Can Public Sector Organisations Learn?

by

Maria Barrados and John Mayne[*][1]

* Maria Barrados is Assistant Auditor General, Office of the Auditor General of Canada. John Mayne is Principal, Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

1. Introduction

In recent years, considerable attention has been focused on the importance of managing information in organisations, as well as the challenges for organisations to make use of and adapt from it. Organisations are expected to value information, to be able to learn from the past and to adapt to changing circumstances. While much of the literature has focused on private sector organisations, public sector organisations and indeed the governments within which they operate are undergoing significant reforms and face equal challenges.

This paper considers organisational learning in the public sector in light of current public sector reform initiatives, many of which have implicitly been based on the assumption that the public sector can indeed use empirical evidence on past experience to inform current decision-making. In doing so, the paper tries to avoid treating organisational learning anthromorphically, focusing instead on the processes and procedures that form the life blood of organisations.

Learning in organisations relates to how the organisation deliberately changes and adapts over time in terms of structures, functions, values, attitudes and behaviour. Organisational learning, as we shall use the term, refers to formal structures of information and whether or not they are used. Our interest is in how organisations can bring together information on past performance and have it influence decisions. Building on organisational learning literature, we will argue that while individual learning is important, it is not enough. There is a need to institutionalise learning processes within a public sector organisation.

After briefly describing several public sector reforms that rely on organisations using information on their performance, we present a short overview of organisational learning using a framework suggested by Lipshitz and Popper (2000). This is followed by a section discussing a number of mechanisms we suggest are needed for results-based learning and relating them to this framework. We then argue that a key reason why public sector organisations do not use evaluative information is their risk-averse nature, and present various elements of a learning culture which the organisational learning literature has identified. We then outline what lessons have been learned in trying to implement public sector result measurement and reporting.

We conclude the article by bringing together what has been learned in developing and implementing results-based initiatives in the public sector with what the organisational literature says about creating learning organisations. We argue that putting in place appropriate review systems and procedures for reviewing past performance can contribute to bringing about the needed culture change to a learning organisation.

2. Public sector reform trends

Public sector management has been undergoing considerable change over the past decade (OECD, 1997). Among the initiatives, one finds in particular:

- managing for results (results-based management);
- performance contracting for senior managers;
- accountability for results/outcomes.

2.1. *Managing for results*

Public sector managers are being encouraged to focus on the results (outputs and outcomes) that their programmes are intended to produce for their citizens, rather than just on following rules and procedures or on doing what was done last year (Office of the Auditor General, 1997). Through tracking and measuring those results, they are expected to adjust their activities, based on what is working and what is not. Managing for results envisages information on results playing a key role in public sector management, requires deliberate efforts at measuring those results (*i.e.* at gathering empirical evidence) and implies a willingness to revise policies and operations based on that information.

2.2. *Performance contracting*

In many countries, public sector managers, especially senior managers, have annual contracts with their organisation or the government setting out the results they are expected to accomplish in the year, and have their pay at least in part tied to how well they are able to produce the expected results. While judgment is still expected to play a significant role in assessing managers' performance under this regime, it is also envisaged that empirical information on the results achieved will play a key role (OECD, 1999).

2.3. *Accountability for results*

Coupled with the managerial focus on results comes the need to build accountability around results. A number of authors have recognised the need to change our traditional view of accountability if we are to focus on results in public sector management rather than solely on rules and procedures. (Behn,

2000; Hatry, 1997). The Auditor General of Canada (2002) has discussed this issue and proposed a revised articulation of accountability:

Accountability is a relationship based on obligations to demonstrate, review, and take responsibility for performance, both the results achieved in light of expectations and the means used.

The Auditor General further suggested that:

Accountability in a performance-based public sector requires being able to credibly demonstrate:

- the extent to which the expected results were achieved at what cost;
- the contribution made by activities and outputs of the programme to the outcomes;
- the learning and change that have resulted; and
- the soundness and propriety of the means used.

The basic idea is that if accountability is to include accountability for outcomes over which a manager does not have control, then we need a more mature concept of accountability which allows for the fact that managers may have done all that could reasonably be expected but planned outcomes have not occurred for reasons beyond their ability to influence. In those cases, the key question is whether or not they have learned from the experience and have made changes to improve their use of tax dollars and public authorities based on what they have learned.

