

Co-management in public service provision: the organisational effects

Paper presented at the 2006 EGPA Conference in Milan

Taco Brandsen, Assistant Professor, Tilburg University, Faculty of Law, Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. Tel. + 31-13-4662128. Fax + 31-13-4668149. E-mail: t.brandsen@uvt.nl.

Eelco van Hout, Assistant Professor, Tilburg University, Faculty of Law, Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands. Tel. + 31-13-4662128. Fax + 31-13-4668149. E-mail: E.J.Th.vanHout@uvt.nl.

Abstract

The organised third sector increasingly produces public services in collaboration with the state. This has not left the organisations in question unaffected. Recent research suggests that organisations involved in public service delivery are evolving towards forms of network production, in which the production process takes shape across a number of different organisations. As we will argue, organisations are faced with simultaneous pressures for differentiation and integration, which are alleviated (though not resolved) by internal changes in staffing, skills, structure and management style. Some of the problems of integrating public service networks are essentially resolved within organisations.

Keywords

Public services, third sector, non-profit, network integration, differentiation.

1. Introduction

The organised third sector increasingly produces public services in collaboration with the state. In this collection, such an arrangement is referred to as co-management. Political rhetoric often suggests that this is a new phenomenon, but in fact such co-operation goes back a long way. What we now call the ‘third sector’ provided public services before the state ever did and in many countries its involvement in the welfare state dates back as far as the 19th century. It has not left the organisations in question unaffected. There is by now a wide range of literature documenting (and often lamenting) the transformation of informal, voluntary organisations to professional service deliverers. In this contribution, we will ignore the normative question whether the process of rationalisation was good or bad in the first place, and look at the stage beyond. Recent research suggests that organisations involved in public service delivery are evolving towards forms of network production, in which the production process takes shape across a number of different organisations.

Various theories have been applied to this phenomenon, most notably the network theories that have been on the ascent in recent decades. Our analysis is indebted to this work and attempts to forge a tighter link with organisational theory. Network theory tends to conceptualise organisations as coherent entities, which is useful as an analytical method, but must be qualified by the observation that some of the problems associated with network integration are played out within organisations. The concept of co-management helps us to explore this phenomenon by linking interorganisational relations to the internal production process. As we will argue, organisations are faced with simultaneous pressures for differentiation and integration, which are alleviated (though not resolved) by internal changes in staffing, skills, structure and management style. Some of the problems of integrating public service networks are essentially resolved within organisations.

In our analysis, we will draw on empirical evidence from research projects in different fields of social policy:

- The results of the project ‘Housing association diversification in Europe’, an intensive case study analysis of social landlords in Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK, including thirty-five interviews with managers and stakeholders, and extensive documentation analysis;
- The results of the project ‘Managing hybrid care services’, an intensive case study analysis of several levels of management in four providers of elderly care in the Netherlands, based on forty interviews;
- The results of the project ‘Local care networks: meeting local care demands’, based on fifty interviews and extensive documentation analysis in local care and care-related organisations.

These studies do not constitute a representative sample and provide input for what is essentially an exploratory analysis. What we will arrive at are preliminary conclusions that require more systematic testing. To be clear about the nature of our case material, we have separated it from the main body of the text in the form of text boxes.

In paragraph two, we will describe the developments that have given rise to co-management, as well as our specific angle on these phenomena. Paragraph three will describe tensions that arise within the networks within which service providers operate, which in turn may affect how they are internally organised. Accordingly, paragraph four describes several of such internal changes, e.g. in terms of staffing,

skills and structure. The concluding paragraph five discusses the broader implications of these findings for the concept of co-management.

