emerald insight

International Journal of Public Sector Management
Broad-based consensus building
Evan M. Berman, William B. Werther Jr,

Article information:

Users who downloaded this article also downloaded:

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

Broad-based consensus building

Evan M. Berman
*Department of Public Administration, University of Central Florida,
Orlando, USA, and*
William B. Werther Jr
*School of Business Administration, University of Miami, Coral Gables,
Florida, USA*

Few leadership skills are more central to being an executive than the ability to build a consensus. Increasingly, however, consensus-building skills must extend beyond the close circle of like-minded executives. Whether addressing issues of social responsibility, trying to create co-operative strategies with government organizations, or creating a shared vision among employees, consensus-building among diverse constituents is often a prelude to attaining co-operation, commitment and strategic success[1] – consider the situation faced by leaders at General Motors. Concerned about the increasing number of states that are mandating zero-emissions automobiles by the year 2000, General Motors first embarked on the development of a battery-operated car and later scaled it back when the costs of developing such technology appeared prohibitive. Through a meeting of automobile leaders and government officials, a consensus was reached that public funding would be necessary. Subsequently, several national laboratories announced new efforts aimed at advanced batteries, and the Advanced Research Projects Agency announced a US$86 million programme for the development of such technology. Coincidence? We do not think so. This example and others suggest that government and business leaders rely on co-operative strategies that lead to new forms of government-business alliances, once both sides reach consensus about what needs to be achieved[2].

The need for such broad-based consensus, however tentatively acknowledged, often begins in response to a threat or opportunity, such as the requirement to produce zero-emissions automobiles as a future condition for selling cars in the largest US market, California[3,4]). Whether the social or economic threat is initially framed by legislation, competition, or public opinion, these threats often go beyond the abilities of either government or individual companies to achieve acceptable solutions – as with zero-emissions automobiles, national health-care policy, and international and trade barriers at the national level or public safety and community economic development at the local level. Confronted by an issue that transcends the ability of any one group to address, a need emerges to create a consensus. The need for broad-based consensus also is revisited on firms, especially when leaders seek to imbue the

organization with a vision. Although former President George Bush dismissed that "vision thing" with a scorn of unimportance, more successful leaders understand that an organization's vision can be its central organizing principle. However, once corporate vision statements emerge from strategic planning retreats, they seldom engender much support or enthusiasm outside the executive ranks –and why should they? Merely having a vision statement is largely meaningless in the absence of some broad-based consensus in support of it. The small cadre of executives who serve as midwives to the corporate vision are often too few in number to do much more than preside over a stillbirth.

Whether executives seek to build consensus among different organizations or within the firm, consensus is more likely to the extent that relevant constituents are embraced by the process[5]. It may be axiomatic, but people do not resist their own ideas. Needed, however, is a systematic method for achieving very broad-based consensus – a process that enables leaders to create a consensus among diverse constituents and leads to a commitment to change, especially among groups with long-standing suspicions and animosities directed at one another, such as business and government[6]. Attempts to create such consensus have given rise to a process called "very broad-based strategic planning" (VBBSP), which holds implications for anyone seeking to build a consensus within their organization or with other organizations. It is called "very broad-based strategic planning" because of its inclusive approach to problem solving. As used to create public-private alliances, VBBSP brings together government, business and community leaders, who usually include opinion leaders, community activists, past critics, subject-matter experts and representatives of constituencies that are likely to be affected by the newly-formed consensus.

Broad-based planning is proving to be important to executives for two compelling reasons. First, and most obvious, executives face an increasing likelihood of becoming part of a government-initiated, VBBSP effort. Whether at the federal level in response to health care, auto emissions, trade policies and social concerns or at the local community level to solve zoning, neighbourhood housing, education or area economic development issues, executives have the rare combination of economic, intellectual and organizational resources needed to solve problems among diverse constituents. And, turning down the President of the USA, the Mayor or the chair of the local school board may not be a satisfactory solution, leading to involvement, whether desired or not. Second, executives find considerable parallels between the process of creating a government-business co-operation centred on mutual concerns and developing an organization-wide focus for their company's vision[7,8]). Just as politicians must create a political consensus around their plans, executives must build an action-oriented consensus around their leadership vision. The VBBSP process used to weld varied constituents into an alliance also promises to be a helpful lever of leadership for those seeking large-scale, vision-driven, consensual change efforts within their organizations.

