


L34544, L34561 & L34678. Public management and governance

[View Online](#)

1.

Ashworth R, Ferlie E, Hammerschmid G, Moon MJ, Reay T. Theorizing Contemporary Public Management: International and Comparative Perspectives. *British Journal of Management*. 2013 Sep;24:S1–S17.

2.

Bevir M, Rhodes RAW. Searching for civil society: changing patterns of governance in Britain. *Public Administration*. 2003 Mar;81(1):41–62.

3.

Bevir M, Rhodes RAW, Weller P. Traditions of governance: interpreting the changing role of the public sector. *Public Administration*. 2003 Mar;81(1):1–17.

4.

Brandsen T, Kim S. Contextualizing the meaning of public management reforms: a comparison of the Netherlands and South Korea. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2010 Jun 1;76(2):367–386.

5.

Chandler J, Barry J, Clark H. Stressing Academe: The Wear and Tear of the New Public Management. *Human Relations*. 2002 Sep 1;55(9):1051–1069.

6.

Considine M, Lewis JM. Bureaucracy, Network, or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. *Public Administration Review*. 2003 Mar;63(2):131-140.

7.

Dunleavy P. New Public Management Is Dead--Long Live Digital-Era Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2005 Sep 15;16(3):467-494.

8.

Ferlie E, Hartley J, Martin S. Changing Public Service Organizations: Current Perspectives and Future Prospects. *British Journal of Management*. 2003 Dec;14(s1):S1-S14.

9.

Hajer M. Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy Sciences*. 2003;36(2):175-195.

10.

HOOD C. Intellectual Obsolescence and Intellectual Makeovers: Reflections on the Tools of Government after Two Decades. *Governance*. 2007 Jan;20(1):127-144.

11.

HOOD C, DIXON R. A MODEL OF COST-CUTTING IN GOVERNMENT? THE GREAT MANAGEMENT REVOLUTION IN UK CENTRAL GOVERNMENT RECONSIDERED. *Public Administration*. 2013 Mar;91(1):114-134.

12.

Hood C. The Middle Aging of New Public Management: Into the Age of Paradox? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2004 Jul 1;14(3):267-282.

13.

Jones BD. Bounded Rationality and Political Science: Lessons from Public Administration and Public Policy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2003 Oct 1;13(4):395–412.

14.

Kickert WJM. Beneath consensual corporatism: traditions of governance in the Netherlands. *Public Administration*. 2003 Mar;81(1):119–140.

15.

LE GRAND J. Knights, Knaves or Pawns? Human Behaviour and Social Policy. *Journal of Social Policy*. 1997 Apr;26(2):149–169.

16.

Lynn Jr. LE. The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For. *Public Administration Review*. 2001 Mar;61(2):144–160.

17.

Martin S. The Modernization of UK Local Government: Markets, Managers, Monitors and Mixed Fortunes. *Public Management Review*. 2002 Jan;4(3):291–307.

18.

Rhodes RAW. The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Political Studies*. 1996 Sep;44(4):652–667.

19.

Rhodes RAW. Understanding Governance: Ten Years On. *Organization Studies*. 2007 Aug 1;28(8):1243–1264.

20.

Skelcher C. Changing images of the State: overloaded, hollowed-out, congested. *Public*

Policy and Administration. 2000 Jul 1;15(3):3-19.

21.

Stewart J, Walsh K. Change in the management of public services. Public administration. London [etc.]; 1992;70(4):499-518.

22.

Zafirovski M. Administration and Society: Beyond Public Choice? Public Administration. 2001 Sep;79(3):665-688.

23.

Bryson JM. What to do when Stakeholders matter. Public Management Review. 2004 Mar;6(1):21-53.

24.

Hajer M, Versteeg W. performing governance through networks. European Political Science [Internet]. 2005 Sep;4(3):340-347. Available from:
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210034>

25.

Hartley J, Sørensen E, Torfing J. Collaborative Innovation: A Viable Alternative to Market Competition and Organizational Entrepreneurship. Public Administration Review. 2013 Nov;73(6):821-830.

26.

Klijn E hans. designing and managing networks: possibilities and limitations for network management. European Political Science. 2005 Sep;4(3):328-339.

27.

KLIJN EH, SKELCHER C. DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE NETWORKS: COMPATIBLE OR

NOT? Public Administration. 2007 Sep;85(3):587–608.

28.