2. Mixed mechanisms in public service delivery

Public service delivery is not the exclusive territory of public administration, as it never really was. Modern governance implies that multiple parties are involved in the delivery of health care, elderly care, education, housing, welfare, safety and other public goods. Recent decades have been marked by a re-arrangement of the relationships between the state and third sector organisations that supply public goods and services like education, housing, health care and community services. New third sector organisations have been drawn into public service provision; in other words, there has been an increase in co-management between third sector and state. In addition, those third sector organisation already in the public services have faced the challenges of quasi-marketisation and/or performance measurement. Long-term relationships based on trust have been replaced by short-term, contract-based relationship, changing the nature of the government-third sector partnership. Broadly speaking, two types of effects can be discerned, one of integration and one of differentiation. It is one of the classic tensions of social science, which we will here approach primarily through the lens of organisational theory. In this context, differentiation denotes a rational division of labour, whereas integration refers to the coordination of interdependent activities (cf. Jaffee, 2001). If an organisation is to work effectively, then the two must be balanced. Any movement towards differentiation must be compensated by a movement towards integration. There is a lot of third sector research documenting the effects of public contracting and regulation, imposed on groups and organisations when they apply for state funding. Such effects are usually conceived of in terms of rationalisation, and more specifically bureaucratisation.

At the level of organisations, it leads to a harder and more explicit social division of labour. The activities of organisations are redefined in terms of bureaucratic categories of action ('housing', 'welfare' etc.), which then become 'core tasks'. At the level of tasks, the process leads to a greater technical division of labour, with public goods disassembled into small and specialized components. For example, elderly care can be differentiated into different medical treatments (revalidation, different kinds of cure), into specific aspects of care (e.g. personal care, transport, home support), but also into the maintenance of buildings, treasury management and even staffing. This is a (perhaps inevitable) consequence of the effort to make services more accountable and more efficient.

There are several potential disbenefits of differentiation, such as the risk of asymmetric dependencies between parts of the system, the possibility that one element of the system may disfunction, conflicting interaction between the different parts and the costs of integration (Kenis, 2006). Research on the third sector has tended to focus on the risks on asymmetric dependencies. As the system of public service delivery is further differentiated, there is a need for stronger mechanisms to integrate the various tasks (cf. Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). The different parts of the service delivery system must interact in such a way that they produce the desired outcome. The empirical evidence described in the next sections indicates that the opposite movement towards integration is initiated within the organisations themselves.

The movement towards integration that we are referring to takes the shape of linked production processes. Public services are increasingly delivered by networks rather than by single organisations and the integration of production processes is therefore closely linked to the integration of networks.

Our analysis has an obvious affinity with the network theories that have emerged in public management research (e.g. Klijn et al., 1995; Klijn, 1996; Koppenjan and Klijn, 2004). Much of this work is focused on the formation of networks (e.g. processes of framing, network activation) and the games played by actors in these networks (e.g. partnerships, selective activation). However, our conceptual starting-point differs from these and similar applications of network theory, which conceive of organisations as individual actors, connected to other individual actors. This is a useful analytical starting-point, especially when the focus is on processes at the network level and effective network management. However, there is the risk of losing sight of the fact that some of the dynamics of networks are played out below the network level. In the current analysis, we wish to draw attention to the relationship between network interactions and the internal organisation. We will therefore wander purposefully in the border area between organisational and network theory. In that sense, our analysis is somewhat more closely related to studies on process management (e.g. De Bruijn et al., 2002) and on boundaryless organisations (Ashkenas, 2002).

Given that the involvement of third sector organisations in public service delivery causes greater differentiation, and that this in turn causes a need for a compensating movement of integration, then the question for our analysis of co-management is how the latter is realised. Our focus in the current analysis will be primarily on third sector organisations, given that they have been central to the empirical studies that underpin our argument. However, it may be possible to generalise our argument to other types of organisations. There are significant similarities between state, commercial and third sector organisations active in the public services. In fact, they increasingly tend to become 'hybrid', without clearly belonging to any of these spheres.¹ The autonomy gained through such a hybrid position may in itself be one of the drivers of the integration process we have described. If hybridisation is as important as we have claimed elsewhere (Brandsen and Van Hout, 2004; Brandsen, Van de Donk and Putters, 2005) then our findings may be more widely relevant.