The new alliances

Consensus-building activities result in shared commitments to new goals and objectives. As suggested by Table I, VBBSP-based government-business relationships exist for pragmatic, not ideological, reasons. They are further characterized by a mutuality of concern and are typically impermanent – unlike the close and ongoing symbiotic relationships found in the space and defence industries or the often antagonistic relations that are associated with regulatory agencies such as the Food and Drug Administration or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

	Government-business relationships	
	Traditional	VBBSP
Characterization	Adversarial (regulatory) or government-directed (defence/space)	Pragmatic, co-operative alliance with mutuality of concerns
Change process	Top-down mandate	Bottom-up agreement among affected constituents
Tools of change	Lobbying Litigation Ridicule	Discussion Consensus Co-leadership
Focus	Limiting or directing the adversary's power	Shared problem solving
Goal	Winning Controlling	Consensus Positive-sum solutions
Major activity	Being heard	Co-ordination of leaders
Contributions by parties to the process	Political contributions	Facilitators Loaned-execs In-kind service Research polls
Duration	Longer term Career-long	Impermanence Conditionality

Table I.
Government-business relationship characteristics

Typically, a public-sector VBBSP process is begun by a small cadre of elected or self-appointed leaders. As the issue is framed and re-framed, the inclusive nature of these alliances generally swells until it includes 20-1,200 public, business and community leaders, organized around a steering committee. During the six weeks to two years of its existence, the VBBSP alliance will be a fluid mixture of leaders organized into standing and *ad hoc* groups, loosely guided by the steering committee. The purpose of this activity is to reach an agreed set of goals and related action plans that alliance members will pursue. With VBBSP efforts, earnest attempts are made to engage the community of

relevant stakeholders as co-equals. Rather than the "either-or" mentality of government versus automobile producers, for example, a wider net is cast to embrace a consensual solution among producers, environmentalists, state officials, regulators, scientists, private and government laboratories. And given that zero-emissions automobiles hold potentially large sales revenues for producers, cleaner air for citizens and environmentalists, and political benefits for government, this loose VBBSP alliance focuses less on "whether" and increasingly on "how" and "when" to achieve zero emissions with positive, competitive gains for producers.

Alliances hinge on the ability of participants to reach consensus about meaningful and credible strategies. Attaining consensus, however, is complicated by the public nature of these alliances, which necessitates a broad and inclusive definition of the relevant participants. To obtain consensus in these diverse settings, alliances rely on extensive decision-making processes based on the creative testing of alternative proposals against the community's standards of credibility and acceptability. In doing so, participants ideally engage in a process of selective reinforcement, the search for areas of common interest, rather than digging in around partisan proposals that lack broad appeal. Although final strategies are often cast in language of public interest, this does not mean that businesses abandon their self-interests in decision making: firms must find significant long-term self-interest in the common good, or they will not support subsequent objectives and implementation strategies.

When VBBSP accomplishes consensus and thus moves from planning to implementation, the nature of collaboration resembles even more closely that of an "alliance" because participation is voluntary, derived from common interests and based on positive-sum strategies. Although business-government alliances share these characteristics, they differ in some important ways from traditional alliances among businesses. Salient differences include the forces that bring alliances into existence, the political nature of the environment in which they operate, and the reliance on voluntary rather than contractual compliance. These differences are shown in Table II.

For example, in the global environment, confronted by potentially superior Japanese semiconductor technology and threat of continued loss of market share, the US Government led a VBBSP effort with US firms to devise a way to increase the level of US technological abilities. US firms voluntarily participated. Through a process of mutual accommodation, reached through extensive but informal consultations, the federal government crafted a 50/50 partnership to which it contributed US$100 million per year for the development of superior memory chips. Although sceptics note that some companies stayed technologically ahead of the partnership, called SEMATECH, the partnership has defined the direction of technological pace for US companies during the last five years[9].

	Alliance characteristics		Broad-based consensus building
	Business-business	Government-business	
Primary goal	Economic	Societal and economic	
Success measure	Profits	Effective policies and programmes	**65**
Duration	Long term	Short term	
Orientation	Outcomes	Processes	
Constituent focus	Partner/customer	Multiple constituents	
Responsibilities	Contractually defined	Open-ended but "voluntary"	
Primary catalyst for formation	Strategy driven	Crisis driven	
Primary barriers	Trust	Trust Stereotyping Antagonisms Ideology	**Table II.** Characteristics of government-business alliances

Strategic consensus-building competences

At the heart of the alliance is the ability to reach and maintain consensus among its often diverse members. To this end, public leaders (and some private leaders, too) have adapted strategic planning in wholly new ways. Although the structure of activities is roughly the same – such as scanning the environment for opportunities and threats, taking stock of strengths and weaknesses, and defining new objectives and strategies to reach them – business participation by business leaders often requires a different mix of process skills. Given the public and often political nature of government and business alliances, the needed skill mix includes three broad areas: participation; coalition-building; and follow-through.

