

Theme paper

'NEW LEADERSHIP' AND INNOVATION

Many governing bodies formulate stretching goals. Electorates often have raised expectations. Customers are becoming more demanding. Investors seek high returns. Staff are concerned with their advancement and incomes. Governments expect taxes to be paid. Balanced scorecard reviews often highlight areas that require improvement. Unless many individuals, teams and organisations excel and innovate such a combination of demands may far exceed available resources.

LEADERSHIP CHALLENGES

Business and political leaders face many challenges in reconciling performance and delivery with contending requirements and demanding expectations. Their performance is variable and competence cannot be assumed. Across Europe there is suspicion and a degree of hostility towards sections of the business community such as bankers and many citizens do not trust their Governments' handling of public finances (ICAEW & PwC, 2014). In relation to corporate governance codes and leadership practices, questions have been asked about the relevance of western approaches in Asia (Zinkin, 2010).

Allegiance of stakeholders cannot be taken for granted. Groups that are not satisfied may take their custom, service, money, allegiance and votes elsewhere. What should leaders focus upon? How might they inspire and enable the innovation that creates new options and choices, or harness more of the potential they command? Are there more affordable ways of creating high performance organisations and practical ways of avoiding traditional trade-offs? It is sometimes lonely at the top - who should they listen to?

Should one prioritize the interests of different stakeholders or concentrate upon releasing creativity and increasing the capability to simultaneously deliver multiple objectives? Imaginative, innovative, ethical, rapid and sustainable responses are required from many boards and leaders at various levels to confront threats or seize opportunities facing their organisations. Such responses should enhance rather than compromise longer term prospects and the benefits that can be delivered to stakeholders. In uncertain times and challenging contexts what are the requirements for successful leadership?

Many boards have tried traditional approaches and have found them either wanting or not matching the requirements of the contemporary business environment. Are there cost-effective alternatives? 2015 is the year of innovation in the UAE. Questioning and challenge should be second nature to a competent director and effective board. What can they do to stimulate innovation? Are current governance codes and practices resulting in innovation in leadership and direction?

RAISING THE BAR

Where is the innovation in governance practices and on boardroom agendas? Are directors looking for better or different responses? Some boards are focused upon the next quarter's results or surviving an imminent AGM while others have a longer-term perspective. In reality one may need to both cope with today's issues if there is to be a tomorrow, and have a vision for the future in order to provide strategic direction. The establishment of a vision that is stretching and compelling yet achievable is an acid test of effective leadership. Setting the bar high can raise ambitions and spur achievement.

Some visions embrace innovation. An envisaged future state could involve technological breakthroughs or scientific revolutions. Certain companies such as 3M have set targets for the proportion of turnover that is represented by new products. One could aim for innovation in other areas, for example, processes, ways of working or learning, relationships with customers and suppliers or how business is done to the extent of creating new markets.

Could a vision for innovation embrace social innovation as well as step changes in areas such as management practices, the creation of new options and choices, or the form of organisations? Past business leaders have both built successful companies and laid the foundations of social revolutions. George Cadbury's provision for workers at his Bournville chocolate factory in Birmingham anticipated aspects of the

welfare state. Could those establishing operations in rural areas and developing countries learn from his provision of education and other forms of support?

At what point does a business leader accept responsibility for some of the wider challenges facing mankind, such as climate change? How should the CEO of a food and beverage company balance the competing demands of profiting from the sale of sugary drinks and the problem of obesity? Some leaders become innovators in relation to their own roles, for example William Lever, the founder of Unilever, in building Port Sunlight and introducing a form of co-partnership.

Can a leader be both competitive and caring? Is it possible to be flexible and at the same time resilient and sound, or both entrepreneurial and prudent, and radical but responsible? Can one transform what needs to be changed while preserving what is distinctive and valued and ensuring the continuity of vital relationships? Are there better ways of creating and exploiting know-how or stimulating ideas and successfully bringing new offerings to market?