Papadopoulos Y. taking stock of multi-level governance networks. European Political Science [Internet]. 2005 Sep;4(3):316–327. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210032>

29.

Skelcher C, Mathur N, Smith M. The Public Governance of Collaborative Spaces: Discourse, Design and Democracy. Public Administration. 2005 Aug;83(3):573–596.

30.

Smith M, Beazley M. Progressive Regimes, Partnerships and the Involvement of Local Communities: A Framework for Evaluation. Public Administration. 2000 Jan;78(4):855–878.

31.

Sørensen E. the democratic problems and potentials of network governance. European Political Science [Internet]. 2005 Sep;4(3):348–357. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210033>

32.

Stoker G. Public Value Management: A New Narrative for Networked Governance? The American Review of Public Administration. 2006 Mar 1;36(1):41–57.

33.

STOKER G. WAS LOCAL GOVERNANCE SUCH A GOOD IDEA? A GLOBAL COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE. Public Administration. 2011 Mar;89(1):15–31.

34.

Torring J. symposium: governance networks. *European Political Science* [Internet]. 2005 Sep;4(3):301–304. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210030>

35.

Torring J. governance network theory: towards a second generation. *European Political Science* [Internet]. 2005 Sep;4(3):305–315. Available from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210031>

36.

WEST K, DAVIS P. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC VALUE OF GOVERNMENT ACTION? TOWARDS A (NEW) PRAGMATIC APPROACH TO VALUES QUESTIONS IN PUBLIC ENDEAVOURS. *Public Administration*. 2011 Jun;89(2):226–241.

37.

Skelcher C. Changing images of the State: overloaded, hollowed-out, congested. *Public Policy and Administration*. 2000 Jul 1;15(3):3–19.

38.

Adsera A. Are You Being Served? Political Accountability and Quality of Government. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*. 2003 Oct 1;19(2):445–490.

39.

Bawn K, Rosenbluth F. Short versus Long Coalitions: Electoral Accountability and the Size of the Public Sector. *American Journal of Political Science*. 2006 Apr;50(2):251–265.

40.

Chapman R, Lowndes V. Accountable, authorized or authentic? What do 'faith representatives' offer urban governance? *Public Money & Management*. 2009 Nov;29(6):371–378.

41.

Christensen M, Skærbæk P. Framing and overflowing of public sector accountability innovations. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. 2007 Mar 6;20(1):101–132.

42.

Considine M. The End of the Line? Accountable Governance in the Age of Networks, Partnerships, and Joined-Up Services. *Governance*. 2002 Jan;15(1):21–40.

43.

Cunningham GM, Harris JE. Toward a Theory of Performance Reporting to Achieve Public Sector Accountability: A Field Study. *Public Budgeting & Finance*. 2005 Jun;25(2):15–42.

44.

Dereli C. Smoke and mirrors and performance management. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2011 Jan 25;24(1):42–56.

45.

Flinders M. Daring to be a Daniel: The Pathology of Politicized Accountability in a Monitory Democracy. *Administration & Society*. 2011 Jul 1;43(5):595–619.

46.

Glynn JJ, Murphy MP. Public management. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 1996 Sep;9(5/6):125–137.

47.

Heinrich CJ. Outcomes-Based Performance Management in the Public Sector: Implications for Government Accountability and Effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*. 2002 Nov;62(6):712–725.

48.

Monfardini P. Accountability in the new public sector: a comparative case study. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2010 Oct 5;23(7):632–646.

49.

Mulgan R. 'Accountability': An Ever-Expanding Concept? *Public Administration*. 2000 Jan;78(3):555–573.

50.

Papenfuss U, Schaefer C. Improving public accountability by aligning reporting to organizational changes in public service provision - an empirical Internet study of all Austrian, German and Swiss towns and states from an agency-theory perspective. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2010 Sep 1;76(3):555–576.

51.

Ryan C, Walsh P. Collaboration of public sector agencies: reporting and accountability challenges. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2004 Dec;17(7):621–631.

52.

Shaoul J. 'Sharing' political authority with finance capital: The case of Britain's Public Private Partnerships. *Policy and Society*. 2011 Sep;30(3):209–220.

53.

Tetlock PE. Vying for Rhetorical High Ground in Accountability Debates: It Is Easy to Look Down on Those Who Look Soft on. *Administration & Society*. 2011 Sep 1;43(6):693–703.

54.

Willems T, Van Dooren W. Lost in diffusion? How collaborative arrangements lead to an accountability paradox. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2011 Sep 1;77(3):505–530.