Participation

Local or national business leaders are often asked to sit on steering committees of a VBBSP effort. Generally, the activities of steering committees are many. They include developing a timetable; serving as spokespersons to create a general awareness among the public; inviting others to participate in various phases of the process; reviewing and approving committee and sub-committee reports; conducting interviews with other business leaders; chairing committees and sub-committees; and resolving disputes, conflicts and inconsistencies. These actions are needed so that the resulting plans reflect a true consensus among the community being served so that these constituents are more likely to support the implementation phase of the VBBSP.

Although these activities are not foreign to many executives, they come with a different perspective. In the VBBSP process, the executive is an equal among equals, neither subordinate nor superior to others. Influence, persuasion,

charisma and vision must, of necessity, replace authority based on organizational rank.

Business leaders must evaluate whether they wish to become involved in VBBSP. To evaluate the appropriateness of participation, the following criteria must be met: the area of concern truly represents a significant focus of the leader's company; public leadership is fully committed to creating an alliance and its subsequent implementation; business would be willing to participate for no other reason than the exercise of its corporate social responsibility; the time commitment is commensurate with the salience of the issue at hand.

In the broader context, initial decisions about the numbers and types of leaders who are invited, the manner in which invitations are extended and who actually makes the invitations are crucial first steps. Because public alliances are by their nature inclusive, the selection of participants is in large measure achieved by how an issue is framed. For example, an alliance for regional economic development may or may not include a focus on the environment, thereby including or excluding environmental activists. The acid test question becomes: does the inclusion of environmental activists increase the legitimacy of the proposal? Conversely, it may be necessary to limit the scope of an issue for practical reasons. For example, an alliance for local economic development may well wish to exclude issues of public safety, however relevant, if it cannot benefit from drawing police and other safety experts into the alliance.

Executive involvement in VBBSP activities demands a knowledgeable awareness of participation, particularly with regard to how the issues are framed. How the issues are framed ultimately decides the number of factions involved and the ease with which coalitions are built. In a similar parallel, how executives frame the need for a corporate vision helps determine which internal constituencies become involved in the vision-setting process and what internal coalitions result.

Coalition building
The VBBSP process is about building coalitions. These processes range from informal consultations to well-structured planning processes that rely on *ad hoc* and standing committees to reach agreements and then pursue wider and wider circles of support among stakeholders. These structured processes may involve multiple committees and sub-committees in order to accommodate the number of constituents. How well consensus is reached within the committees and sub-committees, and how effective they are in gaining the support of others, shapes the speed and success of the alliance and its subsequent implementation. Business leaders greatly influence the likelihood of proposals gaining momentum and achieving consensus by actively seeking support for proposals among their peers and other supportive groups, such as suppliers, customers, employees and industry or professional associations. *Ad hoc* working groups are one way of seeking consensus, as is informal interaction outside planned meetings of VBBSP. Too often, however, business leaders rely on the "logic" of

their positions and fail to engage in their own coalition building, feeling discouraged when other groups gain momentum for their proposals.

Health-care reform provides an example of a large-scale, multi-year VBBSP effort. Although it failed politically in 1994, it shows the importance of business participation. After President Clinton took an interest in health-care reform as presidential candidate in April 1992, insurance executives were instrumental in initially framing a consensual vision of both "crisis" (the need for reform) and some rough parameters (market-driven strategies). This vision was re-articulated shortly after his election during the Little Rock Economic Summit in December 1992, and it is widely held that the forcefulness and consensus among industry executives prompted President-elect Clinton to pursue health-care reform as a priority. Then the Task Force on Health Care undertook "external scanning" during spring 1993, subsequently recommending goals and strategies that went further than industry preferences. (In regard to goal and strategy formulation, it is unclear to what extent industry was consulted in this process.)