Each of these major initiatives is based on the theory that organisations and individuals in the organisation will adjust their activities based on empirical evidence on the past. But that is a key assumption. Empirical evidence that public sector organisations do learn in this fashion is not overwhelming (Torres and Preskill, 2001). And there are several literatures which have examined this lack of learning from facts, including that which examines utilisation of evaluative information, and the literature on organisational learning. This paper examines what a public sector organisation has to do to operate in this way, namely to engage in results-based learning.

3. Organisational learning

The literature on organisational learning is vast, covering a wide range of topics ranging from professional development to knowledge management to the utilisation of performance information in organisations. There is not a generally accepted theory nor readily accessible best practices, as numerous authors have pointed out (Argyris and Schön, 1996; Easterby-Smith, 1997). As Lipshitz and Popper (2000, page 346) note, there is conceptual fragmentation between academic researchers and organisational consultants who differ in

purpose (research *vs.* change), methodology (social science *vs.* action research) and terminology (organisational learning *vs.* learning organisation). No attempt will be made here to summarise the literature and this debate.

Rather we will build on some of the areas of agreement, define the terms we are using and set out what seems to be needed for a public sector organisation to effectively use empirical information on the results being achieved by the organisation. We are thus focusing on one specific type of learning in an organisation, namely that founded on deliberate efforts at acquiring and using empirical information. There are other types of learning that can occur such as professional development of individuals, learning from sharing on-the-job experience, and water-cooler discussions.

We are interested in organisational-level learning, whereby in a deliberate manner, evidence on past and other's organisational performance is sought and used to inform decisions in a public sector organisation.

3.1. *Organisational learning mechanisms (OLMs)*

The conceptual framework we are using is the one proposed by Lipshitz and Popper (2000), which focuses on learning **by** organisations and introduces the useful concept of organisational learning mechanisms (OLMs). The framework uses both a structural – the OLMs – and cultural elements. OLMs are "institutionalised structural and procedural arrangements that allow organisations to systematically collect, analyse, store, disseminate, and use information relevant to the performance of the organisation". OLMs are seen as necessary but not sufficient for learning by organisations to occur. The quality of that learning depends on additional cultural/social facets without which OLMS are likely to be enacted as rituals rather than as mechanisms to detect and correct error (Lipshitz and Popper, 2000, page 345). The likelihood of learning is increased if the OLMs are embedded in an appropriate learning values system.

Lipshitz and Popper (2000, page 348) posit five organisational learning values.

Table 1. **Organisational learning values**

Inquiry	Persisting in a line of inquiry until a satisfactory understanding is achieved.
Integrity	Giving and receiving full and accurate feedback without defending oneself and others.
Transparency	Exposing one's thoughts and actions to others in order to receive feedback.
Issue orientation	Focusing on the relevancy of information to the issues regardless of the social standing (*e.g.* rank) of the recipient or source.
Accountability	Assuming responsibility both for learning and for implementing lessons learned.

"Improving organisational learning involves designing and institutionalizing OLMs and embedding them in a learning culture" (Lipshitz and Popper, 2000, page 349). In this paper we are examining the kinds of OLMs needed in a public sector organisation and how the required supporting learning values can manifest themselves.

4. The requirements for organisational results-based learning

What then is required for results-based learning in a public sector organisation? What types of OLMs are needed? What would we expect to see in a results-based learning organisation? In terms of systems and procedures, we suggest that **results-based learning** would require in an organisation:

- **Credible measurement and analysis.** The results being achieved by its activities and the soundness of those activities are known in a timely manner (*i.e.* measured).

- **Information dissemination.** This information is communicated and shared within the organisation.

- **Regular review.** Specific routine organisational procedures form the basis to assess the empirical information about past performance, whereby decisions taken by staff and managers in the organisation to change existing policies and activities are informed by this information.