55.

Sørensen E. the democratic problems and potentials of network governance. *European Political Science*. 2005 Sep;4(3):348-357.

56.

Berg AM. Transforming public services – transforming the public servant? *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2006 Oct;19(6):556-568.

57.

BATTEN E, CORREIA L, HEDGES H, KAVANAGH L, PAGE EC, PAUL G, PHUA A, VIVYAN N, WILSON C. EXPERTISE AND POLICY-MAKING: LEGAL PROFESSIONALS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT. *Public Administration*. 2006 Aug 15;84(3):771-781.

58.

Burgess S. The Role of Incentives in the Public Sector: Issues and Evidence. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. 2003 Jun 1;19(2):285-300.

59.

Carboni N. Changing relationships between politicians and bureaucrats in contemporary democracies: an empirical analysis of the Italian experience. *International public management review* [Internet]. 2010;11(1):90-109. Available from: <http://journals.sfu.ca/ipmr/index.php/ipmr/article/view/77/77>

60.

Farrell C, Morris J. The 'Neo-Bureaucratic' State: Professionals, Managers and Professional Managers in Schools, General Practices and Social Work. *Organization*. 2003 Feb 1;10(1):129-156.

61.

Fitzgerald L, Ferlie E. Professionals: Back to the Future? *Human Relations*. 2000 May 1;53(5):713-739.

62.

Greener I. Understanding NHS Reform: The Policy-Transfer, Social Learning, and Path-Dependency Perspectives. *Governance*. 2002 Apr;15(2):161–183.

63.

Horner L, Lekhi R, Blaug R. Deliberative democracy and the role of public managers [Internet]. 2006. Available from: http://www.theworkfoundation.com/DownloadPublication/Report/107_107_Deliberative%20democracy%20and%20the%20role%20of%20public%20managers.pdf

64.

HOWLETT M, WELLSTEAD AM. Policy Analysts in the Bureaucracy Revisited: The Nature of Professional Policy Work in Contemporary Government. *Politics & Policy*. 2011 Aug;39(4):613–633.

65.

Kearney, Richard C. Professionalism and Bureaucratic Responsiveness: Conflict or Compatibility? *Public Administration Review* [Internet]. 1988;48(1). Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=4599374&site=ehost-live>

66.

Kirkpatrick I, Jespersen PK, Dent M, Neogy I. Medicine and management in a comparative perspective: the case of Denmark and England. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. 2009 Jul;31(5):642–658.

67.

Parsons W. Modernising Policy-making for the Twenty First Century: The Professional Model. *Public Policy and Administration*. 2001 Jul 1;16(3):93–110.

68.

Pedersen D, Hartley J. The changing context of public leadership and management. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2008 May 30;21(4):327–339.

69.

Probst HB, Hussain ZB, Andersen O. Cancer patient pathways in Denmark as a joint effort between bureau... - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. 2011. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22136810>

70.

Sehested K. HOW NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT REFORMS CHALLENGE THE ROLES OF PROFESSIONALS. *International Journal of Public Administration*. 2002 Nov;25(12):1513–1537.

71.

Taylor I, Kelly J. Professionals, discretion and public sector reform in the UK: re-visiting Lipsky. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*. 2006 Dec;19(7):629–642.

72.

Tummers L. Explaining the willingness of public professionals to implement new policies: a policy alienation framework. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2011 Sep 1;77(3):555–581.

73.

Considine M. The End of the Line? Accountable Governance in the Age of Networks, Partnerships, and Joined-Up Services. *Governance*. 2002 Jan;15(1):21–40.

74.

Willems T, Van Dooren W. Lost in diffusion? How collaborative arrangements lead to an accountability paradox. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2011 Sep 1;77(3):505–530.

75.

Alcock P. A strategic unity: defining the third sector in the UK. Voluntary sector review [Internet]. 2010;1(1):5-24. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1885989521?pq-origsite=primo&accountid=8018>

76.

Bode I. Co-governance within networks and the non-profit – for-profit divide. Public Management Review. 2006 Dec;8(4):551-566.

77.

CUNNINGHAM I. A RACE TO THE BOTTOM? EXPLORING VARIATIONS IN EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IN THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR. Public Administration. 2008 Oct 24;86(4):1033-1053.

78.

Davis Smith J. The inflatable log: volunteering, the state and democracy. Voluntary action. London : National Council for Voluntary Organisations, 1980-; 2001;3(3):13-26.

