacked the skills necessary to deliver alliancing frameworks (Interviewees, 7, 22, 23, 33, & 42). Others referred to the absence of working models and expressed frustration that they were being asked to “re-invent the collaboration wheel” (Interviewees, 4, 15, 22, 23, 29 & 35). While BSI 11000 was cited as good practice by two interviewees\textsuperscript{22} no other bespoke models or frameworks were referenced. Interviewee 5 discussed contracts she/he had reviewed, that where poorly written and inappropriately skewed towards the consequences of failure rather than opportunity maximisation. To reinforce this point s/he provided the following challenge: “Look at the terms and conditions typically used by organisations in the UK today. Take a highlighter pen and start reading. Try and find any proactive clauses. You simply won’t because it is all reactive and defensive. The collaboration is being set up with a view to failure. You will not find words such as co-operation and innovation. I know because I’ve done this”.

The ‘marriage’ metaphor was popular when describing strategic alliances (Interviewees, 3 & 4). Conversely considering the consequences of ‘divorce’ represents an important aspect of the arrangement. This reinforces the value of completing due diligence before committing to the ‘marriage’ and was illustrated by interviewee 3 who, while maintaining the marriage analogy warned “you

\textsuperscript{20} In project management, the Cone of Uncertainty describes the levels of unpredictability encountered during a project lifecycle. Uncertainty decreases over time and by careful planning.

\textsuperscript{21} The planning horizon typically denotes the extent of the next planning cycle for that organisation or project.

\textsuperscript{22} This does not include the author of BSI 11000, who was also an interviewee.
need to get the prenup in place as this can damage the ardour if considered retrospectively”. Several interviewees emphasised that this is a specialist area of management and therefore it was paramount organisations acquired the skills and experience required. This was also referenced as good practice in both surveys. The partnering framework must include shared objectives and clear metrics in order to assess the on-going health of the alliance (Interviewees, 5, 4 & 27). These points appear congruent with the advice contained in BSI 11000 (Hawkins, 2013, p. 143) and in Lendrum’s Strategic Collaboration Handbook (2003).

Maintaining, nurturing, developing and eventually exiting from the collaboration represents the final, albeit linked, challenge (Hawkins 2013, p. 151). The existence of appropriate metrics will assist greatly (Interviewee, 5), although, as interviewee 27 alluded to “it is frightening how many joint ventures come together when the objectives are not clear”. Working together requires a ‘win win’ approach supported by ‘enabling governance’. Too often interviewees talked of mistrust and of a culture of blame. Frustration can occur if the perception is that the alliance is failing to deliver. Disharmony may be caused by unrealistic timescales or exaggerated expectations (Interviewees, 4, 15 & 21). Similarly, a failure to confront the harsh realities that the alliance was under-performing was referenced by interviewees 3, 5, 7, 13 and 25. One interviewee illustrated this using the “boiling frog” metaphor23, while another referred to the “hubris of management” as a principle reason for inactivity (Interviewees, 3 & 25). Relationships necessitate nurturing and mechanisms need to be in place to handle disputes. Interviewee 5 referred to the requirement to hold “adult conversations and to resolve areas of differences amicably”. This underlines the importance of the relationship aspects of collaboration, a point strongly reinforced in both surveys and emphasised by Lendrum (2003, p. 141).

---

23 the story of the boiling frog is often used as a metaphor to describe the inability or unwillingness of individuals to react to threats that are developing.
The final aspect considered relates to an exit strategy, as identified by several interviewees. This reinforces BS 11000 which states that, “maintaining a joint exit strategy is important, to keep the partners focused. At the same time, clear rules for disengagement will frequently improve active engagement throughout the life of the relationship” (Hawkins, 2013, p. 83).

The survey findings broadly reinforce the points made above by the interviewees. In one exercise, respondents with experience of major collaborative change, were asked to rank ten given success factors in order of importance. While the full list for both surveys can be found at Annexes ‘L’ and ‘M’, the top three factors are depicted in Figure 10 on the following page:
While the ranking differs between survey 1 and 2, it is noteworthy that there is consensus regarding the top three success factors. This point was underlined in the free text responses which emphasised the softer aspects of trust and strong inter-personal relationships.

Several key learning points emerge from the research. Firstly and importantly, most of the challenges encountered delivering single organisational change appear equally applicable to change of a collaborative nature. There are, however, still unique aspects to inter organisational change which create added considerations and pressures. The collaborative paradigm places great
emphasis on trust, relationship building and a different style of leadership. Collaborations can be complex and specialist knowledge and experience will be required. Crafting a vision for the next phase is important, as are metrics and systems to measure performance. While nurturing and developing the partnership necessitates a considerable investment, swift and early intervention is required when it becomes apparent that alliances are no longer delivering the benefits they were set up to realise. This calls for a clear exit strategy to minimise the risk of alliance drift and paralysis.

4.2.3 Core research category (iii): Assessing the effectiveness of organisations when delivering change

This research area assesses respondent perception relating to the success or failure of intra and inter organisational change and then canvases a longitudinal perspective concerning improvements or shortcomings in delivery. The views of the interviewees were considered alongside survey responses to questions dedicated to this topic. Persuasive and compelling findings emerged relating to the limitations of using success or failure as change descriptors and the negativity and defensiveness that an association with failure can foster. Given the strength and significance of this particular finding, a separate sub-section has been dedicated to this aspect.

The first area of research sought to assess the levels of success or failure achieved when embarking on intra and then inter organisational change. While the overwhelming majority of interviewees were dissatisfied with the outcomes achieved, only two interviewees, both with a policing background, were of the opinion that the failure rates were greater than the 60% - 80% band reported by professional bodies such as the CIPD, IoD, IoCW (CIPD, 2013a; IoD, 2012, p. 3; Hawkins, 2010, p. 4; Beer et al., 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6). The dominant view was that the failure rates reported by these organisations were too high, regardless of the change category. The overwhelming majority of interviewees refused to accept very high failure rates.
Their argument was that the consequences would be too damaging and senior managers so 'scarred' this would temper future collaborative ambitions, which is certainly not the case. When asked to provide an indicative success to failure ratio based on their own personal experience, the majority of interviewees opted for a 50/50 split.

The researcher sought to explore the indicative 50% success rate proposed by interviewees. Nine respondents believed that their organisations were improving the delivery of change in both categories. Sixteen respondents sought an explanation of the commonly cited failure rates. The point alluded to by this cohort was that judgements regarding failure rates necessitated supporting evidence and this was rarely available. Value statements that rely on personal judgement and perception were unsatisfactory.

Some of the comments recorded describing intra and inter organisational change delivery were unequivocal and uncompromising:

“Big mistakes are still made” (Interviewee, 40).
“We still have a poor track record” (Interviewee, 39).
“We are achieving a sub-optimal outcome” (Interviewees, 36 & 27).
“We are not achieving what we should” (Interviewee, 29).
“Our track record is variable” (Interviewee, 16).
“It is a mixed bag” (Interviewee, 12).
“Abysmal to brilliant, but mostly bad” (Interviewee, 11).
“Very patchy” (Interviewee, 8).
“Superficially pretty hopeless” (Interviewee, 7).
“Pretty slow” (Interviewee, 6).
“Painfully slow” (Interviewee, 5).
“Not achieving what we hoped for” (Interviewee, 4).

While these comments should not be construed as conclusive evidence of failure, they are, indicative of poor and unsatisfactory performance.
Some interviewees suggested that there was a level of “manipulation” regarding the language of success or failure. For example, interviewees 2 and 26 referred to projects being “doomed to succeed”. Interviewee 35, described techniques of “spinning” and of using “rose tinted glasses” to present a more favourable outcome. Interviewees 14 and 15 referred to “hype”, “window dressing” and the use of “noise” to disguise results. Interviewee 26, when talking about policing, claimed that she/he “had yet to encounter a change project that had failed”. They continued, explaining that, “any notion that a project had not achieved all that it had set out to do could be career damaging. In such an environment openly collecting and considering lessons learned was described as futile. Collectively this suggests a degree of hyperbole when describing the case and achievements of change initiatives.

The position within the policing research pillar, where distinctly different perceptions emerged concerning the ability of the police to deliver major organisational change in either category, merits exploration. A divide was apparent between those interviewees with experience of change in policing and at least one other sector and those with police only experience. Interviewees in the first category were significantly more critical of the change capabilities of police leadership. This finding is examined in core research category 5.

Understanding the limitations of using success and failure as change descriptors

While many academics and professional bodies continue to rely on percentages to report the state of organisational change (CIPD, 2013a; IoD, 2012, p. 3; Hawkins, 2010, p. 4; Beer et al., 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6), many of the interviewees considered these headlines descriptors to be overly simplistic and unhelpful. Several interviewees referenced an absence of clearly defined goals as being a principle reason for disliking the terms success or failure. Quantification will always be problematic, it was argued, when objectives and metrics to measure them were not delineated at the outset.
Some interviewees sought to explore the success or failure perspective. This was dependent upon through whose lens the change initiative was viewed. We have already discussed ‘change exaggeration’ and opportunities for ‘outcome manipulation’. One respondent in survey 2 went further by accusing senior management of “outright lying” regarding the status of their change initiative. This appears linked to a failure to learn or even admit that mistakes have been made. Interviewee 33 refers to “mistakes being buried” while interviewee 29 talked of the “unspeakables” and a “paranoia” about “airing dirty laundry”. Evidently, it may be career damaging to be associated with a failed project, which may explain the reluctance to admit that some aspects had not gone well.

Developing a critique of success and failure as change descriptors, interviewee 26 said, who said “I’m not sure whether I have experience of a failed change initiative but I’ve certainly seen many that have achieved a sub-optimal outcome”. Interviewee 33 referred to the “damaging consequences of failure”, and agreed that, “most change projects were not achieving the desired results”.

Interviewees 5, 25 and 41 talked about an undue emphasis on changing systems and structures. While these changes may be delivered successfully the ‘back end’ or ‘softer’ people aspects of change, were frequently neglected. The net result is of a ‘successful’ project resulting in minimal or cosmetic change.

In conclusion, the evidence provided suggests that ‘success’ and ‘failure’ are too polarised and too emotive to be used to assess project delivery. Unwittingly these words promote defensive behaviours that are not conducive to learning, development and improvement.
Survey results:

Analysis of the quantitative research data suggest significant levels of commonality and consistency, both with the qualitative research findings and within the two surveys.

In the survey 1 one hundred and twenty-two respondents answered the question “How effective was your organisation when implementing major change?” The results are shown in Figure 11 below:

![Figure 11](image.png)
The results of the forty-seven respondents who answered the same question in survey 2 indicate broadly similar findings (Figure 12):

**Figure 12**

- **Highly effective**
- **Generally effective**
- **Sometimes effective and sometimes ineffective**
- **Generally ineffective**
- **Highly ineffective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of respondents</th>
<th>Highly effective</th>
<th>Sometimes effective and sometimes ineffective</th>
<th>Generally effective</th>
<th>Generally ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Figure 13 below, categorises the replies to survey 1 to the question “How effective is the organisation you have experience of at implementing major collaborative change?”: There were seventy-two substantive selections.