We shall consider each of these requirements for institutionalising a learning process. But we can first note that these activities relate fairly well with the learning values of Table 1, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. **Organisational learning values and results-based learning**

Learning values	Results-based activities		
	Measurement	Dissemination	Review
Inquiry	✓	✓	
Integrity	✓		
Transparency		✓	
Issue orientation	✓	✓	
Accountability			✓

4.1. *Credible measurement and analysis*

An organisation valuing results information would not leave the gathering of that information to chance. Rather we would expect to see a credible information seeking process in place which would include:

- **Active measurement.** Deliberate, proactive procedures are in place to measure the results being achieved across a wide spectrum of performance.

Measurement would include both ongoing measurement as well as more periodic evaluation, co-ordinated as part of the sensible effective and efficient measurement strategy. Further, results are not all that is important in the public sector. As indicated in the revised articulation of accountability presented earlier, the means used to achieve the results are also important. That is, public sector organisations are expected to adhere to certain values and practices such as propriety, prudence, fairness, treatment of staff in delivering services to citizens. How they conduct their business matters. A measurement OLM needs to cover both the results achieved and the means used.

● **Useful analysis.** To become useful information, data need to be assessed, put in context and appropriately interpreted. Procedures are needed to provide for analysis, synthesis and interpretation of results measurement.

● **A focus on data quality.** Measurement costs time and money, and can be seen taking resources away from programme delivery. Further if the information gathered is to be useful in decision-making, it must be seen by the organisation as credible. Specific quality assurance efforts are required to ensure that the data gathered are valid and reliable. These could include both efforts internal to the organisation as well as the use of external oversight.

Thus we would expect to see specific organisational processes in place to create knowledge about the results the organisation is, or is not, accomplishing.

4.2. Information sharing

Having invested valuable resources in the gathering and analysis of quality data, the results information becomes a valuable resource itself – assuming it is made available to potential users in the organisation in an easy-to-use form. Since the aim is for individuals in the organisation to routinely seek out and consider results information in their ongoing activities, we would expect to see widespread dissemination of the information as the norm. This simple requirement can be at odds with the traditional bureaucratic view of information as a source of power, and hence be carefully guarded and discretely used, or be seen as a source of embarrassment in the blame and shame world. Thus we would expect to see:

● **Knowledge management.** Deliberate practices in the organisation to manage the development and communication of results information.

● **Communication practices.** Procedures in place to ensure the timely delivery of relevant information in useable formats to all who might be able to use the information.

4.3. *Regular review*

The creation and communication of results information will be for naught if the information is not taken into account in the various decision-making venues in the organisation. The measurement of results in the public sector is as much an art as it is a science. Definitive answers to the important performance questions are usually not possible. Even with a sophisticated measurement system in place, there will be ample room and need for experience and judgment of staff and managers. Thus the goal is that results information routinely informs decisions, not that decision-making becomes automated.

But we frequently see that this does not happen in organisations. Decisions are taken without relevant results information at the table, or such information is viewed by decision-makers as something to get around rather than to use. Experience and "gut feel" are seen as adequate for guiding actions. And of course, that is how much public sector management has been and is undertaken. But the public sector trends outlined earlier are arguing the need for a more empirically based approach to management. Reviewing past actions based on empirical evidence on what has worked or not is not part of the decision-making processes in many organisations.

In our view, what is required is that "review" become as integral to managing an organisation as planning. What is required is:

- **Review of performance.** Processes in an organisation requiring regular and routine review of past accomplishments and failures by decision-makers at different levels.

- **Accountable decisions.** Processes to ensure that decisions on future actions demonstrate how they relate to what has been learned about what works and what does not.

In summary, we have identified seven generic OLMs we would expect to see in an organisation that is indeed learning from its past (Box 1).

The OLMs we have identified can also serve as criteria for assessing the extent to which an organisation is indeed learning (in the sense we mean here). In our experience, the gaps frequently found are:

- a lack of attention to quality assurance practices – suggesting that a limited value is being placed on data gathering efforts (weak inquiry);

- limited communication of results information – again suggesting it is not seen as an essential aspect for managing (weak transparency);

- review of activities undertaken as an afterthought or as an external requirement – indicating that review is not a serious part of managing (weak integrity and issue orientation); and

> **Box 1. Organisational learning mechanisms for results based learning**
>
> **Credible measurement and analysis:**
> - deliberate measurement practices;
> - useful analysis;
> - data quality assurance practices.
>
> **Information dissemination:**
> - knowledge management practices;
> - wide-spread communication of results information.
>
> **Regular review:**
> - practices for routine review of accomplishments;
> - procedures for follow-up on decisions taken.