79.

Harris B. Voluntary action and the state in historical perspective. Voluntary sector review [Internet]. 2010;1(1):25-40. Available from: <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1885989660/shibboleth?accountid=8018>

80.

Harrow J, Jung T. Philanthropy is Dead; Long Live Philanthropy? Public Management Review. 2011 Nov;13(8):1047-1056.

81.

KELLY J. REFORMING PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE UK: BRINGING IN THE THIRD SECTOR. Public Administration. 2007 Dec;85(4):1003-1022.

82.

Lewis J. New Labour's Approach to the Voluntary Sector: Independence and the Meaning of Partnership. *Social Policy and Society*. 2005 Apr;4(2):121–131.

83.

LOWNDES V, PRATCHETT L, STOKER G. LOCAL POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE IMPACT OF RULES-IN-USE. *Public Administration*. 2006 Aug 15;84(3):539–561.

84.

Lowndes V, Sullivan H. Like a Horse and Carriage or a Fish on a Bicycle: How Well do Local Partnerships and Public Participation go Together? *Local Government Studies*. 2004 Mar;30(1):51–73.

85.

Srinivas N. Against NGOs?: A Critical Perspective on Nongovernmental Action. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 2009 Aug 1;38(4):614–626.

86.

Taylor M. Co-option or Empowerment?: The Changing Relationship between the State and the Voluntary and Community Sectors. *Local Governance*. 2002;28(1):1–11.

87.

Tiwana M, Belay N. Civil society: the clampdown is real [Internet]. 2010. Available from: [http://www.civicus.org/view/media/CIVICUS_%20paper_%20global_%20trends_%20Civil%20Society_%20Space_%202009-201012\[1\].pdf](http://www.civicus.org/view/media/CIVICUS_%20paper_%20global_%20trends_%20Civil%20Society_%20Space_%202009-201012[1].pdf)

88.

Aberbach JD, Christensen T. Citizens and Consumers. *Public Management Review*. 2005 Jun;7(2):225–246.

89.

Arnstein SR. A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 1969;35(4):216–224.

90.

Bang HP. 'Yes we can': identity politics and project politics for a late-modern world. *Urban research & practice* [Internet]. 2009;2(2):117–137. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17535060902979022>

91.

Bang HP, Sorensen E. The everyday maker: a new challenge to democratic governance. *Administrative Theory & Praxis* [Internet]. 1999;21(3):324–341. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10841806.1999.11643381>

92.

Davies JS. The governance of urban regeneration: a critique of the 'governing without government' thesis. *Public Administration*. 2002 Jan;80(2):301–322.

93.

Davies JS. The Limits of Partnership: An Exit-Action Strategy for Local Democratic Inclusion. *Political Studies*. 2007 Dec;55(4):779–800.

94.

Dwyer P. Making sense of social citizenship: some user views on welfare rights and responsibilities. *Critical Social Policy*. 2002 May 1;22(2):273–299.

95.

Hastak, Manoj. The Role of Consumer Surveys in Public Policy Decision Making. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* [Internet]. 2001;20(2). Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=5578310&site=ehost-li>

ve

96.

Johnson C, Osborne SP. Local Strategic Partnerships, Neighbourhood Renewal, and the Limits to Co-governance. *Public Money and Management*. 2003 Jul;23(3):147–154.

97.

Nancarrow C, Evans M, Pallister J. Polls apart! Political, research and ethical lessons from UK pressure groups' use of opinion polls. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 2003 May;8(2):181–193.

98.

Prabhakar R. Commercialisation or Citizenship? *Politics*. 2004 Sep;24(3):215–220.

99.

Stolle D, Hooghe M. Consumers as political participants? Shifts in political action repertoires in Western societies. *Politics, products, and markets: exploring political consumerism past and present*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers; 2003.

100.

Roberts N. Public Deliberation in an Age of Direct Citizen Participation. *The American Review of Public Administration*. 2004 Dec 1;34(4):315–353.

101.

Davis Smith J. 'The Inflatable Log': volunteering, the state and democracy. 2001;

102.

Alford J. Why Do Public-Sector Clients Coproduce?: Toward a Contingency Theory. *Administration & Society*. 2002 Mar 1;34(1):32–56.

103.

Arnstein SR. A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. Journal of the American Institute of Planners. 1969;35(4):216-224.

104.