Figure 13
The results of the thirty respondents who answered the same question in survey 2, indicate similar findings. See Figure 14 below:
The second research topic relates to perceived improvements (or otherwise) in the effectiveness of organisations to deliver change. The research question posed adopts a longitudinal perspective. For survey 1, one hundred and seventeen respondents answered the question “In your experience are organisations you are familiar with better or worse at implementing major organisational change than they were ten years ago?” The results are shown in Figure 15 below:

**Figure 15**

![Bar chart showing the results of the survey](chart.png)
The results of the forty-six respondents who answered the same question in survey 2 suggests broadly similar findings. See Figure 16 below:

**Figure 16**

![Bar Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little better</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neural</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little worse</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to say</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In survey 1 sixty-seven respondents addressed the corresponding questions relating to collaborative change. The question posed was “In your experience are organisations you are familiar with better or worse at implementing major collaborative change than they were ten years ago?” The responses are classified in Figure 17 as follows:

**Figure 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much better</th>
<th>A little better</th>
<th>Neural</th>
<th>A little worse</th>
<th>Not able to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the twenty-nine respondents who answered the same question in survey 2 indicate broadly similar findings. See Figure 18 below:

Three principle points emerge from the answers provided to the longitudinal questions. Firstly, the findings in survey 2 are consistent with those in survey 1. Arguably, this validates the research approach used for survey 1 which relied on promotion via social media and involved self selection. The second point is that both surveys appear to question the validity of conventional thinking which reports organisational change failure rates at 60% - 80% (Hawkins, 2010, p. 4;
This research indicates that this figure is too high and appears consistent with the qualitative research findings discussed earlier, suggesting that a failure rate of 50% is more realistic. Finally, there appears to be a marked improvement in the ability of organisations to deliver change compared with the position ten years earlier. While this assertion is also consistent with the analysis of the interview transcripts, it contradicts the stated position of organisations, such as the CMI, who report constant levels of achievement and failure spanning many years (2013, p. 21).

Conclusions and key findings

In this category the researcher has focused on assessing the effectiveness of organisations when delivering change. A number of key findings emerge.

The reported failure rates of 60% - 80% (CIPD, 2013a; IoD, 2012, p. 3; Hawkins, 2010, p. 4; Beer et al., 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6), does not align with the experiences of the overwhelming number of research participants. While there appears to be too many instances of failure, a rate significantly lower than that proposed, appears more appropriate.

According to the research participants, the ability of organisations to deliver both intra and inter change appears to be improving.

The terms success and failure are too polarised and limiting when used as descriptors of change. Failure results in defensive behaviours which restrict learning and improvement.

Finally, there are widely ranging viewpoints regarding the ability of the police to deliver intra and inter organisational change. Interviewees with experience of change in policing and at least one other sector were inclined to be significantly more critical of the change capabilities of senior police leaders. This contrasted
with the position of existing police officers and personnel who were considerably more upbeat and positive in their assessment of the police when delivering organisational change, of either category.

4.2.4 Core Research Category (iv): Assessing the change knowledge and the change knowing /doing gaps

This category examines the levels of change management knowledge among practitioners and the application and utility of existing change theory and practice. A key finding emerges relating to the approach many organisations appear to adopt when delivering change, which is often not underpinned by reference to established theory or practice. This is referred to as the change management knowledge gap. When the change is of a collaborative nature the problem appears more acute. A second and equally important finding emerges regarding the ‘change knowing and doing gap’. Even when practitioners are aware of change theory and practice this is frequently ignored in the ‘heat of delivery’. For this core category the semi structured interviews are supported by specific survey questions.

During the semi structured interviews thirty people (70%) named one or more theory, framework or method they had personal knowledge of when delivering change. In total twenty-nine different models were mentioned. The most popular of these, which were cited two or more times, are shown below in Figure 19. Table 3 explains the codes awarded on the ‘x’ axis:
Figure 19

Table 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Assigned</th>
<th>Theory, model or framework cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kotter’s 8 Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lewin's Force Field Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Whole Systems Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Cultural Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>BS 11000: The standards for collaborative working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Kuber Ross’ Change Curve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lewin's 3 step model: unfreezing, moving, re-freezing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Maturity assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The models, theories and frameworks were categorised as being either process orientated (hard) or people orientated (soft). Of the selections made, 60% were for ‘hard’ frameworks or models. Only three of the interviewees were able to cite models, theories or frameworks bespoke to collaborative change.

Surveys 1 and 2 broadly support the variable applicability of theories, models and frameworks when introducing both intra and inter organisational change. In response to a question about intra organisational change in survey 1, fifty respondents (38% of those who provided material answers) cited twenty-seven different theories and models, as illustrated in Figure 20 below. Table 4 explains the codes awarded on the ‘x’ axis
All the models, theories and frameworks were categorised as being either process orientated (hard) or people orientated (soft). Of all the selections made 60% were for ‘hard’ frameworks or models.

In survey 2, in response to a question about intra organisational change, nineteen people (41% of those who provided material answers) cited fourteen different theories, models or frameworks. Figure 21 lists the most popular. Table 5 explains the codes awarded on the ‘x’ axis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Assigned</th>
<th>Theory, model or framework cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kotter’s 8 Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>PRINCE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Change First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lewin’s Force Field Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lewin’s 3 step model: unfreezing, moving, re-freezing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Kuber Ross’ Change Curve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Assigned</th>
<th>Theory, model or framework cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kotter's 8 Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>PRINCE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21

Number of times popular theories, frameworks and methods for delivering change cited.
All the models, theories and frameworks cited were categorised as being either process orientated (hard) or people orientated (soft). Of the selections made 67% were for ‘hard’ frameworks or models.

When asked about theories, frameworks and models for delivering collaborative organisational change the numbers reduced significantly in both surveys.

Twenty-one respondents cited theories, models and frameworks when delivering collaborative change in survey 1. This represented 16% of those deemed to have provided material answers, but significantly, only three of these respondents referenced models bespoke to collaborative change. The most popular theories, models and frameworks cited for delivering collaborative change are shown in Figure 22. Table 6 explains the codes awarded on the ‘x’ axis:

Figure 22

No. of times popular theories, frameworks & methods for delivering collaborative change cited
All the models, theories and frameworks were categorised as being either process orientated (hard) or people orientated (soft). Of the selections made 61% were for ‘hard’ frameworks or models.

In survey 2 nine respondents cited theories, models and frameworks (20% of those deemed to have provided material answers) but only one of these respondents referenced a model bespoke to collaborative change. The most popular theories were MSP (2) (OGC, 2007) and Kotter’s Eight Steps (2) (Kotter, 2008). Of the selections made 70% were for ‘hard’ frameworks or models.

Two clear findings emerge from the research. Firstly, the use of theory, frameworks and models, when embarking upon major organisational change appears to be sporadic, ad hoc and inconsistent. When used, several of these models, such as MSP, PRINCE2, Lean and Systems Thinking, focus exclusively on the process of delivery. The situation becomes more marked when embarking upon major collaborative change. Several of the respondents were critical of using process orientated doctrine. Interviewee 20, for example, cited PRINCE2 which she/he claims did not include any references to the topic of behaviour. Interviewee 13 emphasised the shortfalls in MSP and PRINCE2 which focused exclusively on method. Interviewee 20 argued that existing methods encouraged a “tick tick” mentality. She/he cited an example, when

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Assigned</th>
<th>Theory, model or framework cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>PRINCE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Kotter’s 8 Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Lewin’s 3 step model: unfreezing, moving, re-freezing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>BS11000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
following a cursory meeting, it was decreed that an important project management activity of communication planning merited a ‘tick in the box’ as a completed action. Interviewees 1, 2 and 17 developed this theme by arguing that there was a pressing need for MSP and PRINCE2 plus editions which encompassed the softer aspects of change.

Several of the ‘softer’ theories cited relate to models developed decades earlier and when organisational life and the pace of change were fundamentally different. For example, Lewin’s Force Field Analysis (1947) and his Three Step Model (1952) were developed in the mid twentieth century. Kuber-Ross’ Change Curve was first published in 1969 and Kotter’s Eight Steps (2008), the most widely cited framework, was first published in 1995. While these seminal theories retain appeal it is debatable whether the evolving and relentless nature of change undertaken by contemporary organisations accord with organisational life sixty, fifty or even twenty years ago, when these theories were conceived. This is illustrated by reference to the final stage of Lewin’s Three Step model which refers to ‘re-freezing’ or locking the organisation into a steady state situation, after a period of planned change (Lewin, 1952; Dawson 1994, p. 3). While this may have been appropriate for handling change of an episodic nature, it is questionable whether such an approach is appropriate in contemporary Britain which is characterised by organisational change of an unrelenting and ubiquitous nature.

It is noteworthy that all forty-three interviewees stated that collaborative change was more complicated and challenging than change limited to a single organisational entity. This compounds the assertion that change delivery, particularly involving multiple organisations, is not supported by reference to adequate proven theory or practice.

Closely linked to the knowledge gap discussed above, is the assertion that good theory is apparently wantonly ignored or jettisoned in the ‘heat’ of change delivery. Interviewees 2 and 38 emphasised that “knowing frequently did not equate to practice”. This is a reoccurring theme. Interviewee 27 referenced
“CEO egoism, impatience and machismo” as reasons for cutting corners. Interviewee 28 referred to “absurdly ambitious timescales” while interviewee 35 cited an example where the project team had been forced to “move too quickly, driven by the CEO’s misguided sense of urgency”. The police were referenced as being guilty of “corner cutting”. Interviewee 22 assessed the police as being “twenty years behind other organisations” with their project and change management practices. Interviewee 6 referred to a “bish bosh bash - job done mind-set”. Getting the job done was all that mattered, regardless of the collateral damage caused. The “impatience of senior management”, “short termism”, “the butterfly syndrome”, (Caless, 2011, p. 118; Reiner, 1991, p. 79), “vested self interest”, “politicking” and a “burning desire to leave a legacy” were all cited by as being harmful to good theory and practice (Interviewees, 2, 6, 8, 15, 16, 25, 26 & 29).

Conclusions and key findings

The researcher has focused on assessing the change knowledge and the change knowing / doing gaps. Several key findings emerge. There is evidence of an organisational change knowledge gap among managers and practitioners. When the change involves collaboration the gap appears more acute. When knowledge is applied, there appears to be a predilection for process orientated or ‘hard’ knowledge. Even when people orientated theory is considered and applied, very few of these models can be categorised as being contemporary as nearly all were designed for previous generations of workers. Markedly, there is evidence of a knowing / doing gap where good theory and practice is jettisoned in the ‘heat’ of delivery. Finally, there was support for the development of new contemporary doctrine which incorporates the process and people orientated aspects of intra and inter organisational change. This is referred to as the MSP and PRINCE2 plus editions.
4.2.5 Core Research Category (v): An examination of the policing

This section focuses exclusively on policing with comparisons being made to the wider public and private sectors. While the surveys were not designed for a policing audience, some limited but poignant references were still made to police leadership and culture in the free text responses. The research population for this aspect of the thesis has, therefore, primarily been drawn from twenty-two interviewees with experience of delivering intra and inter organisational change in policing.

The twenty-two interviewees making up the policing research pillar were invited to comment on the effectiveness of constabularies delivering change. This included exploring comparisons with other sectors, particularly when the interviewee possessed this breadth of experience. This represents the first area addressed. Inevitably, both police leadership and culture arose as dominant considerations. To a few, police leadership and culture were considered as ‘enablers’, while the majority they assessed them as ‘barriers’. External factors facing the police, including the roles of the PCCs and Home Office, were cited by some as representing a new, uncertain and challenging paradigm in which to deliver change. Resourcing represents the final area considered.

There was unanimous agreement that austerity was a ‘game changer’ and was driving internal re-structuring as well as pulling forces towards new models of operation. Collaboration was seen as one, albeit very important, means of maintaining service resilience and delivery, while reconciling budget reductions. Inter police strategic alliances appeared to represent the safest and least risky option. For many, no alternative models appear to have been considered. Several respondents were critical of the police in this regard, believing a failure to consider more ambitious programmes of change represented a “missed opportunity” (Interviewees, 2, 6, 12, 7, 26, 28 & 42).
The ability of the police to deliver both intra and inter organisational change was the source of polarised opinion. There were five respondents with a police only background. As a cohort, the five were significantly more upbeat, positive and generous in their assessments compared to the remaining seventeen respondents, all of whom had experience of policing and at least one other sector.