In any case, our findings show that co-management does not necessarily lead to a state of asymmetric dependence in which the autonomy of the third sector is lost. Many organisations appear to have taken important steps in rejuvenating welfare state policies from the bottom up, attempting to resolve major tensions at the stage of policy implementation. The flipside is that it engenders a constant struggle over the coherence and identity of the organisation.

3. Rising tensions

The tension between differentiation and integration rises (or, to be more precise, sharpens) in relation to three aspects of third sector organisations: external relations, accountability and task demarcation.

¹ Hybridity, in our definition, refers to a mix of co-ordinating mechanisms. 'Pure' state, market and third sector organisations rarely exist, so this must be regarded as a movement along a continuum away from idealtypical representations. Hybridity represents the stage where elements from different idealtypes become entangled to the point where there is no longer a clear match with any single type.

External relations: competition and co-operation

At the network level, the relationship between the different actors (state and third sector) involved in the production of services has become more ambiguous. On the one hand, they are increasingly in a situation where they are competitors (when the organisations address the same demands) or in a purchaser-provider relationship (e.g. when local authorities outsource part of the functions to other organisations). On the other hand, the products they make are often inextricably bound up, either as part of a chain or of a single geographical area. Patients often pass through different types of care; local communities are served by various organisations simultaneously.

Efficiency and effectiveness, the objectives behind the reforms, also call for closer integration. This combined drive for competition and co-operation within a context of joint products places the managers of providers in a difficult position. The activities needed to achieve these two seem to be in direct conflict. Depending on the field in which providers are active, these conflicts appear to take different forms.

If services are produced in chains, as in health care, the integration of differentiated organisations is encouraged by transparent and interlocking organisational processes. One provider must pass on as much information about its clients to the next provider in the chain, so that care can be adapted to individual needs and the transition made as smooth as possible. This, in turn, requires a certain level of uniformity in administrative data and procedures, as well as openness regarding the treatments and other services clients have previously received. Competition, by contrast, favours distinctiveness and secrecy in relation to other providers. The aim of the game is to stay distinct. To give up one's distinctiveness or to share information about how it is achieved is to lose competitive advantage. This is an incentive for providers not to co-operate with other types of organisations active in its functional and/or geographical territory.

The same problem occurs when the relationship is one of purchaser and provider. Especially where innovation is concerned, which is long-term and risky, a certain extent of certainty is required. Yet the need to abide by regulations for public procurement often makes such certainty hard to achieve, as it is formally impossible to create preferred-supplier relationships. There have been instances when providers invested in innovative schemes, in close cooperation with local authorities, only to be replaced at the implementation stage, where they lost out to cheaper competitors. In the end, such uncertainty may discourage long-term innovation.

Accountability

One trend is for co-management to result in a stronger structuration of the activities of service providers. This expresses itself most clearly in relation to accountability, where there has been a major shift towards output legitimacy. The number of performance indicators has grown rapidly over the past years. It is a by now well-studied phenomenon, as is the oft-heard complaint that we are heading for an 'audit society' (Power, 1997). Employees and managers of service providers argue that they feel that they are often more occupied with justifying themselves than with performing their duties. Whether or not such complaints are justified we will not discuss here.

What is important to note for our argument is that accountability mechanisms often overlap and sometimes hardly seem to be coordinated. This is perhaps to some extent inevitable, given the multiplicity of objectives in the context of co-management. For instance, meeting the professional requirements of social services (e.g. to devote personal attention to clients) can be at odds with the requirement to be efficient. The

economic requirement to increase the numbers of students in higher education conflicts with the educational quality of universities, unless additional funds are made available - which is rarely the case. The ambiguous and conflicting nature of organisational goals may be noted by organisational theorists as early as the 1950s and is certainly not particular to the context we are describing. However, the formalisation of such goals through accountability mechanisms, established as a consequence of co-management, sharpens the potential conflicts between goals because it reduces the scope for balancing by means of consensus. It is therefore more likely to encourage 'loose coupling', in which coherence is sacrificed to deal with external pressures.