THE ROLE OF THE BOARD

What role should a board or other governing body play in relation to leadership for excellence and innovation? How might a board add more value in areas ranging from providing strategic direction to reporting achievements and activities such as planning or supporting a CEO and management team? What needs to change for a board to become less cosy and complacent? Is it perceived as negative, a brake on progress, interfering and preoccupied with compliance or as a positive force in the growth and development of a successful, sustainable and responsible business?

Are business excellence and other general models and traditional approaches to strategy and planning still relevant? Outdated approaches and beliefs, delusions and going automatic as a result of a lack of creativity and challenge can lead to the replication of past behaviours and responses that do not reflect changing situations. Such board, leadership and executive practices can result in stagnation, marginalisation, missed opportunities, failed initiatives and the destruction of shareholder value (Stigter & Cooper, 2015).

Directors need to ask questions. If significant change and radical transformation is to occur - and where relevant and if required - how should stakeholders be informed, engaged and involved? How might one handle tough choices or avoid certain trade-offs? Can one reconcile pressure for innovation and change with prudence and a responsible risk appetite? Are there affordable ways of transforming performance with an existing team, culture and corporate structure? How are other directors addressing these issues?

Effective direction requires thought, an awareness of the market environment and business and corporate situation and sound judgement. Leadership requirements and style should reflect the context. For example, the leadership required by a virtual team in a network or cellular organisation may be very different from that needed by a bureaucratic and hierarchical one. The areas that directors and boards concentrate upon and question will depend upon factors such as their confidence in past decisions, the capability of a CEO and management team and the extent to which change occurring in the internal and external environment.

When people are struggling with seemingly intractable problems working harder can become self-defeating. The more people thrash about the quicker they sink into the mire. Effective leaders can help people to tackle problems by encouraging them to first think about solutions (Niven, 2015).

CHANGING LEADERSHIP REQUIREMENTS

A change of context or circumstances can give rise to a requirement for a different leader. Some of those at the top of organisations could learn from Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus who on two occasions quickly vacated a position of absolute power as director of Rome once he had dealt with the situation that had given rise to his appointment. Many CEOs lack self-awareness, humility and a sense of when it is the right time to change leadership arrangements and/or hand over to a successor. In rapidly evolving and uncertain contexts identifying leadership potential is difficult and risky.

Where once leaders might be picked for behavioural reasons, for example their ability to organise people or form relationships today in some arenas situational criteria have come to the fore. In regard to contemporary relationships those between leaders and followers can be especially important. Increasingly they may need to be two-way or multi-directional and involve consent and shared values. In a digital and multi-generational

world with multiple social networks leadership can be shared. Thought leaders and others may be in a position to influence or make things happen.

Ethical and moral leadership is also important, especially in contexts in which there is an identifiable risk of corruption, the consequences of which can be damaging to an organisation, its stakeholders and a wider society and economy (Shleifer and Vishny, 1993). Corruption can sometimes be difficult to root out, as while the costs may be widely spread the benefits it may confer on its perpetrators can be tangible and significant. Checks and balances, vigilance and more democratic forms of leadership can help (Johnston, 2014).

Leaders have to be proactive in pursuit of a vision while sensitive to developments and alert to opportunities and reacting to them appropriately. They also need to retain a balance between aspirations and capabilities. Excellence and innovation are important because corporate capabilities can be costly. They need to be effectively used. There is little point having resources that cannot be accessed and used as and when required to address an issue, seize an opportunity or progress a goal.

ASKING RELEVANT QUESTIONS

Asking the right questions is critically important. Take potential - something today that may have relevance and utility at some point in the future. Like capability potential can be costly. For example, many companies engage in talent wars to recruit and retain people judged to be high fliers. Large sums may be devoted to preparing them for future roles when in dynamic and competitive markets the future form of one's organisation and its management requirements may be uncertain. Will prized potential be required if there is a change of situation, direction or priorities?

Even where affordable and still relevant potential like capability needs to be harnessed and deployed when required. Leadership is more than articulating visions, listing desired values, making motivational speeches and cajoling other people to succeed. The bull who charges ahead regardless can be a dangerous animal. Leadership is also about empathy and enabling and being a facilitator, catalyst and coordinator. It involves listening, helping and supporting, making sure that people are equipped to do what is expected of them. As activities are undertaken by networks of self-managing groups more people may assume responsibility and lead themselves.