Shortly thereafter, during summer/autumn 1993, consumer groups put forward proposals for universal coverage, that were initially embraced by the President. The business lobby, which had been present during 1992, became dormant. Part of this dormancy resulted from a lack of consensus among insurance executives about the desirability of proposed changes, with large insurers favouring stricter federal regulations. Only small business interest groups and large corporations spoke out on health-care reform, undertaking an organized "damage control" effort. This example shows how initial coalition building by business furthered its interest, and how subsequent lack of consensus created a void that was filled by opposing interests. It can be argued that, strategically, health-care reform was doomed to fail because it did include Congressional law makers. These law makers used the small business lobby to defeat the reform effort.

At other levels of government, similar dynamics are present. Public activities can be even more political than business, and business leaders must accept that coalition building goes beyond merely a "logical" plan – politics is the art of the possible, not logical. Even logical plans need consensual support.

Here, too, parallels exist when VBBSP is applied within a business. For example, coalition building is central to creating and operationalizing an effective vision statement in an organization. The relatively easily attained agreement on a vision statement among like-minded executives may lull the leader into believing widespread support exists for the vision statement. Just as "logical" arguments in the public sector VBBSP may fail without participation-built coalitions, company vision statements are unlikely to be successful if their support does not extend beyond the leader's immediate circle of fellow executives. Even with that support, the lack of follow-through may damn the vision statement to little more than a dust-collecting plaque in the home-office lobby.

Follow-through
The third skills area affected by VBBSP includes follow-through. Successful VBBSP activities result in a multitude of goals, objectives and strategies that meet these criteria. As in business strategic planning, the quality of alliance goals and strategies is evaluated according to the following criteria: strategies must be specific, measurable, action-oriented, responsibility-focused and time-targeted (SMART). An example of a "typical", public-sector VBBSP objectives and strategies appears in the following statements from a VBBSP action plan, taken from [10].

Task force: jobs and economic development
(1) *Goals*:
- strengthen and broaden Hollywood's economy by supporting and encouraging the growth of existing businesses and encouraging new job-creating investment;
- create a pro-business environment within city government which distinguishes Hollywood from the cities with which it competes;
- create an integrated economic development delivery system that reflects a partnership between the city, business community and the Broward County Economic Development Council.

(2) *Objectives*:
- increase the availability of funding for new and expanding businesses by creating new sources of debt financing;
- implement a targeted marketing programme directed at attracting companies in the health-care industry, aircraft industry and marine-related industries;
- implement a business calling and retention programme;
- establish a city business centre within City Hall;
- assess the employment skills needed in Hollywood, and develop a mechanism to co-ordinate economic development-related job training resources and activities;
- develop a non-profit public-private partnership for economic development, whose governance and financing will be shared between city government and Hollywood's business community.

(3) *Selected strategies*:
- Community Redevelopment Agency to issue bonds, setting aside 10 per cent of the proceeds dedicated to funding a revolving loan fund for businesses locating in the CRA area, by September 1994;
- economic development director and the Chamber of Commerce to design an ongoing retention/calling programme, which will be co-ordinated with Broward Economic Development Council, by December 1994, and implemented by March 1995;

- city manager to initiate a total quality management programme beginning May 1994;
- Broward Employment and Training Administration (BETA) to identify job training partnerships and educational programmes by August 1994;
- Strategic Planning Committee to appoint a committee to draft a business plan for the public-private partnership by May 1994[10].

To revitalize the local economy of Hollywood, Florida, a city of about 135,000, the city initiated a six-month VBBSP conducted with about 200 participants. Four task groups were formed, which addressed: jobs and economic development; tourism and hospitality; commercial revitalization and neighbourhood rehabilitation; and housing.

In the public sector, governments are usually responsible for implementing and co-ordinating the strategies that result from a VBBSP effort. To ensure implementation, VBBSP plans are often adopted as public policy and public-private steering committees are created to ensure that government officials and private sector participants implement agreed plans as promised and on schedule. Steering committees also examine the outcomes of plans and may propose changes as required to meet new or altered targets.

To offset the impermanence usually associated with VBBSP, some alliances have created public-private partnerships (PPP). PPPs are loosely structured, permanent alliances that seek to accomplish a particular goal – such as the development of environmental technology, sponsorship of job training programmes, or neighbourhood safety. They are best suited to strategies that are considered to be long term or potentially open-ended, especially when they require shared public/private responsibilities related to policy making, implementation, or resource commitments. When resource commitments are a condition of involvement, the result is often described under the "no-pay-no-play" principle. Requiring a resource commitment to participate ensures that participants take their commitments seriously. The attraction to participate in PPPs typically comes from the promise of direct benefits for the sponsor, such as access to graduates from training programmes on a priority basis for corporate sponsors. In practice, however, many PPPs rely heavily on government funding, with the government often footing a 50 per cent share or more.