Task demarcation: diversification and core tasks

The third and final tension manifests itself in how the organisation defines its core tasks. In the context of state funding, such tasks are often defined on the basis of bureaucratic borderlines. From a top-down perspective, the borders are necessary for the protection of budgets and for a clear political and legal division of responsibilities. However, real demand clearly fails to fit within these niches. Citizens tend to have little regard for bureaucratic sensitivities and often address their demands to whichever organisation they happen to be in touch with. While some progress has been made with 'one desk' policies, there remains a tension between the differentiation within public service delivery and the unitary, messy nature of demand.

We have observed that, given that service providers have sufficient autonomy, they start taking initiatives to reconcile this tension. Such initiatives may be presented as 'a focus on communities', 'demand-driven supply', 'putting the customer central', borrowing from both market or third sector discourse, or both. In terms of organisational theory, it comes down to a strategy of diversification, possibly (though not necessarily) accompanied by a cognitive change in how the problems they need to solve are framed.

Accordingly, in our case studies we observed that organisations start to expand into new areas of activity where they believed their clients could be served better. Either they invented and implemented these new activities themselves, or they started formal co-operation with providers in other fields or in other parts of the chain. In health care, hospitals branched out in domiciliary care, following patients further down the production line. Such diversification may even lead to a revision of the organisational mission. For example, in our case study of housing, the associations and foundations in question started out as landlords, who merely rented out their property, and gradually expanded into various forms of urban regeneration and community investment. They went beyond their original (bureaucratically defined) function and adopted a more holistic perspective, in which they would 'revitalise communities' or something similar, treating their housing stock as a means rather than an end. It led to a burst of creative energy within the organisations we examined.

But broadening the organisational scope is not without risks. First of all, it may lead to a conflict with conditions attached to public funding. What from one perspective is considered as 'integration' may be regarded as 'leaking' from another. Furthermore, it is not always clear that organisations are competent in the new ventures they undertake. There are many examples of commercial businesses branching out into areas where they lack the expertise to be successful; the third sector is not necessarily different. Finally, when innovation and creative energy are devoted to new activities, this may adversely affect their core production 'technology', which is supposedly

their strength. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that partnership with the state does not invariably lead to a narrower definition of activities, as much of the literature suggests. We can only speculate at this point, but it seems that organisations that are successful at creating a mixed resource base can acquire more freedom than those that make themselves dependent on a single donor. This would be in line with the premises of resource dependency theory (cf. Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978).

Case 1: complexity and hybridity in Dutch elderly care

The Dutch elderly care sector consists of professional organisations which have gone through several transformations over time, as was the case in many other Western European countries. The variety among providers has greatly increased. The environment of elderly care providers not only consists of clients and the national state, but also of insurance companies, decentralised state agencies (such as the offices that allocate funds), nursing homes, hospitals, municipal authorities, welfare providers, housing associations and so forth. Commercial providers have been allowed to enter the supply side of elderly care, making the overall nature of supply more hybrid in nature.

These developments have resulted in major tensions within the system. The public control and guarantee of elderly care facilities are opposed to market competition between service providing organisations. The relationships between them are partly based on co-operation, both incidental and more permanent, as links of a chain of services; partly, they are based on competition. The drive for greater efficiency leads to an increasing rationalisation of activities, deconstructing elderly care provision and organising it into a set of carefully defined activities.

Dutch elderly care is increasingly about smart networks with a temporary character. Management of elderly care provision is mostly a strategy of leaving room for co-production. Successful elderly care managers have been found to be pragmatic, open and interactive, and intellectual, analytic and with an overview of the wider elderly care sector, rather than only their individual care organisation. (based on: Van Hout, 2006; Brandsen and Van Hout, 2004)

4. The organisational effects of co-management

As we will argue in this paragraph, the three types of tensions are alleviated by adaptations within the internal organisation of service providers. As we have argued, these are basically network tensions that are drawn inward. By implication, efforts to resolve them and restore the cohesion of the organisation also encourage network integration. We will discuss these efforts in relation to skills, staffing, structure and management style. These are the organisational aspects in which we have witnessed the most profound changes in our case studies. We will not suggest that they occur within all organisations, nor with the same intensity everywhere, so they must be regarded as potential directions for future development. Systematic research will have to show the exact conditions under which these developments materialise.