Those in the police only cohort referenced a “can do culture” (Charman et al., 1999, p.299; Godfrey, 2006, p. 58; Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 95). The dominant view is that this acts as an ‘enabler’ and represents a positive trait (interviewee numbers withheld to safeguard anonymity). Others with experience of policing and at least one other sector, were less complimentary. The following quotations illustrate the strength of opinion expressed:

“The police are behind the times - at least twenty years behind the private sector” (Interviewee, 23),

“The police are not natural collaborators, more conspirators” (Interviewee, 24),

“The police are suspicious of the private sector” (Interviewee, 12),

“The police are blinded by hierarchy” (Interviewee, 42),

“The command decision making model is not appropriate” (Interviewee, 26),

“They can’t admit mistakes or therefore learn from them” (Interviewees, 31, 26),

“The word of the chief is gospel. The police are misguided in the belief that rank equates to the quality of advice given” (Interviewee, 6),

“They are not serious about change…. shadow boxing and playing politics” (Interviewee, 7),

“It is just tinkering” (Interviewee, 8),

“They are afflicted by the hippo syndrome - decisions are automatically referred to the highest paid person in the room, regardless of their knowledge, experience or capability” (Interviewee, 33),

“Senior officers are too occupied climbing the greasy promotion pole” (Interviewee, 26).

24Hippo refers to the Highest Paid Person's Opinion - a term used to describe the trait of deferring decisions to the highest ranking or positioned person present.
“There is a toxicity in policing - I’ve never experienced anything the like of which before”. To illustrate this damming assessment interviewee, 26 referred to several examples of police leaders guided by self interest rather than the wider good. S/he also talked of the unhealthy divide between sworn and non sworn officers, even at command team level. Finally, they cited instances of an unwillingness to learn from other sectors because of the misguided belief that policing was “special”, and in any event, “there was nothing useful to be gleaned from outside”.

These comments appear to reinforce the established narrative of police culture discussed earlier in chapter 2 (Reiner, 2010, pp. 115-137; Button et al., 2007, p. 296; Brown, 2000, p. 250; Westmarland, 2008, pp. 253-280) and of the culture of ‘management cops’ (Reuss-Ianni, 1993; Skansky, 2007, pp. 19-46).

Those with police only experience were relatively sanguine, while those with experience of other sectors tended to be more judgemental. When comparisons are made with the wider public sector, the police appear to be playing ‘catch-up’, particularly in relation to collaboration. Several references were made to the police enjoying privileged and protected status under previous Governments (Interviewees, 26, 28 & 42). Although this appears to represent an historical position, arguably the police having enjoyed protected status may have tempered their energies and enthusiasm for organisational change. A dominant perspective suggested that when strategic alliances were initially proposed, the police had been somewhat ‘conservative’ and limited with their ambitions. A “mistrust of the private sector” (Interviewees, 9, 12 and 31), “an absence of business acumen”, a “belief that the police are different” (Interviewees, 18, 26, 33 and 42) or simply lack of exposure to, or experience of, cross sector alliances may explain their lacklustre performance.
Police leadership

Police leadership (Gibson & Villers, 2007, p. 16; Dale, 2012, pp. 41-60; HMIC, 2014a, p. 19; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 4) was the subject of considerable comment, and along with police culture, represented the two most recurring and dominant themes. Several of the interviewees were forthright when describing their experiences. A respondent to survey 1 wrote, “the police service finds it very difficult to deliver collaboration due to political, sovereignty and cultural issues. The greatest barrier is senior officers who see this as a further hurdle to overcome before collecting their pension. There are no real champions of change in the police service and no formally trained and committed SROs. Police hierarchy gets in the way of innovative change and collaboration”.

For many, operational experience, masculine leadership traits, charisma and the ability to make swift decisions were still considered to be dominant leadership characteristics of policing. “Clear lines of authority” enabling “the job to get done” was valued by some. Others took a different perspective. Interviewee 6 talked of the “bish bosh bash” approach to delivering change which was totally unsuitable and unlike anything s/he had experienced operating in other sectors. In this particular case, the interviewee claimed to have been left “open mouthed” and “astounded” by the absence of meaningful discussion concerning a proposed major change”. Interviewee 42 was frustrated with what she/he considered the inability of senior officers to take an holistic view of the organisational challenges they faced. “Its as if they only have a hammer in the tool box, so all problems are treated in the same way”. Conceding control is a collaboration trait that sits uncomfortably with the stereotypical image of the police leader. Several interviewees referred to a “reluctance to let go”, while interviewee 24 suggested police leaders were “more suited to being conspirators than collaborators”. “Complacent”, “lacking knowledge, experience and skills”, “insular”, “unaccountable”, “arrogant” and “reluctant to learn”, were some of the descriptors provided (Interviewees, 6, 9, 16, 23, 26, 28, 31, 42). The researcher
has labelled these traits as the ‘hubris of police leadership’. Others contributors referred to the “unsuitability of the rigid police hierarchy” where decisions are pushed upwards. There appears to be minimal consultation with, or involvement of, more junior ranks in organisational decision making. “Blinded by hierarchy”, “the command and control model is totally unsuitable”, “they are misguided in the belief that rank equates to the quality of advice given” and the “word of the chief is gospel” were some of the comments recorded (Interviewees, 6, 26, 31 and 42). Direct entry at chief officer level emerged during discussions, with critics of police leadership arguing for a “much needed injection of new skills, thinking and ideas” (Interviewee, 26).

“Personal self interest”, “parochialism”, “climbing the greasy promotion pole”, “looking after number one” are some of the comments used to describe police leaders (Interviewees, 8, 9, 12, 26 & 3). These comments can be linked to the ‘butterfly’ metaphor (Caless, 2011, p. 118; Reiner, 1991, p. 79), ‘short termism’ and the desire to make an immediate impact (Interviewees, 2, 6 & 25).

Several interviewees drew comparisons between police leadership and other sectors. The dominant view was that the police had much to learn and were behind the curve of progress. However, this view was not universally shared. Interviewee 7, for example, referred to the emergence of a “new breed of police leaders who will be skilled in the ideas and process of collaboration”.

**Police culture**

The topic of police culture is interwoven with the descriptors of police leadership (Reiner, 2010, pp. 115-137; Button et al., 2007, p. 296; Brown, 2000, p. 250; Westmarland, 2008, pp. 253-280). The dominant view was that police culture was still “highly suspicious and guarded” (Interviewees, 2, 6, 9 & 19). The private sector are treated with suspicion by some within policing. The phrase “policing is not a business” was mentioned several times to emphasise sector differences. This was illustrated by interviewee 7 who argued that “business is
relatively simple - make a profit and the business survives. Policing is more complex in both its purpose and achievements. We (the police) adhere to higher values focused on public service. Not everything we do is measurable. Some outside policing would have difficulty appreciating the multi faceted and multi dimensional nature of our work”. Another point to emerge concerned the apparent long standing divide that still appears to exist between sworn and non sworn managers (Interviewees, 5, 12, 26 & 28). Organisational work for some, lacked the thrill and excitement of “proper” operational police work which emphasised the here and now (Interviewees, 31 & 42).

The hierarchal structure of policing (Neyroud, 2011, pp. 347-354) appears to impacts adversely on staff communication and engagement. Some interviewees alluded to “arrogance” on the part of police management and a misguided belief that it was not always necessary to explain the reasons for change to officers and staff. The rationale offered was that these matters were the domain of management. Those on the ‘factory floor’ were being adequately compensated so they had a responsibility to act accordingly. This is illustrated by the following remarks:

“I am not interested in what you say - just do it”. Interviewee, 39, continued by describing the dominant hubris that existed within certain sections of senior management. This group viewed the opinion of those ‘below’ them within the organisational hierarchy as being inferior. In such circumstances the utility of opinion appeared to equate to position. This can be linked to the HIPPO approach described earlier were decisions default to those who are paid the most, regardless of their experience, knowledge or competence

(Interviewee, 39).

“Your opinion is neither sought nor expected”

(Interviewee, 22).

While established command and control protocols and a non questioning, compliant workforce is essential in an emergency or real time operational
scenario, misuse or excessive use in an organisational change context is, according to many of the interviewees, potentially harmful. References were made to the changing world and a new breed officers and staff who were more questioning than their older colleagues. It is said that the ‘y’ generation are “IT savvy, socially connected, more challenging and even narcissistic” (Martin, 2005, pp. 39 - 44). The ‘do as I say’ approach is more likely to agitate this section of the workforce who want to be involved and express an opinion. The consequence of ignoring these shifting dynamics could be demotivation and cynicism. Most interviewees characterised communication in policing as being top down and of the ‘broadcast’ style. This was seen by some, as being outdated and inappropriate.

There appears to be a low propensity to change in policing. Interviewees made frequent reference to an unwillingness to learn, caused by a reluctance and fear to admit mistakes (Interviewees, 6,12, 24, 28 & 42). This is illustrated by recurring use of the “doomed to succeed” phrase. Such an organisational culture, if it exists, is unhealthy and unreceptive to the delivery of all categories of change (Buchanan & Hucznski, 2004, p. 661). As already discussed interviewee 26 reinforced this assertion by using the word “toxic” to describe police culture.

While the melancholic picture painted above represents a majority and dominant view, others were generally more positive. The ‘can do’ culture, described in chapter 2 (Godfrey, 2006, p. 58; Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 95). was referenced on several occasions by interviewees. Put simply, police leaders could be relied upon to get the job done.

Some interviewees highlighted political pressures, unique within policing, that impacted adversely on the ability of police to deliver change. The Home Office, for example, was criticised for its failure to provide any central direction or guidance. This was described by one interviewee as “laissez fairism” (Interviewee, 7). As a consequence, the holistic viewpoint is not being considered and many of the existing police collaboration schemes are
piecemeal, uncoordinated and localised. The role of PCC’s, was aired and while some interviewees felt they inhibited change others were more positive. The dominant view was that it was too soon to draw any substantive conclusions. Finally, governance, particularly for collaboration, was referenced by some interviewees, predominantly in a negative context. Interviewee 9 talked about being “drowned” in a “sea of bureaucracy”. Interviewee 38 referred to “horrendously complex oversight”.

Resourcing

The final aspect to be considered relates to ‘resourcing’. This covers a multitude of areas that collectively impact on the effective delivery of change. While, arguably, the issues of inadequate resourcing appear to afflict change initiatives across all sectors, the problems appear more vivid and precipitous within policing. The following extracts illustrate some of the resourcing difficulties discussed:

“The practice of ‘pigeon holing’ cops into project management roles they were unsuited for continues”

(Interviewees, 2, 31 & 42)

“Projects being used as a ‘dumping ground’ for the lame and the unwanted”. Interviewee 5 provided examples of personnel lacking in skills, knowledge and aptitude being posted to project work. The inference was that this work was seen as being inferior to operational duty and therefore was better suited to those with disciplinary issues or in need of a period of recuperation following an extended period of illness.

“There is a misguided belief that projects are cost neutral and can be delivered using existing staff and resources”

(Interviewees, 8 & 12)
“Senior responsible owners (SROs) not understanding their roles, leading to poorly conceived and ill thought through programmes of change”

(Interviewees, 9, 12 & 16).

“Inadequate commercial and procurement knowledge and skills”

(Interviewees, 5, 7, 22).

“An unwillingness to expose the project to external scrutiny, such as the Major Project Authority’s Gateway Review Scheme”.

(Interviewee, 12).

For the sake of balance, it is important reiterate that these views were not universally held. There was some optimism, albeit expressed by a minority, who agreed that police leadership was learning to adapt, becoming more agile and as a consequence ‘catching up’ rapidly.