Bureaucracy: results versus process
Perhaps the most frustrating element of VBBSP alliances for business leaders concerns the trade-offs among results and processes. Business organizations (and by inference their leaders) are "results-oriented". Years of concern for the "bottom line" create a focus on outcomes, with processes largely seen as alternative routes towards those ends. In government, however, outcomes can be secondary to processes. For example, "open meeting laws" that specify the need for advance public notice may appear to be bureaucratic inefficiency to many executives who are used to calling meetings when needed. But such requirements – efficient or not – are law.

On a deeper level, the reward structure in government is geared towards process compliance, not results. Government being a monopoly, the efficiency of results is secondary to the process. Elected public officials and career civil service workers typically face a web of rewards that are contingent on following easy-to-measure procedures rather than hard-to-measure outcomes. After years of focus on procedures that ensure citizens' rights and freedoms, outcomes can be incidental to the process. Thus, an executive's desire for quick, time-based solutions may be culturally incompatible, even illegal, with government approaches. In fact, to varying degrees it is this difference in orientations that necessitates VBBSP alliances as one of the few feasible ways for government and business to address mutual problems. Not only do VBBSP alliances capture government's need to be an inclusive decision maker, but also business benefits by addressing minority concerns before implementation and thus reducing costly and time-consuming, after-the-fact lawsuits. Admittedly, suits may still occur. But VBBSP gives judges (and juries, if suits are not pre-empted by a dismissal) a basis for rejecting suits as untimely, given the previous, widely open opportunity to participate in the VBBSP process.

Conclusion

Executives who are intimately familiar with the challenges facing their company often build a consensus among themselves about what vision of the future best serves the organization and what actions need to be taken. Exposed to the central problems of the organization day after day, they form opinions about what is needed – opinions that are often reinforced by peers who see similar issues. When change is undertaken, however, resistance is common because the consensus seldom extends beyond the executive suite. Broad-based approaches to involving the affected constituencies are needed.

Government, which often must be more focused on processes than outcomes, has proved an interesting laboratory for identifying ways of building consensus on a large scale through very broad-based strategic planning. Of relevance to executives, the skills necessary to manage the VBBSP processes are increasingly the same as those needed by executives seeking to re-invigorate their organizations with a widely-shared vision and the commitment to achieve it. Ironically, executives who seek to avoid government involvement on the basis of ideological or efficiency reasons may actually deprive their company of needed alliances in an increasingly competitive world.

An inherent risk in a pluralistic, democratic society is that identifiable groups such as government or business apply different criteria to evaluate the successful solution of issues. At the most basic level, governments seek solutions that are politically attainable, while businesses seek solutions that enhance wealth-creating capabilities. When confronted by community issues, pursuit of the "optimal" solution by either of these groups may be "suboptimal" for the other and for the community. It is important for reluctant participants – particularly business leaders – to remember that when multiple groups are involved, this "suboptimality" may actually prove disastrous for those groups

without voice in the decision-making process. Perhaps the classic example is what are now called EPA "Superfund" sites. Initially, many industrial waste sites like Love Canal were "optimal" for the companies involved and "optimal" for the local governments which were glad to see the resulting jobs and tax revenues. However, the exclusion of environmentalists and conservationists from the decision-making process resulted in "optimal" solutions becoming "disastrous" for all involved. Although it may be unfair to judge with the benefit of hindsight, the growing complexity of government-business issues suggests that "disastrous" outcomes are more likely to be avoided in the future through VBBSP alliances. On the organizational level, building consensus may appear to be too slow in a turbulent world, but fast decisions that overlook building consensus may be no quicker when implementation encounters resistance to change.

As a result, given this increased interconnectedness and complexity associated with organizational decisions, growing numbers of citizens and employees question whether decisions can be left to a limited number of actors. VBBSP takes a broader view, involving not only the lead actors but also representatives of the supporting cast that will be affected by strategic decisions. VBBSP is not a replacement for government or business deliberations. Rather, it is a realization that those decisions increasingly involve complex levels of issues and sub-issues that can be best addressed and implemented by actively involving those who are to be affected by the decision.