A growing need for soft skills

Handling an increasingly ambiguous, but also increasingly significant external environment requires specific skills. One crucial condition for survival is the ability to

be pragmatic. When demands are multiple and often contradictory, it pays not to have fierce (political) principles on the nature of the service. For example, it may mean having to treat clients differently. It also requires the ability to think strategically, as contacts with other organisations extend across all levels of the internal organisation. Finally, and this is the most far-reaching change, there is the need to invest in ‘soft skills’.

To start with, there need to be good lines of communication into those providing new services and those offering the traditional range of services – regardless of whether the two are in one organisation. Even if the new service is provided by a unit of the same organisation, the work of the various units must be sufficiently integrated.

Again, this is the classic tension between differentiation and integration, but one that is clearly made more urgent by diversification. What will also increasingly happen is that staff members operate on the fringes of the traditional organisation, communicating either with other units or other organisations. They will need to deal with the uncertainties that accompany joint and spread-out products. The significance of boundary-spanning individuals is likely to increase.

All in all, co-management leads to a demand for the generic skills of people who appreciate the importance of the context within which they work, with an ability to track the changing environment, analyse it and respond. Skills of communication are central. A willingness to work at uncertainties and to cope with ambiguity is important, whatever particular specialist skills are also needed. For many organisations these matters imply a considerable shift in culture, brought about by training and, more importantly, by example.

From staffing to sourcing

What the required skills demand in terms of staffing is difficult to say generally, or without treading on toes. Many third sector organizations deliver public services with a relational and/or professional character. They therefore depend strongly on people as their most valuable resource: teachers, attendants, nurses, doctors, and so forth; professionals and volunteers, staff at the ‘frontline’ as well as their managers. Any solution to the previously described tensions, such as the acquisition of new skills, is therefore very likely to involve changes at the level of staffing. Although it is often possible to retrain people and coach them, it may not be possible to achieve the desired cultural turn without some individual sacrifices. In this respect, we will note two trends that have emerged from our research.

One important trend we have observed is that formerly long-term relationships between staff and organization are exchanged for more transitory, contract-based relationships. As demand becomes more volatile, numeric, quantitative flexibility is becomes necessary in order to adapt to demand-driven changes within the context of (quasi-)markets. Simultaneously, temporary staffing helps to guarantee the continuity of public service delivery and to cope with peak moments in demand. However, when services have a strong relational character (which is especially the case in health care and social services) such temporary arrangements can be at odds with the perceived quality of the services.

In addition to this somewhat predictable movement towards flexibility, we have observed a shift from ‘staffing’ to ‘sourcing’. One can distinguish four types of sourcing:

(1) The combined sourcing of organizations delivering comparable services like home care and elderly care on the basis of flexible contracts and informal, personal networks of contractors and subcontractors (so-called ‘ad-sourcing’).

(2) Where the interdependency in public service delivery by the organised third sector is very strong, we observe temporary project organizations, staffed by employees from several organizations (as in PPP-constructions), in which municipalities, care providers, the police force, housing corporations, project developers, building firms, hospitals, social assistance and voluntary organisations together establish temporary organizations ('co-sourcing').

(3) A third and rapidly growing form of sourcing is the one in which specialised staffing agencies deliver staff on a regular basis and actually take over their contracts (traditionally called 'out-sourcing').

(4) The last form covers the mergers of third sector organizations to increase their labour potential ('in-sourcing').