Conclusion

This section has focused exclusively on policing. The research draws upon the product of twenty-two semi structured interviews. The interviewees were divided into two cohorts depending on the extent of their non policing experiences. A clear divide is apparent in the views expressed by the different cohorts, with the five serving officers generally being more sanguine about the ability of constabularies to deliver change. The data rich responses illustrate the depth of feeling that exists among all the interviewees. In a number of cases the comments were raw and highly judgemental. Some of the most passionate interviewees, particularly in their observations of police leadership and culture, involved senior police staff who had never been police officers. The findings indicate that the delivery of organisational change in policing remains problematic, arguably to a higher degree than in other sectors. Police culture and leadership emerge as significant contributory factors. While
Government austerity acts a catalyst for collaboration, change ambitions generally appear ‘cautious’ and ‘conservative’. Despite talk of transformation the evidence suggests that in policing the approach to change is invariably incremental in nature. Police culture appears to act as both a change enabler and inhibitor. The complexities of delivering collaborative change, demand different skill sets from those normally associated with a command and control, hierarchal, organisational structure, typically associated with policing. Other specialist skill gaps exist which the police will either need to develop in house or buy in. Strategies used in policing to communicate change and ‘engage’ staff appear inadequate and dated. When considered holistically the evidence available suggests that policing sits towards the back of Roger’s change implementation curve (2002, p. 990).

4.2.6 Core Research Category (vi): Proposals to improve inter and intra organisational change preparedness and delivery

To address this final category, the researcher will consider and evaluate some of the many proposals made during the interviews and in free text survey responses. When considered holistically these suggestions seek to enhance change preparedness in organisations, speed up change delivery, increase the benefit yield and minimise collateral damage caused by poor implementation. Specific recommendations relating to inter organisational change will also be considered.

Shortcomings in change preparedness are likely to exacerbate the sub-optimal change outcomes reported. This situation merits greater prominence when taking account of the shift in change from episodic, to dynamic, relentless and continuous (CIPD, 2015b). While there is evidence of a new paradigm of change having evolved, many organisations appear structured for delivering business as usual within a relatively steady state environment (CMI 2012, p. 2). Added to this is the pressing, and exponential drive to engage in alliances, aptly depicted as “the seduction of collaboration” (Interviewees, 7 & 33).
Many of the organisations referenced in this research appear to lack both the capacity and capability to handle contemporary change which is depicted as being multi dimensional, multi faceted, asymmetric and relentless in nature. The situation portrayed was of organisations continuing to maintain their functional command hierarchies with change being managed by ad hoc teams hastily convened as an add-on. This supports the earlier assertions of the CMI (2012, p. 2). Handling change as an anomalous, unique, event is likely to create disruption when establishing change teams, leading to tensions within the steady state organisational hierarchy. Frequently, there is no organisational knowledge to draw upon and apply. Following delivery, the change team resume business as usual activities. In haste lessons are rarely captured or relayed back to the organisation. Given such circumstances delivery can be ad hoc, unstructured and haphazard.

A lack of skills and resilience was highlighted on numerous occasions. Interviewee 14 specifically referenced the dangers of organisations becoming “too lean”. Comparisons were made with the military and their capacity to respond swiftly and effectively. The point being made was that the drive to ‘downsize’ had gone too far and many organisations were simply not capable of responding or taking advantage of opportunistic changes in the macro environment.

Several respondents mentioned the lack of change knowledge and skills within organisations. This point was illustrated by interviewee 9 who argued that organisations must make project and change management a core competence. Other respondents went further and suggested restructuring organisations to incorporate a ‘Change Director’, someone with specific responsibility for ensuring change is delivered effusively and efficiently (Interviewees, 3 & 11). Several survey respondents referred to the role of CXO, an acronym commonly used to describe the chief experience officer.
The second structural recommendation made related to the creation of an project management office (PMO). Some respondents specifically referred to an Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO), a term used to denote a permanent ‘centre of excellence’ with a pan organisational remit to standardise and improve the delivery of projects (APM, 2014c, p.43). A key role of an EPMO is collecting and reporting metrics to assess the health of change programmes and this role takes on even greater significance when measuring collaborative change. Interviewee 14 spoke favourably of a balanced scorecard approach (Kaplan & Norton, 2005; Lendrum, 2003, p. 28) in order to capture a much wider range of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ performance measures. “What gets measured gets done” and “crude measures can result in crude management action” (Interviewee, 14).

Additional suggestions were offered to bolster organisational change capacity and capability. Notably, developing specialist skills in areas such as human resource management, project delivery and procurement, represent three important areas. The area that received the greatest attention related to the skills, or perceived lack of them, at the level of the change sponsor. Organisations needed leaders with “higher levels of emotional intelligence” (Interviewee, 3 and 34). They also needed to nurture a new cadre of politically savvy, collaborative leaders, schooled and ready to face the challenges of the new change paradigm.

Greater awareness of existing models, methods and tools to deliver change effectively, as well as the need for new and revised ones, were frequently cited as areas for improvement. While a dominant theme of this research relates to the change knowledge gap, two generic change management frameworks, one bespoke maturity assessment model, and one bespoke collaborative standard, were cited by the respondents as being relevant, helpful and worthy of endorsement:

• Kotter’s Eight Steps for Change (2008),
• The Prosci Group’s ADKAR\textsuperscript{25} framework (Hiatt, 2006),
• The CMI’s Organisational Change Maturity Assessment Model (2012, p. 5),
• BSI 11000 (Hawkins, 2013, p. 82).

Kotter’s work has been included because it was the most cited change model in this research. The ADKAR model provides a simple but repeatable process for delivering change, applicable to all organisations and all categories of change. This model received wholesome praise by the survey respondent who cited it. The CMI Organisational Maturity Assessment Model was referenced by interviewee 1 as providing an invaluable means of measuring organisational change preparedness, the core theme of this section. Finally, BSI 11000 is deemed relevant because it was the only model that was cited in the research as being specifically applicable to the delivery of inter-organisational change.

The McKinsey Seven ‘S’ framework (2008) has been referenced several times previously in this thesis and now merits further discussion. The significance of this model emerged during the literature review and the primary research. The model possesses contemporary utility because it addresses a re-occurring and dominant research finding regarding an over-emphasis on the tangible aspects of change such as structure and systems, frequently to the detriment of the ‘softer’, people orientated change elements. The McKinsey framework makes the distinction between ‘soft’ S’s and ‘hard ’S’s (McKinsey, 2008). The principle purpose of the McKinsey model is to illustrate that that all seven S’s’ need to be alignment in order to achieve effective change. It is noteworthy that thirty-six years after the publication of this seminal research, that a failure to address the ‘soft’ issues still appears to represent a symbolic and pressing issue. The following comment serve as a poignant illustration:

“Bad leaders are too task focused. They don’t invest in the team”

(Interviewee, 6).

\textsuperscript{25} ADKAR = Awareness Desire Knowledge Ability Reinforcement.
According to the interviewees, despite best intentions, shortcuts are frequently taken in these ‘fuzzier’ areas of change management.

While a failure to attend adequately to the ‘soft’ S’s is referenced as a cause of failure, this issue also featured prominently in more positive discussions about organisational change initiatives that were successfully delivered. “Openness”, “trust”, “honesty”, “listening”, “engagement”, “participation”, “flexibility”, “contribution”, and “being valued”, were recurring words used during the interviews and survey responses. Attending to the ‘soft’ issues requires planning, resourcing and investment, as well as resolve and commitment. Arguably, these softer leadership traits align with those of ‘emotional intelligence’ espoused by Goleman et. al. (2013).

Interviewees 8 and 26 recommended incorporating a ‘systems thinking’ approach (Senge, 1992, p. 6) for the delivery of organisational change, while a number of survey respondents cited positive experiences when using ‘lean manufacturing principals’ to design and deliver new organisational systems. While both approaches may have merit, this has not been explored further as part of this research.

Numerous interviewees and survey respondents referenced the absence of change management guidance in established doctrine, such as the APM’s BoK, MSP and PRINCE2, thereby reinforcing gaps previously highlighted in the literature review. Interviewees 1 and 2 explored this theme by suggesting that project and change practitioners would benefit greatly from being able to access new doctrine encompassing both the ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ elements of change. They referred to this as the MSP and PRINCE2 plus editions.

While most of the proposals offered during the course of this research are relevant to both categories of change, some of the recommendations were directed exclusively at inter organisational change. These include, the creation of a shared vision, co-location of the new joint delivery team, developing a new identity for the collaboration and reinforcing this through branding, investing in
team building, setting metrics and creating joint management information systems. The use of consultants experienced in delivering inter organisational change and developing collaborative leadership and ‘boundary spanning’ skills were also commended.

Conclusion

The literature review suggests that strategy should determine structure, yet according to this research the contra position appears prevalent. Many organisations referenced appear to have been structured to operate in a stable, steady state environment. For most this environment no longer exists. Some rebalancing and structural redesign appears necessary. Developing higher levels of organisational change maturity is likely to necessitate dedicated resourcing, knowledge creation and new organisational infra structure.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

The researcher will now synthesize the findings, drawing upon relevant literature explored. Given the depth and breath of this subject area, coupled with the conditions imposed by doctoral presentation, the research aim was limited to exploring evidential based first principles for organisations embarking upon collaborative change. The researcher plans to continue this study as a post doctoral project assignment. The intention is to create publishable advice and guidance for a professional project and change management audience.

The primary research findings discussed in this thesis provide a novel and illuminating perspective on the limitations of the police, the wider public and private sectors when delivering major organisational change. Of particular interest are the challenges encountered when change is of a collaborative nature. At times the findings reinforce and build upon existing literature, offering new insights, thinking and ideas. In other areas the findings question or contradict established doctrine and practice. When considered holistically, it is asserted that scholarly thresholds relating to originality and utility have been achieved.

The adoption of a mixed methods approach (Burke-Johnson et al., 2007, p. 12) for the research has enabled triangulation which adds to the robustness and validity of the key findings set out and discussed (Eisner, 1991 p. 110; Grix, 2000, pp. 83-84; Robson, 2011, p. 158; Bryman, 2008, p. 379). The intention remains an exploration of first principles of best practice when embarking upon major inter-organisational change, the stated aim for this research. In total eleven key emerging findings are proposed and discussed. In limiting the list to eleven the researcher acknowledges that there are additional themes that have not been included. This is a conscious step aligned to the 80/20 rule and the

26 The 80/20 or ‘Pareto’ principle states that, for many events, approximately 80% of the effects come from 20% of the causes.
philosophy of pragmatism and ‘do-ability’ discussed in chapter 3. The intention is to focus discussion on those areas where the impact will potentially create the greatest yield. Markedly, while the original intention of this research was to explore inter organisational or collaborative change, findings 1 - 9 suggest a generic change management applicability and utility. Finding 10 focuses on the unique aspects of inter organisational collaboration while the remaining finding (11) is reserved exclusively for policing.

The context for this research is noteworthy. Firstly, the extent and pace of change within organisations continues to escalate (CIPD, 2015b) and secondly, within this context, the appetite of organisations wishing to explore collaborative ventures remains unabated (Austin, 2000a p.44; Linden, 2003, p. 42; Hawkins, 2010, p. 10; Hughes & Weiss, 2007, p. 122; CIPD 2015a, p. 2; PWC, 2009, p. 3). References have been made to the 21st century as representing the ‘age of alliances’ and of ‘collaborarchy’ representing a new organisational partnering paradigm (Austin, 2000b, p. 10). Of particular note has been the rapid growth in outsourcing in public sector promoted by a mix of pragmatic and ideological drivers (Plimmer, 2014; Hill & Plimmer, 2013; NAO 2013a, p. 13; Sako, 2014, p. 29; Cordella & Willcocks, 2010, p. 82; Cope et al., 1997, p. 448; Linder, 1999, p. 35). Given the strength and consistency of the literature critiqued concerning these trends, it was reassuring to establish that this research has reaffirmed the growth in popularity and complexity of organisational collaboration. Key drivers such as austerity, government promotion, cost reduction, new technology, competition, changing markets and products were all cited.