In relation to innovation, whereas a lack of trust, enforcement of standard ways of doing things and control mechanisms can inhibit or prevent creativity, exploration of alternatives and the asking of questions that lead to breakthroughs setting people free can liberate them. Ten Essential Freedoms in relation to where, how and when people work, who they work with, the technology used, etc. and matching the approach one adopts to the situation and task has been suggested as a way of encouraging innovation and responsible risk taking (Coulson-Thomas, 1987).

Questions for executive directors in relation to people for whom they are responsible could include: Do you encourage people to question and challenge? What would liberate your people and set them free? Are you focused on outcomes rather than micro-managing them? Do you trust them and encourage responsible risk taking? Do you allow them to 'take responsibility' and become accountable? How could you better support the process of innovation? How could you best disseminate and share the results of innovation? How could you help people to help themselves? How could the support required be provided on a 24/7 basis? (Coulson-Thomas, 1987)

In some companies variety, differentiation and innovation are discouraged in a variety of ways for fear that they might give rise to quality problems or create problems for processes and systems. Building checks into the support that people use, for example to make sure that items proposed to potential customers are compatible and will work together, can give people greater freedom in coming up with solutions to problems, offering alternatives or creating new options and choices (Coulson-Thomas, 2007, 2012a & b, 2013).

THE ROLE OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

In some organisations the ability to influence, support and make things happen is widely dispersed. In others it is more concentrated and chief executive officers (CEOs) can feel particularly exposed. While having position power they are also targets. In the first instance many communications - from customer complaints to media requests for interviews are directed at CEOs. They often top the list of those whom external parties seek to build relationships with and companies seek to influence.

One of the challenges for leaders is those who endeavour to position themselves to gain preferment from them. If unchecked the desire of people to ride on the coat tails of a leader can result in them being surrounded by crawlers, boot-lickers and toads. Flatterers, lickspittles and grovellers are unlikely to add much value to boardroom discussion, but groupthink and the desire of others to fit in or be team players can result in a lack of constructive challenge (Janis, 1971, 1972 & 1982).

CEOs should attract the sympathy of anyone who feels they have been mis-sold to. CEOs are priority targets of pedlars of advice from colleagues, some of whom are hoping, angling or plotting their downfall, external suppliers motivated by self-interest and consultants whose business models require them to extract income from companies as blood-sucking parasites feed upon dumb beasts. Whistleblowing arrangements to encourage the reporting of those who are endeavouring to take advantage need to be in place along with steps to protect those who endeavour to act in the best interests of an organisation (Vandekerckhove, 2011).

Unions were established to protect people from organisations. In today's world when so many people are focused primarily upon themselves and building personal brands, networks and wealth increasingly it is organisations and their intellectual property and other resources that need protection. In some cases more people may be taking out than putting in. A leader needs to be able to distinguish between those who are contributing and those who are free-loading or parasitic (Coulson-Thomas, 2003).

Some CEOs like to be a focal point and at the heart of things like a spider at the centre of its web, influencing things directly and visibly exerting power (Handy, 1996). Others, while appearing more detached, seek to make things happen by delegating, encouraging others to think, challenge and take decisions, and actively building the competence and confidence of members of their team. Successful achievement for the latter would be an organisation able to survive and thrive in their absence.

Given that a high proportion of past new product launches may have failed, many hares may need to be set running in order to land a commercial return. On occasion, the consequences of success may be more traumatic for some than the costs of failure. A brave board and ambitious CEO may need to be prepared to engage in Joseph Schumpeter's (1942) creative destruction and write off significant past investments in order to move to a new and better place.

THE CEO AND THE BOARD

Whereas some CEOs might seek a compliant board, the more aware and confident ones should realise that a strong and effective board can be questioning but helpful and can help a company to remain current, vital and viable and sustain success. Similarly effective directors recognise that understanding the pressures CEOs are under can help a board to build relationships with them and support them.