A growing divide between formal and informal structure

All developments lead to a diminishing significance of formal structure. As the pressure for accountability grows, organisations start to decouple formal requirements from actual activities (cf. Meyer and Rowan, 1992). Many new activities are initially introduced within separate functional units. The question, in terms of structure, is whether those separate units should be integrated with other functions. Yet as the activities of service providers diversify, the need to maintain legal and administrative barriers will grow. For a start, external supervisors will demand clear demarcations when public funds are used. For example, housing grants awarded to schemes for the elderly are expected not to spill over into elderly care, even when housing and care are offered as a single package and when they are in practice inseparable. In addition, reducing the financial risks involved in new activities makes it sensible to restrain formal integration, even when in practice old and new activities increasingly blend into one another.

Actual practice always differs from the blueprints, but the combination of developments described above will widen the gap. The need for compensating mechanisms of integration will grow accordingly. Maintaining organisational coherence will increasingly rely on informal rather than formal mechanisms. A greater distinction between the formal and informal structure is therefore likely. If it is to achieve effective coordination, the organisation will have to take on more characteristics of the 'missionary' type (cf. Mintzberg et al., 2003, p. 224).

From contracting and hierarchy to trust and persuasion

This, in turn, fits well with the rising significance of external relations. When specialist skills and information are needed, but they are not available within the organisations themselves, members must look to their network to access them. In addition, the need for additional financial resources and partners requires a visible presence in local and regional networks, if not a role in local governance. Given such requirements, the identification of interesting new partners will be a skill of increasing value, both at the management and the street level. One difficulty is to assess the reliability of other organisations as future partners. Here we come back to the tension between competition and cooperation. On the one hand, the integration of local and regional networks requires an investment in long-term, trust-based relationships, with a select group of partners. On the other hand, greater emphasis on competition and contracting upsets the stability of at least some of these relationships, as already noted in research on the quasi-markets established during the 1980s and 1990s (e.g. Bartlett et al., 1998). When an organisation has a strong internal culture of co-operation, as we

argued for in the previous section, it therefore makes sense to export that culture to its relationships with stakeholders, rather than to focus on hard contracting.

As the organisation's core tasks are increasingly fulfilled in partnerships, they shift outward, and the organisation's boundaries become more fluid. By implication, it may increasingly become a network-like organisation. One should not get carried away by such a concept: local service deliverers are not international businesses competing on dynamic global markets and one should be wary of using fashionable concepts where they do not apply. Nevertheless, some of the looseness of external networks will be drawn inward and this may require a change of management style. As managers no longer maintain full control of the services their organisation offers, they increasingly have to operate through incentives and persuasion rather than hierarchy. This is where co-management starts to undermine the managerialist ethic: managers will lose power as their organisations diversify and stretch out. To be more precise, they will have to exercise a different kind of power, with an emphasis on charisma and inspiration rather than rule-making. Also, it will become more important to watch the quality of the organisation's gatekeepers and boundary spanners. There is a potential trade-off between effective gate-keeping and responsiveness to network partners, although this is not necessarily the case.

Case 2: Housing association diversification

In 2004-2005 Tilburg University (The Netherlands) and Coventry University (UK) conducted a joint research project into the diversification of the activities of social landlords in Ireland, Italy, The Netherlands and the UK (Brandsen, Cardoso Ribeiro & Farnell, 2006). Most of the landlords provide some additional personal services to residents in need, whether health and personal care for the elderly, care for those with learning difficulties and other disabilities, the provision of welfare benefits advice and debt counselling or capacity building for residents looking for work or wanting new skills. Practice varies between associations. Some undertake these tasks themselves. Others work with specialist partners to deliver such services on a contractual basis. Some provide these services to local people who are not their residents, but who are easily accessible to areas of main provision.

These new activities have required landlords to rethink their staff policy, their internal communication and their criteria for adopting new initiatives. When should they say no? On a more fundamental level, it has raised questions about their organisational mission. Is their purpose to provide social rented housing, as a goal, or is social rented housing their means of solving problems in neighbourhoods, as a means?