- no review and challenging of decision taken to show the extent to which they were informed by results information (weak accountability).

As indicated in the brackets, one can see that most of these gaps correspond to weaknesses in the learning values outlined earlier in Tables 1 and 2.

5. Why is review not loved?

If the programmes of a public sector organisation were all working just fine, delivering the goods and services efficiently, and producing the desired benefits for citizens in an effective manner, there would be little need to emphasise formalised learning. Other than perhaps an occasional check on reality, there would be little to do other than carrying on in the same fashion as before.

Of course that is not reality. Things are not working just fine, conditions are changing, priorities are changing, resources are changing and management is often a scramble just to get through the day.

Public sector organisations, however, do not like to admit that things have gone wrong, even internally. Too frequently, risk avoidance is the practice, and mistakes are downplayed or blamed on someone or something else. Yet, in our view, organisations will not be able to learn from their past efforts unless they can actively learn from their mistakes. Organisations need to, as Michael (1993) has suggested, embrace errors.

Review as an organisational practice – as an OLM – is not loved largely because it tends to show the things that are not working well, the things that have gone off the track. It involves admitting mistakes, finding out what went

wrong and who might have erred, and making that knowledge known in (and probably outside) the organisation.

6. An error-embracing culture

Most public sector organisations live in a world of considerable uncertainty and complexity (Zapico-Goni and Mayne, 1997). Michael (1993) points to the need to be able to live with uncertainty, of admitting that all is not known, but also of valuing the opportunity to learn from knowing what has not worked well. In this environment, the organisation values resilience – the ability to adjust, to accommodate and to partially contain problems.

That may be what is needed but how to get there? This takes us into the cultural aspects of organisational learning. Table 1 identified key values needed to support organisational learning. What values would an organisation have to exhibit in order to "embrace errors"? A little reflection suggests that the values needed so that active learning from errors can be supported include a willingness:

● to seek out explanations of what went wrong (inquiry);

● to accept and discuss the facts uncovered (integrity, issue orientation, transparency);

● to adopt new approaches as a result (accountability).

Of course, the suggestion is not to seek out error, but rather to deliberately encourage learning when errors occur. Indeed, an organisation would try through good risk management to minimise its errors, but not to the point of stifling the learning values listed in Table 1.

7. Learning from the past measurement initiatives

In terms of the OLMs in Box 1, by far the most common ones found in public sector organisations are those which measure and analyse evaluative information on the organisation's performance. There is considerable literature addressing the general question of the use (or non-use) made of evaluative information. Utilisation of evaluative information – our "regular review" OLM – is the subject of ongoing discussion in the evaluation profession (Preskill and Torres, 2000), but the link with the literature on organisational learning has, for the most part, yet to be extensively explored. The book by Leeuw, Rist, and Sonnichsen (1994) and work by Preskill and Torres (1999) are useful exceptions.

Over the past several decades, considerable efforts have been made in trying to measure the results of public sector programmes and to use that information to improve programmes and the accountability of programmes. These areas of measurement effort are:

- performance measurement/monitoring;

- programme and policy evaluation; and

- performance reporting.

These OLMs can be found in many public sector organisations today, and each is the subject of a large amount of literature.

By and large (and with notable exceptions) success in these areas has been limited, despite considerable effort and expense. Routine use of the evaluative information produced by these measurement OLMs is not the norm in the public sector. What is the problem?

- Too much performance information is being produced?

- The wrong type of information is being produced?

- The information is not credible?

- The information is not timely?

At different times, we suggest, each of these problems has existed and has limited the use made of performance information in organisations. What have we learned about organisational learning from this measurement perspective?

7.1. *Performance measurement/monitoring*

We can identify several problems encountered when implementing ongoing performance measurement and monitoring in an organisation:

- Too often, performance measurement is done without an adequate framework being set out. Without some framework of what the programme is supposed to be accomplishing, such as a results chain or logic chart, the measures selected have no context and cannot be credibly interpreted as representing an aspect of the programme's performance. Frequently, too many indicators are tracked, overwhelming an organisation.