On a societal level, VBBSP suggests that alliances are consistent with American preferences for free markets and limited government intervention. Whether one admires the efficiency of Japan or Singapore, for example, or abhors their limited personal freedoms, much of the wealth and wellbeing of those societies is attributable to efficient government/business relationships. To the extent that waste is reduced, delays minimized, and the quality of decision making enhanced, all constituents benefit. This argument does not mean that the USA should adopt those governmental systems. Nor do we suggest that the VBBSP must be followed in all community decisions. On the contrary, the argument made here is that adaptations of existing democratic approaches to government/business relationships offer both the efficiency benefits discovered by other nations and a means that is culturally and politically compatible with US society.

Even when existing activities do not follow the VBBSP approach, that result does not invalidate the VBBSP model. Instead, the argument here is that community-based decision making must become more open to varied constituents, particularly to the need to bring more business leaders into strategic planning processes at the national and local levels.

On an organizational level, trends towards employee empowerment and autonomous work groups mesh nicely with societal trends of open classrooms and more democratic, even child-centred households. Employees used to having a voice at home and at school expect to have one at work. When denied that voice in the elements that shape the organization, resistance is natural and normal. VBBSP approaches when used within the organization to build

consensus about the firm's vision offer one method for enlisting the support of the organization's various constituents.

VBBSP processes offer executives a bottom-up approach to involving the organization's many constituencies into a steering-committee guided collection of work groups aimed at reinvigorating the organization through a broadly created and supported vision of what the organization is to be. Consensus about that future reality serves as a template against which actions can be evaluated and resources allocated. A vision that results from a consensus-building process can be an energizing tool for executives wanting to attack the twin threats of competition and poor internal performance. Broad participation aimed at empowering groups to focus on the future instead of the emotionally-troubling downsizing issues, for example, suggests one way for leaders to reinvigorate their organizations in pursuit of excellence. Concerns about framing the issues, participation, coalition building and implementation require skills and sensitivities similar to those encountered in developing government-business alliances. For, ultimately, what is an organization but a focused collection of alliances, the strength and focus of which determine the company's (and leader's) destiny?

Perhaps it is axiomatic, but people do not resist their own ideas. What VBBSP seeks to do is cast a wider net than typical decision-making processes and involve those affected by potential solutions. What VBBSP seeks to do is to involve the leaders of society's greatest wealth-creating engines, for-profit corporations. What VBBSP seeks to do at the corporate level is re-enfranchise many employees who have long felt excluded. Simply put, VBBSP seeks to create an even more sensitive process of democratic decision making, among and within organizations.

References
1. Hitt, M.A., Hoskisson, R.E. and Harrison, J., "Strategic competitiveness in the 1990s: challenges and opportunities for US executives", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 5 No. 2, 1991, pp. 7-22.
2. Pucik, V., "Strategic alliances, organizational learning, and competitive advantage: the HRM agenda", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, 1988, pp. 77-93.
3. Porter, M.E., "From competitive advantage to corporate strategy", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 67 No. 3, 1989, pp. 63-76.
4. Werther, W.B. Jr, "Strategic foundations of productivity improvement", *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 8 No. 1, 1991, pp. 3-8.
5. Dutton, J.E. and Jackson, S.E., "Categorizing strategic issues: links to organizational action", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12 No. 1, 1987, pp. 76-90.
6. Werther, W.B. Jr, "'Job 1' at Ford: employee co-operation", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 7 No. 1, 1985, pp. 10-16.
7. Bartlett, C.A. and Ghoshal, S., "Changing the role of top management: beyond strategy to purpose", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 72 No. 6, 1994, pp. 79-88.
8. Drucker, P.F., "The coming of the new organization", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 66 No. 1, 1988, pp. 45-53.
9. Grindley, P., Mowery, D. and Silverman, B., "SEMATECH and collaborative research: lessons in the design of high-technology consortia", *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 13 No. 4, 1994, pp. 723-59.
10. Florida Strategic Planning Task Force, "VBBSP action plan", Hollywood, FL, 1994.

This article has been cited by:

1. Herbert Kimura, Maria Luisa Mendes Teixeira, Arilda Schmidt Godoy. 2006. Redes sociais, valores e competências: simulação de conexões. *Revista de Administração de Empresas* **46**:3, 42-58. [Crossref]

2. Evan M. Berman, Ronnie L. Korosec. 2005. Planning to Coordinate and Coordinating the Plan. *The American Review of Public Administration* **35**:4, 380-401. [Crossref]

3. Anthony Bennett. 1998. Sustainable public/private partnerships for public service delivery. *Natural Resources Forum* **22**:3, 193-199. [Crossref]