5. Conclusion

Co-management brings third sector organisations into the public services, and into an environment that has been subject to extensive changes. As a result, the organisations are pulled towards differentiation, while they simultaneously take initiatives that encourage integration. This manifests itself in (at least) three ways. In relations with partners within their networks, providers find that they must both compete and co-operate, trust and distrust. The requirements for accountability increase, each of them reasonable in itself, but a threat to the organisation's integrity when they come together in complex and contradictory configurations. Diversification appears to be a

way of integrating activities that are artificially differentiated, but it may threaten the organisation's core business.

The third sector organisations we observed found various ways to ease the tensions: flexible staffing arrangements, the acquirement of new skills, decoupling and a different style of management. Given that we only conducted a limited number of case studies, it is too early to assess the general implications of what we have observed. These are potential directions in which similar organisations could develop. If future research were to reproduce the same findings on a more systematic basis, it would be evidence of a powerful innovative force in the contemporary welfare state.

References

- Ashkenas, R. et al. (2002) The Boundaryless Organization, San Fransico: Jossey-Bass.
- Bartlett, W., J.A. Roberts and J. Le Grand (1998) The development of quasi-markets in the 1990s, in J. A. Roberts a. J. Le Grand, W. Bartlett, (ed.), A Revolution in Social Policy: Quasi-Market Reforms in the 1990s, Bristol: The Policy Press, 1-16
- Brandsen, T., Cardoso Ribeiro, T. and Farnell, R. (2006) Housing Association Diversification in Europe, Coventry: The Rex Group (available for download at www.uvt.nl/kameleon/rexreport.pdf).
- Brandsen, T., Van de Donk, W. and K. Putters, K. (2005) Griffins or Chameleons? Hybridity as a Permanent and Inevitable Characteristic of the Third Sector, International Journal of Public Administration, 28: 9-10, pp. 749-65.
- Brandsen, T. and Van Hout, E. (2004) Public Management Dilemmas in Dutch Domiciliary Care, paper presented at the Eighth International Research Symposium on Public Management, Budapest, 31 March -2 April 2004.
- Breedveld, E. (2003) Thuiszorg in Bedrijf: Herstructurering van de Thuiszorgbranche tussen 1987 en 1997, Tilburg: Van Spaendonck.
- Bruijn, H., Ten Heuvelhof, E. and R. In 't Veld (2002) Process Management, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Hout, E.J.Th.van. (2006) Hybriditeit in de Ouderenzorg: Leidraad voor Innovatie, in T. Brandsen, Van de Donk, W. and P. Kenis, P. (eds.), Meervoudig bestuur: Publieke Dienstverlening door Hybride Organisaties, The Hague: Lemma, pp. 211-34.
- Jaffee, D. (2001) Organization Theory: Tension and Change, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kenis, P. (2006) Hybriditeit vanuit een Netwerkt theoretisch Perspectief, in T. Brandsen, W. van de Donk and P. Kenis (eds.), Meervoudig bestuur: Publieke Dienstverlening door Hybride Organisaties, The Hague: Lemma, pp. 45-54.
- Klijn, E.H., Koppenjan, J.F.M. and Termeer, C.J.A.M. (1995) Managing networks in the public sector, in: Public Administration, 73(3), pp. 437-54
- Klijn, E.H. (1996) Analyzing and managing policy processes in complex networks, in: Administration and Society, 28(1), pp. 90-119.
- Koppenjan, J. & Klijn, E.H. (2004) Managing Uncertainties in Networks: A Network Approach to Problem Solving and Decision Making, London: Routledge.
- Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W. (1967) Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration, Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Meyer, J.W. and Rowan, B. (1992) Institutionalised Organisations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony, in J.W. Meyer and W.R. Scott (eds.) Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality, London: Sage, pp. 21-44.

Mintzberg, H., Lampel, J., Quinn, J.B., Ghoshal, S. (2003) The Strategy Process: Concepts, Contexts, Cases, orig. 1991, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G.R. (1978) The External Control of Organizations : A Resource Dependence Perspective, New York: Harper and Row.

Power M., (1997) The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification. Oxford: Oxford University Press.