- The performance measurement system is inflexible, unable to reflect changing priorities and changing circumstances.

- Inadequate measurement expertise is used in implementing the performance measurement systems. There is no "profession" of performance measurers as there is with evaluators.

- Questions of the quality of the data being collected are often not given adequate attention in organisations, such as through a robust quality assurance system. The credibility of performance measurement data is often questioned by those expected to use or be influenced by performance measurement information.

- Organisations may expect too much from a performance measurement system. As we have suggested, measurement will include considerable

uncertainty, often not providing definitive answers to performance questions, especially if not accompanied with evaluations.

● Indeed, performance measurement on its own cannot provide answers to some important performance questions, such as those dealing with attribution. A weakness has been that performance measurement systems are not seen as part of a broader measurement strategy which would include analysis and evaluation.

7.2. Programme and policy evaluation

Evaluation has experienced similar problems:

● Seen as the only measurement tool in an organisation, evaluation is hard to sustain. Since evaluations tend to be expensive, are done periodically and take time, they need to be part of a broader measurement strategy which includes ongoing performance measurement and analysis of performance information.

● Expectations for evaluation often are oversold. Evaluation cannot be all things to all people in an organisation: a research tool and an accountability tool; an aid to operations and a tool for policy development; comprehensive and specific.

● Experience suggests that evaluation in an organisation cannot address significant rationale questions about the organisation and its major programmes: there are limits to double-loop learning from inside an organisation (Mayne, Divorsky and Lemaire, 1999). They have argued the need for several different kinds of evaluations to deal with the range of performance questions that are of interest.

● Timeliness is a problem. It has often proven difficult to make evaluation findings available at a time when they might be able to influence decisions.

● The weak quality of the evaluations produced often leads to a credibility gap. In addition to data quality issues, evaluations often do not address issues that are of prime concern to the organisation at a point in time.

7.3. Performance reporting

Performance reporting to external bodies is now an accepted feature of many jurisdictions and indeed in many cases legislated. However, progress towards credible reporting is painfully slow (Auditor General of Canada, 2000; Boyle, forthcoming). Problems include:

● difficulty and reluctance in setting out clear and meaningful performance expectations against which to report future performance accomplishments;

● a tendency to report only the good news;

- an insufficient focus on the quality of the data and information being reported, and a general lack of skills and experience in good performance reporting;
- inadequate use made in reporting of the findings from evaluations.

Overall what can we conclude? Measurement and reporting efforts in the public sector have suffered from:

- lack of an overall perspective on performance, exacerbated by inadequate integration between ongoing performance measurement efforts and periodic evaluation studies. Better integration could address the problems of timeliness and limited scope;
- inadequate attention to data quality (seeing empirical information as an asset not a cost);
- inadequate expertise in measurement;
- unwillingness to seek out, learn from and report bad news (error-avoidance);
- unrealistic expectations regarding measurement. There is often an inadequate recognition that measurement in the public sector is not an exact science, and that empirical information is intended to inform not determine decisions. Conclusive proof on the results achieved from programmes and policies often is not attainable. This implies there is a need to accept a degree of uncertainty in our knowledge about public sector performance. This further implies that mistakes and errors are inevitable.

The need for an error-embracing culture is clear.

8. Implications for public sector organisations

What then can we learn from past measurement experience? How does this relate to the framework we have presented for organisational learning? In our view, results-based learning in an organisation requires several things, discussed below.

8.1. *Investment in sensible and quality measurement*

For empirical information on performance to play a significant role in an organisation, the collection and analysis of results information needs to be taken seriously and to be treated as a valuable asset of the organisation. We would expect to see:

- a deliberate measurement strategy spelled out that includes ongoing performance measurement/monitoring, routine analysis of data and information, and periodic evaluations;

- a results framework for the organisation which spells out the logical structure of the organisation and its programmes, as well as what the organisation expects to accomplish;
- attention paid to measuring the propriety of the means used to achieve the results;
- realistic expectations established for measurement as to the role it can play;
- data and information quality assurance practices in place.