It is acknowledged that this is a wide ranging, ambitious and rapidly evolving subject matter area to consider within the boundaries of a professional doctorate. However, the motivation to understand and find out more is compelling and mirrors the professional journey of the researcher from senior police officer to project and change management consultant (Lee, 2009, p. 42; Scott et al., 2004, p. 56). Achieving personal, professional and scholarly symmetry has been a paramount consideration and this goal builds upon researcher suitability discussed in chapter 3 (Robson, 2011, p. 61; O’Leary,
In addition, the research undertaken and the completion of this doctorate provides an exciting platform to explore and contribute new thinking and knowledge to an area of expanding organisational importance.

It is worth reminding readers of the overall aim and three objectives originally set for this research (Annex ‘C’). While specific objectives have been set for generic, collaborative and policing change, the primary aim of this research is to explore first principles of best practice for organisations embarking upon a strategic alliance. The grounded research methodological approach adopted (Bryman, 2008, p. 541), coupled with a thematic consideration of the findings, has enabled a thorough and uninhibited exploration of all the relevant issues, regardless of potential overlap, or apparent misalignment with the ordering of the research objectives. To provide clarification and reinforce the primary relevance of the key findings to specific research objectives, a mapping exercise has been conducted (see Table 7 below).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key finding</th>
<th>Research Objective I</th>
<th>Research Objective II</th>
<th>Research Objective III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key finding 1: The universality and utility of change management theory and practice

Research objective I has sought to assess the utility of generic change management theory and practice when embarking upon collaborative change. A principle finding is that while inter organisational change retains unique characteristics and challenges, virtually all the good practice cited for intra or single organisational change is relevant and applicable to change involving one or more organisations. This finding emerged during the literature review and was strongly reinforced during the research. Many of the interviewees and survey participants did not differentiate between different categories of organisational change. For these practitioners, what worked well in one change category worked well in another and vice versa. Established change management doctrine which emphasises authentic leadership, honesty, clear communication, participation and involvement, appears equally valid regardless of the organisational context or the number of organisations involved (Cameron & Green, 2009; CMI, 2013; Hayes, 2010; Buchanan & Huczynski, 2004; Cooperrider et al., 2008). Sound theory and practice in this domain possesses universal utility. Regrettably, many organisations referenced in the primary research do not appear to be adhering to these cherished, fundamental change management principles.

Key finding 2: Reported headline failure rates of 60% - 80% do not align with this research

The qualitative and quantitative research undertaken as part of this study suggests that the commonly reported failure rates for delivering organisational change are excessive (Beer et. al; 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6; IoD, 2012, p. 3; CIPD 2013a). Many respondents disputed these figures, while others questioned the superficiality and validity of this claim. Clarification was sought regarding the measurements used to assess success or failure. In the examples cited by the CMI and CIPD the researcher was unable to
determine an evidential base for these headlines figures (CMI, 2013, p. 26; CIPD, 2013a). The higher reported failure rate for inter organisational change presented by the authors of BSI 11000 lacks an empirical evidential base (Hawkins 2010, p. 4). While many respondents to this research were disappointed and frustrated with the change outcomes attained, a more measured picture emerges which suggests a failure rate in the region of 50%. As will be reiterated in key finding 3 (below) even this figure needs to be treated with caution, particularly in light of the limitations when using success and failure as descriptors of change.

**Key finding 3: The limitations of using success and failure as change descriptors**

Many participants to this research questioned the utility of using success and failure as descriptors of change. Many change initiatives consist of multiple objectives of differing values, while others may be less clearly defined and intangible in nature (OGC, 2007, p. 3). In such circumstances ‘success’ and ‘failure’ of the aggregated outcome can be challenging to determine. These terms appear too polarised. They can become emotive words when used to assess project delivery. Success implies limited scope for future improvement and learning while failure may foment defensive behaviours, which is equally inhibiting to learning, development and improvement.

When taken into consideration with key finding 2, it appears that more sophisticated measures are called for, perhaps making use of the balanced scorecard approach (Kaplan, & Norton, 2005, pp. 1 - 14). The aim should be on gaining a rounded and objective assessment of achievement that provides a platform for future learning and improvement.
**Key finding 4: The existence and prominence of the change knowledge and change knowing and doing gaps.**

This key finding refers to two distinct but linked elements. Firstly, the research undertaken suggests that many change initiatives are embarked upon without reference to any recognised model, theory or doctrine. When the change is of a collaborative nature this situation becomes more acute. Policing, provides an interesting case study in this area. In disciplines such as homicide investigation and the use of firearms, established doctrine and practice exists dictating the approach to be taken. Service arrangements ensure that only those with the requisite knowledge, competence and experience undertake these activities. (HMIC 2009b, p. 13). The juxtaposition is that in the areas of intra and inter organisational change, where the consequences of failure can be hugely damaging, there is limited evidence of established protocols being followed or consideration given to the knowledge, experience and competence of the staff deployed to deliver the required change. This is not an issue that is unique to policing, as the research indicates that this is a pan sector phenomena. Arguably, many organisations across the private and public sectors need to become more professional and improve the quality of change delivery by internalising established theory and practice.

The literature review highlighted gaps in change management knowledge in all sectors (CMI, 2012, p. 2; Nadler & Shaw, 1993, pp. 3-14, CIPD 2015b). The CIPD suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of the change dynamic (CIPD 2015b). Collectively, deficiencies of change knowledge and practice arguably lead to myopic behaviour where management are impervious to the collateral issues arising, which may ultimately undermine the change initiative.

Competence involves much more than the acquisition of knowledge (APM 2008, p. 1). Skills, experience and motivation are all necessary to ensure knowledge is appropriately and productively applied (ibid). This is illustrated by the second and linked element of this key finding concerning the ‘change knowing and doing gap’. 
The knowing and doing gap refers to the reported inclination of knowledgeable change management practitioners, either to take shortcuts, or ignore established change management good practice. The researcher has labelled this phenomena as the ‘hypocrisy of change management’. The primary research findings indicate that there is a significant variation in approach when embarking upon organisational change. The evidence assessed suggested that ill discipline, optimism bias and unrealistic timescales, coupled with the mounting pressure to deliver, all acted as contributory factors.

The literature review and primary research findings both reinforced a desire to embed change management as a core leadership competency (Nadler & Shaw, 1993, pp. 3-14). Such a measure would appear to represent a positive and welcome step forward. Arguably, organisations need to raise standards, not simply by acquiring more knowledgeable staff, but by applying tried and tested methods and maintaining a disciplined approach to project and change management.

**Key finding 5: Many of the theories / frameworks used to deliver change are historic and, arguably, outdated**

An abundance of research literature is available tackling the general topic of organisational change, the most popular theories cited in the primary research include Lewin’s Three Step Model (1950s), Lewin’s Force Field Analysis (1950s) and Kotter’s Eight Steps (1990s). While acknowledging the seminal nature of these theories, it is debatable whether, given their historic nature, they merit the influence and currency they appear to enjoy. It is noteworthy that these theories were conceived in a different era, where change was of an episodic nature and organisations were staffed by workers who were generally more subservient and less questioning of management. The literature review and research raises significant questions about the continued viability of the top down planned paradigm, particularly in a climate of relentless, asymmetric and multi
dimensional change (Senge, 1993, pp. 18-24 & 174-204; Todnem By, 2005, p. 370). It is suggested that new models and approaches are required to encourage the participation and involvement of staff and create organisations that are in tune with their external environment and capable of responding in an agile manner.

Several references have been made to programme and project management doctrine such as MSP, PRINCE2 and the APM’s BoK (OGC, 2007; OGC, 2009; APM, 2012). These methodologies focus exclusively on the procedures and process of change. Given the predominance of the ‘softer’ or people aspects of change referenced, this is indicative of a gap in the established corpora of knowledge. Several research respondents identified the need for MSP, PRINCE2 and APM BoK plus editions to provide comprehensive contemporary advice and guidance for addressing the people issues. These suggestions possess merit.

Key finding 6: The ‘soft’ aspects of change are equally, if not more important than the ‘hard’ aspects, such planning and scheduling. Organisational change is delivered by people for people.

The McKinsey Seven ’S’ Framework illustrates the importance of the ‘softer’, less tangible aspects of change management, yet the overwhelming emphasis is still appears to be directed towards the ‘hardware’ elements such as systems, structure and strategy (McKinsey, 2008). Process orientated or ‘hard’ S models of change were predominantly cited by the interviewees and survey respondents. The research repeatedly highlighted shortcomings in the delivery of organisational change attributable to a failure to engage staff and adequately address their psychological requirements. While it may appear trite to say that change is delivered by people for people, this does not appear to receive the prominence that it deserves in many of the contemporary change initiatives referenced in this research.
While the ‘software’ elements have featured prominently in change management literature for several decades, it was proposed that organisations need to consider a more holistic and sophisticated means of capturing a raft of performance measures to assess the health of their change programmes. A way forward which merits consideration is to incorporate the McKinsey Seven 'S’ framework as part of a balanced scorecard (McKinsey, 2008; Kaplan, 2005, p. 41). Regular reporting using a traffic light dashboard appears a valid method of capturing the breadth and depth of metrics necessary to properly assess the health of a change programme. This is important because the consequences of ‘disengaged staff’ can be loss of productivity, disillusionment, cynicism and ultimately the delivery of a sub-optimal change outcome (CIPD, 2012, p. 27; Duck, 1993, p. 63; Reichers et al., 1997).

Key finding 7: Many organisations lack the capability and capacity to deliver change effectively

The literature review and research highlighted a structural flaw that appears in many organisations. This relates to out-dated organograms, developed in an earlier era, to deliver ‘business as usual’ in a steady state environment (CMI, 2012, p. 2). In the police sector, for example, the existing hierarchy and rank structure (Neyroud, 2011, pp. 347-354) has remained relatively stable for more than 50 years (College of Policing 2015b, p.22). While strategy should, in theory, drive structure, for many of the organisations referenced, establishing the optimal structure has proven problematic and in some cases, unattainable. Functioning with incongruent organisational structure, arguably, is likely to create a skills imbalance and serves to perpetuate the status quo.

Many organisations lack the capacity and capability to deliver prolonged periods of organisational change. It has been proposed that some senior managers have been seduced into operating excessively lean organisational structures. As a consequence there is precious little spare capacity to deliver change. The absence of staff and contractors who possess the skills sets necessary to
deliver change appears to a problem faced by many organisations. Moving from episodic change delivery to a more synergistic and joined up approach, which is aligned to the evolving and continuous nature of change, suggests structural change is necessary as is the ‘buy in’ or nurturing of new specialist skill sets.

The literature review and research highlighted an absence of core change management skills in several key areas (Nadler & Shaw, 1993, p. 3; CIPD 2015b). Developing a competent cadre of project and change managers, assisted by an EPMO represents a useful first step in developing organisational change capability. In addition, consideration could be given to creating a director level position to take responsibility for and oversee future changes.

**Key finding 8: Change communications should be positive but judicious. Excessive use of the ‘burning platform’ and the ‘lazy change narrative’ may alienate staff**

Effective communication involves being able to engage in a rational dialogue regarding the reasons and consequences for change, confident that the supporting argument is both compelling and persuasive (Hayes 2010, p. 177). The juxtaposition to rationality is that of ‘change hyperbole’. This occurs when senior management exaggerate the case for change, over-estimate benefits and understate the risks, thereby undermining both their position and credibility.

Much has been said regarding the role of the leader in “creating a picture of a compelling future that engages the heart and the head” (OGC, 2007, p. 42). This was reinforced during the primary research where contrasting positions were discussed between ‘burning platforms’ and ‘golden horizons’. While the consequences of a burning platform (OGC, 2007, p. 48) may act as an inducement to change, numerous examples were provided of this approach being used either excessively or inappropriately. The consequences described included those of disillusionment, cynicism and mistrust (Hayes, 2010, p. 191).
The review undertaken of CIPD literature suggests that positivity is imperative when framing key change messages (CIPD, 2012, p. 27; Balogun et al., 2015, p. 6).