Looking ahead, as more work-groups are self-motivated, receive appropriate performance support and share a vision and cause, will leadership as we know it continue to be a requirement? (Ingram & Emery, 2015) In the new forms of organisation that are emerging will a leadership team as an intermediary between a board and the people who are creating and delivering value to customers, clients or citizens still be required?

Just as a board might consider which powers and decisions to reserve for itself and a scheme of delegation to a CEO and executive team, a leader needs to decide what matters to handle personally, which issues can be handled by others, and who to consult when advice is needed. Where a board establishes a framework of policies and values within which the people of an organisation should operate intermediate leaders can set the tone and create the conditions within which others operate. The framework could include guidelines and support relating to innovation development and roll out.

CEOs may have command over certain resources, but the ownership of these may lie elsewhere, for example ultimately the shareholders in the case of a quoted limited liability company. One sometimes forgets that most leaders are themselves accountable to others. The company CEO should be held to account by the chairman and board. The permanent secretary is accountable to the responsible Minister and both may be questioned by MPs who in turn are accountable to an electorate.

Effective leadership involves multiple sets of relationships, upwards, downwards and sideways or horizontally. The leader who appears at the top of one organizational pyramid may themselves report elsewhere from a different perspective, for example a national or international one or that of a holding company head office. A business entity can be but one link in a wider supply chain and successful innovation can be the result of an iterative relationship between customers and suppliers (Bartram, 1996).

HARNESSING THE POTENTIAL OF GROUPS AND TEAMS

The roles, responsibilities and mandates of leaders can vary according to the situation and context. Most are held accountable to some degree for their decisions and those of others for whom they are responsible. Decision making and problem solving can be central activities in the creation of success (Adair, 2013). However some people and groups find it much easier to take decisions than others. In practice, the potential of groups, including for innovation, can be particularly difficult to harness (Coulson-Thomas, 1993)

One might expect a group of people with their collective knowledge to be better at taking decisions and providing answers than individuals. Groups and teams often devote a lot of time to becoming effective at participation and teamwork and can lose sight of their objectives and a quicker and more productive approach can be to give a question or decision to the person with the most relevant knowledge, expertise and experience (Coulson-Thomas, 1993). In an era in which scientific breakthroughs often require the efforts of a group in a collective setting, the curiosity and persistence of an individual can sometimes be critical.

Groups can amplify rather than correct individual errors of judgement among their members, and group dynamics can lead to people deferring to others or following them, polarisation or the expression of a general consensus and the smothering of minority but well informed views (Hastie & Sunstein, 2015). The lone dissenting voice may be eventually proved right (Mill, 1869). Sometimes adjusting incentives and rewards, assigning roles in accordance with people's strengths and restraining or removing a group leader or particularly vocal member of a group can encourage other viewpoints to emerge (Hastie & Sunstein, 2015).

Some leaders have much more power and freedom to act than others. Marketplace realities and competitive pressures mean that some CEOs have little room to manoeuvre. Many are responding to pressures rather than pro-actively initiating. On occasion leaders at all levels, including a national leader, can approach their roles in ways that seem designed to frustrate the emergence of solutions to the problems they face. Putin has been suggested as a contemporary example (Aslund, 2015).

Some leaders are little more than followers of fashion. While there may not be a law that requires them to climb onto bandwagons or imitate others, many do so. Some are slaves to mistaken assumptions, outdated ideas, and misunderstood lessons from past experiences. Alert boards and CEOs should be alert to events, cases and situations that do not seem to fit with established models and past assumptions and willing to commissioning the exploration of other ways of looking at them (Kuhn, 1962). Others are less curious and brave. Some are insecure, riven by feelings of inadequacy, or afraid of their own shadows.

Judging by the average tenure of office of CEOs some of them may be on other people's hit lists for removal. Quite a few will be got rid of before their terms of office expire. Others may have health problems, or find people bad mouthing them behind their backs, or face rivals who seek to fill their shoes. Some of the entities they head up may themselves be potential take over targets. Leadership roles and positions cannot be taken for granted and hence should be used wisely.