These concerns mainly deal with the supply side of the equation: how to improve the supply of timely, quality evaluative information. They cover the credible measurement and analysis OLMs of Box 1.

Much of the organisational learning literature tends to focus on the demand side: What does it take for an organisation to make results information a key part of its management? What is needed is that supply meets demand (Mayne, 1994). The demand side, it was suggested, consists of having information sharing and regular review systems and procedures in place – the other OLMs mentioned in Box 1 – supported by appropriate learning values, including the need for an error-embracing culture.

8.2. *Supporting learning values*

We know the kinds of values needed. Risk aversion in public sector organisations needs to be replaced by considered management of risks, a willingness to admit when things go wrong and to be able to discuss errors. This requires:

- leadership from the top which demonstrates the value of learning;
- a free flow of information in a non-hierarchal way – transparency;
- rewarding inquiry and learning, especially from mistakes;
- political support for a learning public service;
- an accountability system which supports learning.

There is not much that is new in this list. The difficult question is how to develop these requirements together in an organisation – the model in mind being that if these values and factors can be brought about, then we will likely see organisational learning occur. But, in concluding, we would like to turn this logic around and suggest that appropriate systems and procedures in public sector organisations could go a long way to creating and supporting the needed learning values.

9. Using systems and procedures to drive learning

Organisations, and perhaps public sector organisations in particular, thrive on systems and procedures. While problems of excessive rules and

procedures in organisations are legend, it remains the case that much of what organisations do – including well-managed organisations – is defined by the systems and procedures they put in place. Key functions in organisations include budgeting, programme planning and human resource planning, in addition to day-to-day managing towards objectives.

What is missing from that list of key functions – in practice and in the literature – is (regular) review. There are no counterparts, for example, to the usual requirements for strategic plans, annual operational plans, planning committees, and the like. "Plans" in some detail are needed to get budgets approved, but not "reviews". High-profile planning committees and planning retreats abound, but not similar review committees and review retreats to consider past performance of programmes and operations. Audit and review committees do often exist, but they tend to structure their agendas around specific periodic audits and evaluations that have been completed.

We suggest that if review were as required in an organisation as was planning or budgeting, organisational learning would be significantly advanced and the necessary learning values learned. One might imagine a variety of review mechanisms in place at different levels within a public sector organisation, such as:

● Mandatory reviews when projects or significant milestones are completed by those involved, documenting what went well and what not so well, before approval is given for undertaking new projects or the next steps.

● Annual review retreats where the organisational-wide lessons are discussed and documented, undertaken before strategic planning is done.

● Requirements for budget requests to routinely be supported by relevant evidence from past experience.

● Active internal audit and evaluation functions seen as part of the organisation's set of review mechanisms.

● A monthly review committee that not only considers both the quality and findings from audits and evaluations, but also the most current operational performance information (such as in the form of a performance dashboard), as well as the quality of other review mechanisms operating in the organisation.

Many other such review mechanisms can probably be envisaged. If they became an integral part of how the organisation managed – which itself would require leadership – "learning" would be forced on the organisation and its values. Over time, with leadership, review – results-based learning – would likely become a routine part of managing.

10. Concluding remarks

The challenges in moving to a learning organisation are many. This is certainly the case in the public sector. Strong hierarchies and risk-aversion behaviour are two characteristics which tend not to support a learning culture. The predilection to follow rules and procedures unquestionably is another characteristic of many public organisations which tends to run counter to experimenting and learning.

Organisations are indeed good at setting up systems and procedures. Setting up formal information sharing and especially formal review procedures is something that would be quite doable with the right leadership. Such procedures could go a long way, in our view, to addressing these challenges and establishing and encouraging organisational learning values. This would in turn support real results-based learning.

Notes

1. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Office of the Auditor General. The authors would like to thank Ngoun Anupheap for assisting in background research that made this paper possible. The paper is based on a presentation made by Maria Barrados at the OECD Symposium on the Learning Government in February 2003.

Bibliography

Argyris, C. and D.A. Schön (1996), *Organisational Learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*, Addison-Wesley.

Behn, R. (2000), *Rethinking Democratic Accountability*, Brookings.