Communicating positively should not infer that senior management know all of the answers to every question concerning the future of their organisations (Hayes 2010, p. 178; Senge 1993, pp. 18-24). The dynamic, asymmetric and unpredictable nature of 21st century change suggests that the traditional, paternalistic style of leadership, where the person at the top is in control and knows what to do, appears fundamentally flawed (Cameron & Green 2009, p. 131). The new change paradigm demands engagement and ownership at every level to ensure that collective intelligence is harassed for the greater good of the organisation.

Energising staff and securing their commitment appears challenging when the message contains critical undertones regarding past conduct and performance. The AI methods seeks to avoid these issues by using a different philosophy which focuses on identifying and valuing existing elements of the ‘as is’ and using this as a creative platform for change (Cooperrider et. al., 2008, p. 3) Staff appear to learn and develop best in a positive, non accusatory environment (Cooperrider et al., 2008, p. 12).

The research showed that many senior managers needed to channel more effort into building and articulating the case for change. All too often managers opted to take shortcuts, relying on poorly constructed, negative or unconvincing messages to set out the case for change. Over reliance on positional power coupled with excessive use of the ‘broadcast’ method of communication, not being prepared to listen to feedback and an unwillingness to fine tune the message, could be indicative of the ‘lazy narrative’ syndrome.

The message from the research interviewees and survey respondents appears clear. Construct a robust case for change and invest time communicating the
message. Listen, and engage in genuine consultation. Always rely on the power of the argument to secure support within the organisation.

**Key finding 9: Creating a tangible vision for collaborations is frequently problematic as the end goal is often unclear**

Popular models such as Kotter’s Eight Steps Change Model (Kotter, 2008) and structured methods such as MSP (OGC, 2007), both reinforce the significance of constructing a guiding vision. While this model may suit intra organisational change, where power and control operate within the boundaries of a single organisational hierarchy, complications are likely to arise when the initiative involves two or more organisations operating in partnership.

Several interviewees explained that their organisations had embarked upon alliancing arrangements with no clear end goal in mind. Several examples can be found in policing where forces such as Warwickshire and West Mercia, and Surrey and Sussex have created strategic alliances and commenced pooling services, driven by austerity and the need to save money. Yet no vision exists and none of the actors interviewed were able to articulate an end goal. Many of the interviewees used the analogy of a human partnership which necessitated an investment in time and effort to enable the relationship to blossom. Creating a vision of the end state was problematic on two counts. Firstly, the end state was not clear as this would depend on the relationship continuing to develop for mutual benefit and secondly, for some, challenging governance considerations created politically sensitivities which led to concealment of the end goal. Creating a pathway for action may be problematic in circumstances such as this.

The solution proposed is to create a ‘step vision’ which enables the leaders of the collaborating organisations to state publicly the end state for the next phase of the programme. As they approach the attainment of this state, the alliance can be evaluated and a vision crafted for the next stage. Adoption of this
approach provides all the advantages of setting a vision for the future, while working within the boundaries of what is known and considered acceptable.

**Key finding 10: Preparing for the specific challenges of delivering collaborative change**

While the key findings set out above are applicable to intra and inter categories of organisational change, collaboration presents unique challenges that necessitates particular skills and craft (Hawkins, 2013 p. 123; Ohmae, 1989, p. 150; Lendrum, 2003, p. 354)

The ‘seduction of collaboration’ was a phrase used during the primary research and it was clear that several of the organisations referenced had entered into collaborative ventures without any clear view of the likely benefits. It was argued by some, that disproportionate efforts were channelled into developing processes to support the collaboration without properly investigating either the outcome or determine whether collaboration represented the right choice. Hansen’s distinction between ‘good’ and ‘bad’ collaboration is noteworthy (2009b, p. 83), as it provides a clear and irrefutable message, namely that organisations should only embark upon collaborative ventures when a clear and compelling case for doing so exists and when less riskier options have been considered and discounted.

Numerous instances were cited of managers embarking upon collaborative change programmes while being ill prepared and lacking the requisite skills, experience and acumen. The research revealed that ‘alpha’ collaborative change leaders demonstrated protracted resolve, determination and ‘change courage’ while the less able suffered from weaknesses of ‘change sustainability’. Respondents also talked of arrogance, optimism bias, unrealistic time-scales and a reluctance to learn. Collectively this suggest that a management hubris still exists which needs to change in order to create a culture of openness and learning.
Change leadership has been a reoccurring theme throughout this thesis (Heifetz & Linsky 2002, pp. 65-75; Kim & Mauborgne, 2003, pp. 60-71; Meyerson, 2001, pp. 92-102; Garvin & Roberto, 2005, pp. 104-114; Beer et al., 1990, pp.,158-166). In particular, great emphasis has been placed on a different leadership paradigm which looks and appears to be very different from that seen in a traditional command and control hierarchy (Cameron & Green, 2009, pp. 140-141). Organisations need to invest in nurturing collaborative leadership skills which emphasise relationship building, negotiation, managing ambiguity and complexity rather than the exercise of positional power. Reference has been made to the role of ‘boundary spanners’ (Punonti, 2003, p. 143; Hayes 2010, p. 175), as well as the technical procurement and legal skills necessary to create, manage, maintain and develop collaborative organisational relationships. Adequately resourcing project and change teams with professionals possessing the right skill sets appears to represent a key success factor.

Following a recognised model or method when embarking upon collaboration appears to offer the best means of avoiding a piecemeal and haphazard approach, reported by many respondents. The research findings have unearthed a significant issue, namely that the overwhelming majority of practitioners neither know of, nor use, any bespoke tools, frameworks or models when embarking upon collaborative change. While very few bespoke theories or models were found or referenced during the course this research, BSI 11000 (Hawkins, 2013) appears to provide at least one relevant and useful collaborative framework, albeit it lacks a supporting evidential platform.

Taking time to select the right partner was cited in the literature and the primary research and achieving cultural compatibility was stressed as an important goal (Hawkins 2013, p. 119). Again, numerous examples of rushed or poor partner selection and the damaging consequences that occurred were referenced in this thesis. Arguably, this is further evidence of organisations lacking the necessary skills and experience to work effectively in a collaborative manner.
The overriding message from the research is that collaborative working represents a new organisational paradigm. This necessitates a step change in managerial thinking, professionalism and approach. The new paradigm is challenging and evidence of organisations achieving disappointing or suboptimal outcomes is high. Bespoke models and frameworks should be used. Organisations need people with the appropriate experience and skills. At the forefront of this list of requirements are the skills-set of the collaborative leader.

**Key finding 11: Opinions regarding the ability of the police service to deliver collaborative organisational change appear more intense and polarised**

The systematic review indicated that there was limited academic literature directed to the topic of collaborative organisational change in policing. During the research police leadership and culture were discussed in detail (Gibson & Villers, 2007, p. 16; Dale, 2012, pp. 41-60; HMIC, 2014a, p. 19; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 4). It was argued that these important factors inhibited the ability of the police to engage productively in collaborations, particularly with organisations from other sectors. Reviews produced by external bodies such as the HMIC, report that while the levels of collaborative activity in policing have increased, driven primarily by austerity, the ambitions are, in many cases, limited and progress has been disappointing (HMIC, 2012, pp. 56-57; HMIC, 2013, p. 79; HMIC, 2014a, p. 57; HMIC, 2014c, p. 33; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 32; CBI, 2010, p. 12).

It was proposed by many interviewees that the indifference towards organisational collaboration was a consequence of procrastination and a lack of ambition and resolve. Arguably, the special status and more generous funding arrangements afforded to the police in the new labour years have provided little stimulus to change. Regardless of the reasons, the evidence examined in the literature and reaffirmed during the primary research, suggests that policing is

The primary research undertaken indicates a polarisation of opinion between those with a police only background and those with experience of policing and at least one other sector. The picture that emerged is still one of a command and control, pseudo militaristic and hierarchal organisational structure (College of Policing, 2015b, p. 22; Neyroud, 2011, p. 347; Manning, 2007, p. 52). Such a structure, it is argued, contributes to the maintenance of a powerful culture that is hesitant of change, conservative in outlook and suspicious of external organisations, particularly those in the private sector (Button et al., 2007, p. 296; Gill, 2013, p.6; Miles & Trott, 2012, p. 49; College of Policing 2015b, 16-22). Interviewees with experience outside policing were significantly more critical of the ability of the police to deliver both intra and inter organisational change. The opinions expressed by many of this cohort were, at times, raw and uncompromising. While acknowledging the ‘can do’ characteristics of police culture, the existing rank structure, coupled with established practice of promoting from within, appear to present significant change inhibitors.

Much has been said and reported about the ability of police leadership to engage in and deliver collaborative change. Reference is made to poor collaborative leadership, management hubris, short termism, a skills and experience gap and an over reliance on rank and positional power (Gibson & Villers, 2007, p. 16; Dale, 2012, pp. 41-60; HMIC, 2014a, p. 19; Audit Commission, 2010, p. 4). The approach of the police to collaboration during the early years of austerity can, for many, best be described as ‘amateurish’, thereby supporting similar assertions from the HMIC (HMIC, 2012, pp. 56-57; HMIC, 2013, p. 79; HMIC, 2014a, p. 57; HMIC, 2014c, p. 33). To provide balance it is important to emphasise that those interviewees with a police only background, while recognising that this represented new territory, were broadly of the opinion that police management provided organisation, direction and
decisiveness to new partnerships. Regardless of the validity of these various claims, what is clear is that strength, depth and polarisation of views of policing were significantly stronger than other sectors investigated.

**Final Comments:**

This thesis has sought to investigate existing literature and practice for organisations embarking upon major collaborative change. Comparisons have been made between the public and private sectors, with particular reference to policing. While delivering collaborative change poses unique and specific challenges, generic change management theory appears to retain value and utility. This conclusion is significant as it explicitly links to research objective I. There is, however, an important caveat, in that established change management theory appears contradictory in key areas, with an increasing number of commentators questioning the continued viability of the established top down organisational change paradigm (Senge, 1993, p. 18; Todnem By, 2005, p. 369; Jacobs, 2013, p. 3).

Bespoke research relating to inter organisational change is more limited and this represents another significant finding linked to research objective I. Arguably, this situation is disappointing given the exponential rise in both the number and complexity of alliances now operating across all sectors. While models such as BS11000 are available, the absence of an evidential base acts as a significant limiter.

Research objective II focused on investigating existing change management practice, particularly as applied to strategic alliances. While the research findings suggest that failure rates may not be as high as those commonly reported (Beer et. al; 1990, p. 133; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2015, p. 6; IoD, 2012, p. 3; CIPD, 2013a; CMI, 2013, p. 21; Hawkins, 2010, p.4), there were never-the-less, numerous examples of ‘sub optimal’ outcomes being attained as a consequence of poor management, inadequate methods, unrealistic
expectations, corner cutting and under resourcing. Conversely, numerous examples of good practice were cited, particularly with reference to the softer and emotional aspects of change leadership, embracing two way communication and staff engagement.

Research objective III applies exclusively to the police sector. During the course of this study numerous references have been made to policing where cultural and leadership issues both appear to be inhibiting ambition and progress. This builds upon earlier research and observations concerning police culture discussed in this thesis (Button et al 2007, p. 296; Westmorland, 2008, pp. 253-280; Shansky, 2007, pp. 19-46; Caless, 2011, p. 205) and, arguably, is compounded by a lack of experience and business acumen among many senior police actors (White, 2015b). Opinions about the ability of the police to engage in productive collaborations tended to be more emotive and emphatic. The conclusion, after considering the literature and research findings, is that the police service in England and Wales are trailing behind others in terms of their collaborative ambitions and progress. Arguably police leaders will need to raise their game if they are to achieve cross sector parity in this important area of organisational development.