Survival as a CEO is easier for those who focus upon what is most important, choose their advisers with care and concentrate upon the best interests of their organisations and their stakeholders. Engaging in games to promote their own interests such as talking up achievements, concealing problems, seeking scapegoats and claiming credit for the achievements of others can be self-defeating in the longer-term as chickens come home to roost. Where shareholders are restless, rationalising failure and blaming others may only work for so long. To escape prison bars created by their own imaginations and past practices some leaders need to think and behave differently.

SUCCESSFUL INNOVATION

Leadership style and management and operating practices and office and other workspace layouts often inhibit innovation. People should work at times and in places that best enable them to be productive and creative (Coulson-Thomas, 1987). Many environments do little to encourage thought, provoke questions or stimulate imaginations. It is little wonder that so many good ideas originate outside of normal places of work, when on holiday, visiting friends or shopping people see a link or connection, or when going for a morning run or playing with children they suddenly gain an insight.

Practices, controls and the support provided should reflect the people concerned and their aspirations,

preferences and requirements. For the best results an approach to innovation and knowledge creation should also match the organisational context and changes sought (Chen, 2008). Appropriate and personalised performance support can link development and the assistance provided to the requirements of particular individuals and workgroups within organisations, the available time-scale, and to their objectives.

There are some who associate successful innovation with luck rather than approach and for whom identifying relevant sources of advice and counsel can be problematic. Innovation and product development can require trying a number of alternatives and evaluating the consequences. Some companies are reluctant to give people a free hand because of legal, regulatory, quality and other requirements and implications. Ensuring compliance can require time consuming checks, reviews, assessment and testing, which may also inhibit the refinement, improvement or bespokeing of an existing offering (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a).

Many people, especially those with a fear of failure or of being wrong, simply lack the confidence to have a go. Performance support can enable them to confidently address new and complex challenges in the knowledge that compliance checks are built in. This can be liberating and conducive of faster innovation. A basic application cannot be a panacea for every problem likely to be encountered, but the experience of early adopters suggests relatively straightforward support can make a significant contribution, while the cost-effectiveness of tools increases with the number of users, options explored, and changes introduced.

Many organisations move backwards in relation to innovation. When company ownership or senior managers change, new people may not understand innovation practices or related support arrangements (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a). Continuity can be a major problem. If a board does not understand and back an approach, or appreciate its strategic significance, its chances of survival, let alone wider adoption, may be slim, even when it is successful. People may regress to something they themselves have used or commissioned, and may not run with a better approach until they find time to comprehend it.

IMPLEMENTING INNOVATION

In many sectors the pace of innovation is such that companies need to introduce new products to survive. Demanding customers and the relentless activities of competitors force them to speed up development processes and reduce the cost of new product launches. In the public sector, due to emerging needs, rising expectations, scientific and technological innovation, and periodic or frequent changes of Government policy, there may also be new measures, services or initiatives to introduce.

Those new products may seem very exciting, but will front line teams and channel partners be able to understand, sell and support them? Innovations have to be disseminated and understood and people may require help if they are to adopt and benefit from them. The commercial return from successful innovation can depend greatly upon the speed with which new offerings can be rolled out into the marketplace. Appropriate performance support can quickly enable a sales force and business partners to understand and successfully sell them (Coulson-Thomas, 2007 & 2012a).

Many companies have used performance support to successfully launch relatively complex offerings. Tools developed for 3Com, Bolero, Cisco, ICB and The Innovation Group present capabilities, demonstrate products, support account planning, and develop and price solutions. Support tools can incorporate 'best practice' approaches and critical success factors (Coulson-Thomas, 2007 & 2012a & b, 2013). They can ensure people focus on benefits to customers. Users can assess and address requirements using whatever formats - including animations, visual images and video and audio material - best help understanding.

Leaders should ensure front-line teams, channel partners and customers are enabled to understand and adopt new offerings. Performance support can automate routine tasks and incorporate commercial, quality and regulatory checks. It can gather and present relevant information as and when required. Case studies, testimonials, endorsements, competitor analysis and market knowledge can help users to answer questions and identify cross selling and upgrade opportunities. Consistent messages can be delivered, training costs slashed, and reliance upon specialist staff reduced. Confidence can also be significantly increased.