Boyle, R. (forthcoming), Assessment of Performance Reports: A comparative Perspective. In Schwartz, R. and Mayne, J. (eds). *Quality Matters: Seeking Confidence in Evaluation, Auditing and Performance Reporting*. Transaction Publishers. New Jersey.

Easterby-Smith, M. (1997), "Disciplines of Organisational Learning: Contributions and Critiques", *Human Relations*, 50(9): 1085-1113.

Hatry, H. (1997), "We Need a New Concept of Accountability", *The Public Manager*, 26(3), 37-38.

Leeuw, F., R.C. Rist and R.C. Sonnichsen (eds.) (1994), *Can Governments Learn? – Comparative Perspectives on Evaluation and Organisational Learning,* Transaction Publishers.

Lipshitz, R. and M. Popper (2000), "Organisational Learning in a Hospital", *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(3), 345-361.

Mayne, J., S. Divorsky and D. Lemaire (1999), "Locating Evaluation: Anchoring Evaluation in the Executive or the Legislature, or Both or Elsewhere?" in R. Boyle and D. Lemaire (eds.), *Building Effective Evaluation Capacity: Lessons from Practice*, Transaction Publishers, 23-52.

Mayne, J. (1994), "Utilizing Evaluation in Organisations: The Balancing Act" in F.L. Leeuw, R.C. Rist and R.C Sonnichsen (eds.), *Can Governments Learn? – Comparative Perspectives on Evaluation and Organisational Learning,* Transaction Publishers, 17-44.

Michael, D. (1993), "Governing by Learning: Boundaries, Myths and Metaphors", *Futures* (93), January/February, 81-89.

OECD (1997), *In Search of Results: Performance Management Practices*, Paris.

OECD (1999), *Performance Contracting: Lessons from Performance Contracting Case Studies – A Framework for Public Sector Performance Contracting*, PUMA/PAC(99)2.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (1997), *Moving Toward Managing for Results* (Chapter 11), Report of the Auditor General, Ottawa.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (2000), *Reporting Performance to Parliament: Progress Too Slow* (Chapter 19), Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons, Ottawa.

Office of the Auditor General of Canada (2002), *Modernizing Accountability in the Public Sector* (Chapter 9), Report of the Auditor General to the House of Commons, Ottawa.

Preskill, H. and R.T. Torres (1999), "Evaluative Inquiry for Learning in Organisations" in M. Easterby-Smith, J. Burgoyne and L. Araujo (eds.), *Organisational Learning and the Learning Organisation: Developments in Theory and Practice*, Sage Publications, 92-113.

Preskill, H. and R.T. Torres (2000), "The Learning Dimension of Evaluation Use", *New Directions for Evaluation*, No. 88, 25-37.

Torres, R.T. and H. Preskill (2001), "Evaluation and Organisational Learning: Past, Present and Future", *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(3), 387-395.

Zapico-Goni, E. and J. Mayne (eds.) (1997), "Performance Monitoring: Implications for the Future" in J. Mayne and E. Zapico-Goni (eds.), *Monitoring Performance in the Public Sector,* Transaction Publishers.

Bibliography

Dolowitz, D. and D. Marsh (1996), "Who Learns What from Whom: A Review of the Policy Transfer Literature", *Political Studies*, 44, pp. 343-357.

Dolowitz, D. *et al* (2000), *Policy Transfer and British Social Policy: Learning from the USA?*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Halligan, J. (1996), "The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform", pp. 288-317 in H. Bekke, J. Perry and T. Toonen (eds.) *Civil Service Systems in Comparative Perspective*, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Hammer, M. and J. Champy (1995), *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for a Business Revolution* (revised edition), London, Nicholas Brealey.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organisations Across Nations* (2nd edition), Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Hood, C. and M. Jackson (1991), *Administrative Argument*, Aldershot, Dartmouth.

Hood, C. (1998), *The Art of the State*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Jackson, B. (2001), *Management Gurus and Management Fashions*, Routledge, London.

De Jong, M., K. Lalenis and V. Mamadouh (eds.) (2002), *The Theory and Practice of Institutional Transplantation: Experiences with the Transfer of Policy Institutions*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.