While special references have been made to policing, to reflect the author’s personal and professional doctoral journey, the intention has always been to widen the appeal of this research to encompass all strategic alliances, be they in the private or public sectors. The scope of key research findings 1 - 10 are therefore broadened to incorporate a panoramic, pan sector perspective. This was always an ambitious task and while there is clearly much more knowledge to be gleaned, the overriding intention was to present a series of evidence based, first principles of best practice for organisations planning to engage with others in a strategic alliance. Arguably, the product of this research has greater utility given the generic challenges, difficulties and problems apparently encountered by organisations of all complexions and types when embarking on a collaborative pathway.
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Research aim and objectives

To investigate existing literature and practice for public and private sector organisations when embarking upon strategic alliances, with particular reference to policing. The intention is to explore first principles of best practice.

The specific research objectives are:

I. To critically assess the effectiveness of change management theory and doctrine and its relevance to strategic alliances;

II. To investigate existing change management practice, particularly as applied to strategic alliances;

III. To explore the specific challenges of delivering strategic alliances in policing.
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#### Results of the targeted literature review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words / phase (Search strings)</th>
<th>DiscoveryCo mbined / Scholarly database search</th>
<th>Business Source Complete</th>
<th>Ebsco</th>
<th>Emerald</th>
<th>Science Direct</th>
<th>ProQuest</th>
<th>UoP Thesis Database</th>
<th>British Library: EThOS</th>
<th>Google Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police collaboration</td>
<td>256,860 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>70 hits. All articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>111 hits. All articles reviewed. 6 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>2,869 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 5 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>9,570 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>4,330 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>68 hits. All articles reviewed. 1 deemed to be relevant.</td>
<td>29 hits. All articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>326,000 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 8 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police strategic alliances</td>
<td>149,459 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>1 hit. Reviewed but none deemed relevant.</td>
<td>No results found.</td>
<td>2,069 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 5 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>2,373 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 5 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>1,935 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>32 hits. All articles deemed relevant.</td>
<td>No results found.</td>
<td>141,000 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 4 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and organisational partnering</td>
<td>1,126 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>No results found.</td>
<td>63 hits. All articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>1,133 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 7 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>274 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>10 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>7 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>5 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>35,000 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and strategic partnering</td>
<td>6,697 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>1,711 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 23 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>255 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>4321 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 5 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>299 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>13 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>10 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>2 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>26,700 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and joint ventures</td>
<td>62,930 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>31 hits. All articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>4 hits. All articles reviewed. 4 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>1009 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 4 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>124 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 1 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>6403 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>41 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>No results found.</td>
<td>69,900 hits. First 100 reviewed. All articles reviewed. 2 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police and outsourcing</td>
<td>24,941 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 7 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>95 hits. All articles reviewed. 3 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>17 hits. All articles reviewed. 4 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>672 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. 6 deemed relevant.</td>
<td>923 hits. First 100 articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>45 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>15 hits. All articles reviewed. None deemed relevant.</td>
<td>No results found.</td>
<td>33,900 hits. First 100 reviewed. All articles reviewed. 8 deemed relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BSI 11000 Collaborative Relationship Model
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Annex F
A reflective account

In this section I reflect on my own experiences as a practitioner. I seek to provide transparency concerning my preconceptions, while addressing the question concerning my suitability to undertake this research. It is argued that there are key requisites before undertaking research which extend beyond demonstrating a command of the literature. This includes a detailed background knowledge of the relevant discipline, technical proficiency and substantial access to time and resources (Bentz & Shapiro, 1998, pp. 72-4; Robson, 2011, p.50). I will show that I satisfy these criteria. I will also demonstrate that this research is ethically motivated and driven by a desire to better understand the organisational problems I have encountered (Bryman, 2008, p. 5). These organisational problems have both vexed and challenged me professionally. The adoption of a first person style of writing for this part of the thesis is intended eliminate the use of impersonal constructs, while reflecting the unique and personal nature of this learning experience (Turk & Kirkman, 1989, p. 116).

My professional journey is anchored in a career spanning thirty years in policing and incorporates operational and organisational roles up to, and including, the rank of chief superintendent. In January 2007 I retired from the police and set up my own consultancy service specialising in project and change management.

I developed an interest in the science of project and change management during the 1990’s when undertaking a masters degree in business administration. In the later part of my policing career I managed two complex multi million pound projects within Sussex Police. On both occasions the sponsor was the chief constable. The stakes were high and significant
reputational damage was likely to occur from failure. Policing at that time operated within a traditionally functional, command and control structure (Stanford, 2007, p. 49). The environment was relatively stable and the power-base lay, despite the existence of the tripartite system of accountability, firmly with the office of chief constable. Morgan’s metaphor of the chief engineer operating the organisation as a machine and Handy’s analogy to Greek temples resonate with my experiences (Morgan, 1997 p. 11; Handy, 1999, loc. 3630). Delivery, in such an environment, was uncomplicated and straight forward because of a combination of strong positional power and clarity of purpose.

In 2004 a new paradigm was gaining traction within policing which incentivised collaboration and the sharing of services among forces. One such initiative, with which I had personal involvement, was the South East Policing Alliance (SEPA); a project set up to share policing assets between Kent, Surrey and Sussex constabularies. Despite the stated public intentions of all parties, the project rapidly disintegrated, due to power struggles, poor leadership, in-fighting and an unwillingness to compromise. After ten months the HMIC noted that the ‘aims of the project had still not been agreed’ (HMIC, 2005, p. 70). Similar attempts were made after 2005 to share air support services, but progress was slow and painful. These unfulfilled collaborative ventures have left a marked impact on my thinking and approach. Following my retirement as a police officer I undertook a series of project related assignments across the UK, both within policing and the broader public sector. My conclusion, is that while low levels of project management maturity within policing acted to accentuate problems, the wider public sector were also struggling to deliver effective collaboration.

As my career as a project and change management consultant developed, I was afforded opportunities to work in the private sector, including undertaking assessment and review assignments on behalf of the APM. Collaboration appeared omnipresent but beset by similar challenges.
From the outset, I recognised that I could never achieve a position of absolute researcher neutrality (Rose, 1985, p. 77; Nagel, 1986, p. 1). Contemporary thinking acknowledges that the researcher’s position and experiences will affect what they choose to investigate, how they do it and, importantly, the manner in which they reach their conclusions (Malterud, 2001, p. 484; Robson, 2011, p. 78). To address this issue I have engaged in reflexivity by using a research and learning diary (Lee, 2009, p.65; Murray, 2011, p.207; O’Leary, 2004, p.11, Adhern, 1999, pp. 408-10). A critical evaluation of those early days suggested that my attentions had been focused of ‘reflection-on-action’, but then only in a rather unstructured and haphazard manner (Schon, 1982 p. 276). I needed to progress to a higher level which Schon categorises as ‘reflection-in action’ (1982, pp. 49-69). To assist I now use and am an advocate of Rolfe’s ‘what’, ‘so what’ ‘what next model’ of learning (2011, p. 45).

Understanding who I am and how I view the world of research appears an important aspect of researcher reflexivity (O’Leary, 2004, p.11). Thirty years of policing experience, coupled with a second career as a management consultant, suggests an orientation towards practicality and the attainment of results. Research bound by the traditional rules of science did not appear to fit comfortably with the ‘can do’, focus on the ‘here and now’, culture of policing with which I am familiar. (Godfrey, 2006, p. 58; Foster & Bailey, 2010, p. 95). Self analysis suggests that I am likely to experience challenges reconciling my outlook within a traditional positivist paradigm (Robson, 2011, p. 11; Blaikie, 2007, p. 183; Bryman, 2008, p. 11; O’Leary, 2004, p. 10). While my strengths, and personality suggest a leaning towards qualitative research methods I am inherently sceptical of philosophical dogmatism. If I am to self label, my preferred approach to research can best be described as ‘pragmatic’. (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 18; Burke Johnson et. al., 2007, p. 113; Robson, 2011, pp. 28-29).

I am also mindful that there is a risk that my doctoral research may be tainted by my previous negative professional experiences (Nickerson, 1998, p. 175). It was important, therefore, to acknowledge the impact that research bias could
play in this study, particularly in the area of qualitative research. Notably, Maulerud makes the distinction between preconceptions and biases in that a preconception only becomes a bias if the researcher fails to mention them (2001, p. 484).

Researcher positionality is an important element of reflexivity. I am cognisant that, in relation to policing, I am now an ‘outsider’, no longer enjoying the privileges afforded to researchers working within their organisations. Yet as a retired chief superintendent, I still enjoyed access not normally available to external researchers. While no longer an ‘insider’ perhaps I occupied the ‘space in between’ (Corbin Dwyer & Buckle, 2009, p. 54). This aligns with Kerstetter’s study showing that most researchers were neither ‘insiders’ or ‘outsiders’ (2012, pp. 99-117). Brown, (1996, pp. 181-3), refers to former police officers, turned academics, as ‘insider insiders’, a label which appears fitting of my status. Serrant-Green’s conclusion, however, suggests that categorising researchers serves limited purpose, given that there are equal advantages and disadvantages to both insider and outsider research (220, p. 38). Regardless of labelling, after thirty years of policing I still think and act like a police officer. My life experiences are reinforced by a ‘pragmatist’ learning style (Kolb, 1984, p. 68). My conclusion is that I occupy a hybrid position, with knowledge, understanding and sympathies with existing police systems and culture, yet remaining sufficiently detached and independent of thought not to be accused of ‘going native’ (Kanuha, 2000, p. 439). Farrell and Koch, (1995, p. 54), refer to police scholars as ‘unthinking defenders of the system’, because to operate otherwise could jeopardise future relationships with police personnel. While this has to be a consideration, this particular risk appears to have less personal prominence as I have progressively moved away from working in, or having any dependency upon, policing.

The research parameters chosen for this study reflect my personal journey and take full advantage of the opportunities afforded by the APM by linking my old professional world with my new and emerging one. Combining study with evolving and future professional practice creates a synergistic environment in
which to reflect, learn and grow. My research objectives and strategies evolved to maximise the opportunities my personal positioning afforded and now encompass three distinct research populations, namely, personnel with a policing background, personnel with experience in the broader public sector and finally personnel with private sector experience. By using the APM and my policing contacts I was able to access all three groups. The dynamic and evolving nature of this thesis is intertwined with the professional pathway I continue to follow.
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Qualitative Research (Focus Group)

A focus group was held at the offices of the Association for Project Management in July 2013 involving seven management committee members of the newly constituted Enabling Change Specific Interest Group. All of the group have attained membership of the Association and have a declared interest of “improving the change capability of organisations, teams and individuals”. In addition to the seven members of the management committee, it was agreed that the participation of two employed members of the management staff of the Association with experience of collaborative change would add value. It was also a condition that while the participants could be named remarks should not be attributable to named individuals. The group was made up of one practising programme manager, one practising change manager, three change management consultants and one change management author / specialist. A list of the focus group participants can be found in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Thomas</td>
<td>Programme &amp; Change Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Bradbury</td>
<td>Change Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Delany</td>
<td>Change Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Taylor</td>
<td>Change Management Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Goodman</td>
<td>Change Management Consultant and Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebnem Umman</td>
<td>Change Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Graham</td>
<td>APM Specific Interest Group Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David West</td>
<td>APM Volunteers Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After being briefed about the aims and conduct of the research and being advised of the working definition of a strategic alliance the researcher divided the group into two smaller self managed groups of four and five persons.
Each group were provided with a flip chart, pens and paper and asked to record their answers to two specific questions:

**Question 1:** Think about a strategic alliance you have been involved in. 
What went well?

**Question 2:** Think about a strategic alliance you have been involved in. 
What did not go well?

The researcher adopted the approach of a process facilitator and limited further interventions to reminding the sub groups of the task and providing time checks, but only when requested. Both groups enthusiastically set about the task set and independently compiled two separate lists, as requested. Interestingly the interviewees expressed similar views to each other and appeared intent on building upon the statements of the other rather than offering contrary or contradictory opinions. On reflection this was a relatively newly formed group and the desire to achieve cohesion may have acted as a constraining or moderating force. That having been said neither group demonstrated any reluctance to set out areas of collaboration that had not gone well from their experience. Neither was there any discernible difference in the answers recorded by either sub-group to both questions posed.