'NEW LEADERSHIP

Leadership is often equated with the management of people and the importance of people is an article of faith of many business school HR and other courses. Leadership is sometimes portrayed as about leading people rather than making things happen. In reality, leadership is about asking different questions, exploring

alternative options and raising ambitions in order to create better futures. Innovation is often required rather than continual striving for excellence in the implementation of an outdated model. As Theodore Levitt (1960 & 1975) pointed out, creating a new mode of transport may be a more promising route to a global and sustainable business than perfecting the horseshoe.

Many people bring a lot of baggage with them, including their cost. Many CEOs would benefit from worrying less about their lack of “people skills” and devoting more time to the management and exploitation of know-how, mechanisation or how customers could do more to help themselves on-line. Utilisation of relevant knowledge rather than the management of people may be the issue. Past investigation has shown how poor many well known companies are at managing most categories of intellectual capital (Perrin, 2000).

New ways of thinking are required. For example, is employing or having lots of people an advantage or liability? In a more connected world in which vehicles are self driving, services are provided by robots and deliveries undertaken by drones, CEOs may spend much less time on issues relating to the recruitment, remuneration and monitoring of people. Their mechanical and electronic replacements may be easier to track, update and replace. More attention may need to be devoted to ensuring those people that remain are properly supported and that the right mix of people, mechanical and electronic capabilities are in place and appropriately used and the various elements work well together.

The benefits of flexible and responsive forms of network organisation composed of portfolios of projects and multi-locational teams that organically evolve and adapt to new requirements, situations and priorities have been clear for many years (Coulson-Thomas, 1992). Have inertia and a lack of imagination in boardrooms or the self-interests of managers caused bureaucratic and hierarchical organisations to survive for so long? If people join organisations because of their visions, values and purpose, share corporate objectives, assume personal and work-group responsibility, and use corporate and other social networks to share insights and quickly secure solutions to issues as they arise, how many layers of leadership and management are actually required? Will hierarchical organisations be replaced by more democratic ones? (Blaug, 2009).

'New Leadership' puts less emphasis upon top-down direction, motivation and control, and more stress upon providing relevant help and support (Coulson-Thomas, 2012a & b, 2013). Leaders should look for ways of making any people for whom they are responsible more effective, productive and creative. What would they like more or less of? How might they harness more of their potential? Servant leaders focus upon their organisation or team rather than their own self interests. They listen. They are sensitive. They put others first. They engender trust and encourage allegiance to a cause that might long survive their own temporary incumbency of a leadership role.

Traditional approaches while paying lip service to innovation often seek to avoid variety and experimentation in case they create process and systems problems. Innovation may require giving people greater freedom in terms of how, when, where and with whom they work and learn and in relation to the tools and technologies they use to produce novel solutions (Coulson-Thomas, 1987). As mentioned above, building checks into a performance support framework and tools can set people free to bespoke responses and try different alternatives while minimising or preventing outcomes that cause delivery, legal or other problems (Coulson-Thomas, 2007, 2012a & b, 2013). The emphasis is upon liberating people rather than controlling them.

Effective directors and CEOs focus upon the best interests of their companies and internal and external stakeholders. Success in business is often the result of helping other people, and in particular customers, to achieve their visions and fulfil their dreams. The help required can be provided 24/7 at various points from the refinement of a requirement or aspiration to its achievement or implementation. It can include the supply of advice, required capabilities, coaching and mentoring, and it can be provided in many forms from paper check-list to an application on a mobile device (Coulson-Thomas, 2007, 2012a & b, 2013).

Whereas in the past the focus may have been upon top-down command and control 'new leadership' puts much more emphasis upon enabling others to achieve. Hence it is relevant to a range of emerging organisational forms. Helping key work-groups, and especially those in front-line and customer-facing roles, to excel at demanding jobs and emulate the approaches of higher performing peers, can deliver multiple benefits for both people and organisations. Helping people to help themselves and to take more responsible and sustainable purchasing and consumption decisions can also benefit the environment.