Joss, R. and M. Kogan (1995), *Advancing Quality: Total Quality Management in the National Health Service*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Kingdon, J. (1984), *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies*, Boston, Little Brown.

Klein, R. (1997), "Learning from others: shall the first be last?", Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law, 22:5, pp. 1267-1278.

Lynn, L. (1996), *Public Management as Art, Science and Profession*, New Jersey, Chatham House.

Manning, N. (2001), "The Legacy of the New Public Management in Developing Countries", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67, pp. 297-312.

Pierson, P. (2000), "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence and the Study of Politics", *American Political Science Review*, 94:2, pp. 251-267.

Pollitt, C. (2001), "Clarifying Convergence: Striking Similarities and Durable Differences in Public Management Reform", *Public Management Review*, 4:1, pp. 471-492.

Pollitt, C. (2003), *The Essential Public Manager*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Pollitt, C., X. Girre, J. Lonsdale , R. Mul, H. Summa and M. Waerness (1999), *Performance or Compliance? Performance Audit and Public Management in Five Countries*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C. and G. Bouckaert (2000), *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C., J. Caulfield, A. Smullen and C. Talbot (2001), "Agency Fever? Analysis of an International Fashion", *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 3, pp. 271-290.

Pollitt, C. and C. Talbot (eds.) (2003), *Unbundled Government*, London, Taylor and Francis.

Powell, W. and P. DiMaggio (1991), *The New Institutionalism in Organisational Analysis*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Power, M. (1996), *The Audit Society*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Premfors, R. (1998), "Re-shaping the Democratic State: Swedish Experiences in a Comparative Perspective", *Public Administration*, 76:1, Spring, pp. 141-159.

Radaelli, C. (2002), *The Politics of Regulatory Impact Analysis in the OECD Countries: Best Practice and Lesson-drawing*, paper presented to the ESRC seminar on Regulatory Impact Analysis in Comparative Perspective, CARR, London School of Economics and Political Science, 11 March.

Rinne, J. (2001), *Re-designing the State in Latin America: Pundits, Policy-makers and Organised Labour in Argentina and Brazil*, Ph.D thesis submitted to the Department of Politics, Princeton University, USA.

Rogers, E.M. (1995), "Diffusion of Innovations" (4th Edition), New York, The Free Press.

Rose, R. (1993), *Lesson-drawing in Public Policy*, Chatham, NJ, Chatham House.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2001), "National, International and Transnational Constructions of New Public Management", pp. 43-72 in T. Christensen and P. Lægreid (eds.) *New Public Management: The Transformation of Ideas and Practice*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Stiglitz, J. (2003), "Democratising the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank: Governance and Accountability", *Governance*, 16:1, pp. 11-139.

Stone, D. (1999), "Learning Lessons and Transferring Policy, Across Time, Space and Disciplines", *Politics*, 19:1, pp. 51-59.

Talbot, C. and J. Caulfield (2002), *Hard Agencies in Soft States: A Study of Agency Creation Programmes in Jamaica, Latvia and Tanzania*, A report for the United Kingdom Department for International Development, Pontypridd, University of Glamorgan.

Taliercio, R. (2003), "Revenue Authorities in Africa and Latin America", Chapter 14 in C. Pollitt and C. Talbot (eds.) *Unbundling Government*, London, Taylor and Francis.

Van Thiel, S. (2001), *Quangocratisation: Trends, Causes and Consequences*, Aldershot, Dartmouth.

Westney, D. (1987), *Imitation and Innovation: The Transfer of Western Organisational Patterns to Meiji Japan*, Cambridge, MA., Harvard University Press.

Wolman, H. (1992), "Understanding Cross-national Policy Transfers: The Case of Britain and the US", *Governance*, 5:1, January, pp. 27-45.

Wyatt, A. and S. Grimmeisen (2001), *Policy Transfer and Lesson-drawing: Towards a Set of Principles to Guide Practitioners*, paper by the Centre for Management and Policy Studies, United Kingdom Cabinet Office, London, August.

Zbaracki, M. (1998), "The Rhetoric and Reality of Total Quality Management", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, pp. 602-636.

Table of Contents