Due to the difficulties experienced arranging additional focus groups and the inherent risks involved it was decided not to incorporate the findings in the primary research for this thesis. As a consequence the focus was re-directed to informing, shaping and testing the research questions planned for the both the 1:1 interviews and survey. During the subsequent de-brief the focus group participants expressed a strong preference for directed questions encouraging them to draw lessons (both positive and negative) from their own working experience. As a consequence a similar approach was incorporated within the research design.
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Participants to the semi-structured 1:1 interviews

*Ordered alphabetically to ensure remarks are non-attributable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Public sector</th>
<th>Private sector</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Method of conducting the interview. (F2F, telephone, video conferencing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Pyne</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Macklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Eggington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Wernham</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Clifford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video conferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daryl Kenny</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Griffiths</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video conferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hawkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stewart</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Brace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Broad</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Wallington</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Headland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Reiss</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles York</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillary Oglieve</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Harris</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Kirby</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Connell</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>Method of conducting the interview. (F2F, telephone, video conferencing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dywer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Jones</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Kershaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Darby</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merv Wyeth</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McAndrew</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Usherwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller Tang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Video conferencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Fewings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Howe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mason Brown</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Preston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Wilkinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>F2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Willis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebnem Umman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Seabrook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Toynton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Skeletal plan for the 1:1 semi-structured interviews

1) Thank participant.

2) Explain research aim and methodology:

   The aim is to establish first principles of best practice when embarking upon a major inter organisational collaboration programme:

   Objectives:
   a) To critically review contemporary change management theory, particularly as it applies to multi organizational collaborative ventures.
   b) To identify gaps within the current corpus of knowledge.
   c) To test the hypothesis that bespoke theory and methodology are more suited to major collaborative change than generic change management theory and practice.
   d) To determine the suitability of change management theory to a live collaborative programme involving Surrey and Sussex Police. The focus is on comparing and contrasting an operational initiative with a back office venture.

   Methodology:

   a) Detailed literature review: academic, professional, grey literature.
   b) 1:1 semi structured interviews with practitioners in the private and public sectors with experience managing and implementing collaborative change.
   c) Focus groups with change management practitioners.
   d) An electronic questionnaire / survey to a wider change community.
   e) Case study research involving an ongoing strategic partnership between Surrey and Sussex Police. Focusing on comparing and contrasting an operational and a back office collaborative initiative.
3) Explain why the research is being undertaken and the support received:
   a) Personal journey.
   b) Forms part of a professional doctorate at the UoP.
   c) Is being sponsored by the APM’s Programme Management SiG.
   d) Support (written) of the DCC’s in Surrey and Sussex Police.

4) Explain conduct of the Research i.e. adheres to the University’s Ethics Policy. Written approval to undertake the research has been sought and granted by the University’s Ethics Committee. Stress that participation is voluntary.

5) Explain reasoning and seek consent for digital recording.

6) Deal with consent (with tape running):
   a) Are you willing to be named as a participant to this research?
   b) Are you willing to be quoted but not named? In this instance you could be referred to within a grouping e.g. a business change manager said or a senior executive said …………… While it is unlikely, given the number of interviews I am planning to undertake, it is possible that you may be identified from the language used.
   c) Stress and reassure - I will NOT be attributing remarks to named individuals.
   d) Restate the agreed position.
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Clarification of current role / experience delivering major change.

*Initially focus on major change impacting just one organisation:*

a) Are the instances of major change increasing?

b) Why? What are the drivers?

c) What is the track record of organizations you have experience of at delivering major change?

d) Success rate in percentage terms?

e) Why does change succeed?

f) Why does change fail?

g) What can be done to reduce instances of failure *(reported to be as high as 70%)*?

h) What advice would you give to someone embarking upon change?

i) Are there any theories or models that you consciously use when embarking upon major change?

j) Is change always resisted?

k) Please expand upon your response?

l) How do you overcome resistance?

m) What leadership style works best when implementing major change?

n) Any other points?
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Turning to collaborative change:

a) Please describe major collaborative change you are involved in / have experience of.

b) Is the level / extent of collaborative change increasing?

c) In your experience what drives collaborative change?

d) Are collaborative ventures more or less challenging than change limited within one organization i.e. collaborative change v single organizational change?


f) From your experience what is the success rate when implementing collaborative change?

g) What works when implementing collaborative change?

h) What doesn’t work when implementing collaborative changes?

i) What can be done to reduce instances of failure (reported to as 80%)?

j) What are the challenges encountered when embarking upon collaborative change?

k) What advice would you give to someone embarking upon collaborative change?

l) Are there any theories or models that you consciously use when embarking upon major change?

m) What leadership style is appropriate for collaborative change?

n) Are multi organisational collaborative initiatives more challenging than two organisations seeking to collaborate?

o) Why? Please explain your answer.

p) Are there any other points?
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Additional points for Police Personnel

Lets look at a collaborative venture involving a force you know:

a) Is collaboration within policing easier or more challenging than other organisations outside policing?

b) Why?  Please explain.

c) How good are the police at delivering collaboration?

d) Why?
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Major Collaborative Research Survey

Your help would be greatly appreciated

I am undertaking doctoral level research in-conjunction with ProgM to establish best practice for organisations embarking upon major collaborative change.

While much has been written on the subject of organisational change, there is very little evidenced based literature concerning the increasingly topical subject of collaborative change i.e. organisations working together to achieve agreed goals where risks and benefits are shared amongst the participants.

If you have experience of organisational change whether in a single organisational context or collaboratively, I would invite you to answer the on-line questionnaire which is intended to take no more than 10 minutes to complete, and can be found at:

http://svy.mk/13XKrYZ

My plan is to publish the findings in a white paper and to make this freely available through the APM.

If you have already completed the survey thank you. The more people who participate the stronger the evidence base.

If you have experience of major collaborative change and have an additional 45 minutes spare to participate in a 1:1 semi structured telephone call, please drop me a line as I would be delighted to hear from you.

Thank you

Jim Dale

ProgM Secretary

01273 814733
07771 806185

Email: james@jamesdale.co.uk
Collaborative Change Pilot 1

Major Organisational Change (occurring in a single organisation) 1 of 4

1. Have experience of major organisational change in any capacity?
   - Yes
   - No

Comment

Powered by

See how easy it is to create a survey.
2. In what capacity did you act during the last major organisational change?

- Director or board level
- Senior management (just below board level)
- Middle management
- Junior management
- Non managerial
- Change Agent
- Programme or project team member
- Internal or external consultant
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

3. How effective was your organisation when implementing major organisational change?

- Highly effective
- Generally effective
- Sometimes effective and sometimes ineffective
- Generally ineffective
- Highly ineffective

Comment
4. List three areas that went well when implementing major organisational change
1) 
2) 
3) 

5. List three areas which did not go so well when implementing major organisational change
1) 
2) 
3) 

6. In your experience are organisations you are familiar with better or worse at implementing major organisational change than they were 10 years ago?

- Much better
- A little better
- Neutral
- A little worse
- Much worse
- I am not able to say

Comment 

7. When implementing major organisational change what factors do you consider to be important in order to achieve a successful outcome? Please rank your responses in order of priority with 1) being the highest and 10) being the lowest
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior management support and visible leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong programme or project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A clear vision of the “to be” state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The appointment of experienced change agent(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The appointment of a credible business change manager and change team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies for overcoming resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sense of urgency when implementing change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies to reinforce the new ways of working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence to clearly defined change management theories, models or practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. When implementing major organisational change were any theories, models and/or practices used?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know
9. If the answer was 'yes' to the previous question please state what the theory / model / practice is.
10. Have you any experience of major collaborative change i.e. change involving two or more organisations working together e.g. as a strategic alliance, partnering, outsourcing, sharing etc?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Comment

[Prev] [Next]
11. In what capacity did you act during the last major collaborative organisational change?

- Director or board level
- Senior management (just below board level)
- Middle management
- Junior management
- Non managerial
- Change Agent
- Programme or project team member
- Internal or external consultant
- Other (please specify)

Other (please specify)

12. How effective is the organisation you have experience of at implementing major collaborative change?

- Very effective
- Generally effective
- Sometimes effective and sometimes ineffective
- Generally ineffective
- Very ineffective
13. List three areas that went well when implementing successful major collaborative change
1) 
2) 
3) 

14. List three areas which did not go well when implementing major collaborative change?
1) 
2) 
3) 

15. In your experience are organisations you are familiar with better or worse at implementing major collaborative organisational change than they were 10 years ago?
- Much better
- A little better
- Neutral
- A little worse
- Much worse
- Not able to say

Comment

16. When implementing major collaborative change what factors do you consider to be important in order to achieve a successful outcome? Please rank your responses
in order of priority with 1) being the highest and 10) being the lowest

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisations with similar values and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A credible change agent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leaders/managers who get on well together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The ability to achieve clear complimentary goals - <code>win win</code></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strong programme/project management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Senior management commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A credible business change manager and change team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Realistic timescales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clear joint protocols and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. When implementing major collaborative organisational change were any theories, models and/or practices used?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

18. If the answer was 'yes' to the previous question please state what the theory / model / practice is.


19. Please add any additional comments you would like to make.


The results of the completed questionnaires will be analysed alongside a series of 1:1 semi-structured interviews and focus groups which are planned until November 2013. In addition, further case study research is being undertaken with two large organisations based in the South East. The plan is to announce the emerging findings at ProgM’s Annual Conference which is scheduled for Tuesday 26th November 2013 in Central Birmingham. We have some outstanding speakers and it promises to be a great event:

**Delivering more for less:** Using programme management to achieve transformational change in an era of austerity

Further updates, including the results, will be published on the ProgM pages of the APM’s website. Please see:

[APM Programme Management Specific Interest Group](#)

**Thanks again**

Jim Dale
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Breakdown of the APM’s Programme Management Specific Interest Group (SiG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members who are UK residents</th>
<th>Members who are not UK residents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2270 (70%)</td>
<td>982 (30%)</td>
<td>3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>2636 (81%)</td>
<td>616 (19%)</td>
<td>3252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While anyone can join an APM SiG, subject to the proviso that they register their details with the APM, in excess of 80% of the Programme Management SiG enjoy either personal or corporate membership rights with the APM.
Survey 1: Factors deemed to be important when implementing major intra organisational change (in rank order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in priority order</th>
<th>Success Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior management support and visible leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A clear vision of the ‘to be’ state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong programme / project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The appointment of experienced change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adherence to clearly defined change management theories, models and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strategies for overcoming resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The appointment of a credible business change manager and change team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strategies to reinforce the new ways of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A sense of urgency when implementing change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey 2: Factors deemed to be important when implementing major intra organisational change (in rank order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in priority order</th>
<th>Success Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior management support and visible leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A clear vision of the ‘to be’ state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strong programme / project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strategies to reinforce the new ways of working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A sense of urgency when implementing change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strategies for overcoming resistance to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The appointment of a credible business change manager and change team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The appointment of experienced change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adherence to clearly defined change management theories, models and practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey 1: Factors deemed to be important when implementing major collaborative organisational change (in rank order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in priority order</th>
<th>Success Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior management commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The ability to achieve complimentary goals / 'win win'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organisations with similar values and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leaders who get on together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strong project / programme management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Credible change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Realistic timescales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A credible business change manager and team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clear joint protocols and systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey 2: Factors deemed to be important when implementing major collaborative organisational change (in rank order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in priority order</th>
<th>Success Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisations with similar values and cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senior management commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The ability to achieve complimentary goals / ‘win ‘win’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Leaders who get on well together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strong project / programme management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clear communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Credible change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Realistic timescales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A credible business change manager and team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Clear joint protocols and systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>