About the author:

Prof. Colin Coulson-Thomas of the University of Greenwich and Director-General, IOD India, UK and Europe Operations, holds board, public and academic appointments, and leads the International Governance Initiative of the Order of St Lazarus. He is a member of the General Osteopathic Council, chair of the council's Education and Registration Standards Committee and chair of the Audit and Risk Committee of United Learning. He has helped directors in over 40 countries to improve board and corporate performance. Author of over 60 books and reports he has held professorial appointments in Europe, North and South America, the Middle East, India and China. Colin was educated at the LSE, London Business School, UNISA and the Universities of Aston, Chicago and Southern California, and is a fellow of seven chartered bodies. He obtained first place prizes in the final examinations of three professions.

REFERENCES

- Adair, John (2013), *Decision Making and Problem Solving (Creating Success)*, London, Kogan Page
- Aslund, Anders (2015), Putin's leadership approach seems incompatible with any solution to Russia's current economic woes, *economia*, February, 2015
- Bartram, Peter (1996), *The Competitive Network*, Bedford, Policy Publications
- Blaug, Ricardo (2009) Why is there hierarchy? Democracy and the question of organisational form, *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 12 (1), 85-99
- Chen, C. (2008), Linking the Knowledge Creation Process to Organization Environment Change, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp 259-279
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (1987), *The Future of the Organisation*, London, Kogan Page
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (1992), *Transforming the Company*, London, Kogan Page
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (1993), *Harnessing the Potential of Groups*, London, Adaptation
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2003), *The Knowledge Entrepreneur*, London, Kogan Page
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2007), *Winning Companies; Winning People*, Peterborough, Policy Publications
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2012a), *Talent Management 2, A quicker and more cost-effective route to the high performance organisation*, Peterborough, Policy Publications
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2012b), *Transforming Public Services, A quicker and affordable route to the performance public organisations*, Peterborough, Policy Publications
- Coulson-Thomas, Colin (2013), *Transforming Knowledge Management, A quicker and affordable route to the high performance organisation*, Peterborough, Policy Publications
- Handy, Charles (1996), *Gods of Management*, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Hastie, Reid, and Sunstein, Cass R (2015), *Wiser, Getting Beyond Groupthink to Make Groups Smarter*, Boston, MA., Harvard Business Review Press
- ICAEW (Institute of Chartered Accountants in England & Wales) and (PwC) PricewaterhouseCoopers (2014), *Trust in Public Finances, A survey of citizens in 10 European countries*, London, ICAEW/PwC
- Ingram, Kyle and Emery, Cecile (2015), *Leadership*, Presentation at Imagining the future of HR conference, University of Greenwich, 28th January
- Janis, I. L. (November 1971). "Groupthink". *Psychology Today* 5 (6): p. 43–46, 74–76.
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: a Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin

Johnston, Michael (2014), *Corruption, Contention, and Reform: The Power of Deep Democratization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Kuhn, Thomas (1962), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, Illinois, The University of Chicago Press

Levitt, Theodore (1960), Marketing Myopia, *Harvard Business Review*, July/August, Vol.38 (4), p. 45-56

Levitt, Theodore (1975), Marketing Myopia, *Harvard Business Review*, September/October 75, Vol. 53 (5) p. 26-183 (16pp.)

Mill, John Stuart (1869), *On Liberty*, London, Longman, Roberts & Green

Niven, David (2015), *It's not about the shark: How to solve unsolvable problems*, London, Icon Books

Perrin, Sarah (2000), *Managing Intellectual Capital to Grow Shareholder Value*, Bedford, Policy Publications

Shleifer, Andrei and Vishny, Robert W. (1993), Corruption, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108: 599–617

Schumpeter, Joseph (1942), *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, New York, Harper & Bros.

Stigter, Marc and Cooper, Cary L. (2015), *Solving the Strategy Delusion: Mobilizing People & Realising Distinctive Strategies*, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan

Vandekerckhove, Wim (Ed.) (2011), *Whistleblowing and Democratic Values*, London, International Whistleblowing Research Network

Zinkin, John (2010), *Challenges in Implementing Corporate Governance: Whose Business is it Anyway*, Singapore, John Wiley & Sons (Asia)