Bovaird T. Beyond Engagement and Participation: User and Community Coproduction of Public Services. Public Administration Review. 2007 Sep;67(5):846-860.

105.

Brandsen T, Pestoff V. Co-production, the third sector and the delivery of public services. Public Management Review. 2006 Dec;8(4):493-501.

106.

Davies JS. The Limits of Partnership: An Exit-Action Strategy for Local Democratic Inclusion. Political Studies. 2007 Dec;55(4):779-800.

107.

Johnson C, Osborne SP. Local Strategic Partnerships, Neighbourhood Renewal, and the Limits to Co-governance. Public Money and Management. 2003 Jul;23(3):147-154.

108.

Mitlin D. With and beyond the state -- co-production as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organizations. Environment and Urbanization. 2008 Oct 1;20(2):339-360.

109.

Pestoff V. Citizens and co-production of welfare services. Public Management Review. 2006 Dec;8(4):503-519.

110.

Prentice S. Childcare, co-production and the third sector in Canada. *Public Management Review*. 2006 Dec;8(4):521-536.

111.

Johnson C, Osborne SP. Local Strategic Partnerships, Neighbourhood Renewal, and the Limits to Co-governance. *Public Money and Management*. 2003 Jul;23(3):147-154.

112.

Mitlin D. With and beyond the state -- co-production as a route to political influence, power and transformation for grassroots organizations. *Environment and Urbanization*. 2008 Oct 1;20(2):339-360.

113.

Allen, Barbara Ann. BRIDGING THE DIVIDE - COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT: ARE THERE LESSONS FOR HEALTH CARE COMMISSIONING IN ENGLAND? *Journal of Public Procurement* [Internet]. PrAcademics Press, Florida Atlantic University; 2009;9(1):79-108. Available from:
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/223182037/7627EE4859384E9CPQ/6?accountid=8018>

114.

Aritua B, Smith NJ, Bower D. What risks are common to or amplified in programmes: Evidence from UK public sector infrastructure schemes. *International Journal of Project Management*. 2011 Apr;29(3):303-312.

115.

Bartlett W. Quasi-markets and contracts: A markets and hierarchies perspective on NHS reform. *Public money & management*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell; 1991;11(3):53-61.

116.

Baxter K, Weiss M, Le Grand J. The dynamics of commissioning across organisational and

clinical boundaries. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*. 2008 May 23;22(2):111–128.

117.

Bovaird T. Public–Private Partnerships: from Contested Concepts to Prevalent Practice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2004 Jun 1;70(2):199–215.

118.

Bovaird T. Developing New Forms of Partnership With the 'Market' in the Procurement of Public Services. *Public Administration*. 2006 Mar;84(1):81–102.

119.

Boyne GA. Competitive Tendering In Local Government: A Review Of Theory And Evidence. *Public Administration*. 1998 Jan;76(4):695–712.

120.

Bradley S, Taylor J. The Effect of the Quasi-market on the Efficiency-equity Trade-off in the Secondary School Sector. *Bulletin of Economic Research*. 2002 Jul;54(3):295–314.

121.

Bradley S, Taylor J. Diversity, Choice and the Quasi-market: An Empirical Analysis of Secondary Education Policy in England*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*. 2010 Feb;72(1):1–26.

122.

Chalkley M. Competition in NHS quasi-markets. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. 1996 Dec 1;12(4):89–99.

123.

Dopson S, Locock L. The Commissioning Process in the NHS: The theory and application.

Public Management Review. 2002 Jan;4(2):209-229.

124.

Fischbacher M, Beaumont PB. PFI, Public—Private Partnerships and the Neglected Importance of Process: Stakeholders and the Employment Dimension. Public Money and Management. 2003 Jul;23(3):171-176.

125.

Gibbons, Stephen. CHOICE, COMPETITION, AND PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT. Journal of the European Economic Association [Internet]. 2008;6(4). Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=32604699&site=ehost-live>

126.

Gray KE, Ghosh D. An empirical analysis of the purchaser-provider relationship in the NHS internal market. Journal of Management in Medicine. 2000 Mar;14(1):57-68.

127.

Ham C. World class commissioning: a health policy chimera? Journal of health services policy research [Internet]. 2008;13(2):116-121. Available from: <https://www-jstor-org.nottingham.idm.oclc.org/stable/26751153?sid=primo>

128.

Hoxley M. Purchasing UK public sector property and construction professional services: competition v quality. European Journal of Purchasing & Supply Management. 2001 Jun;7(2):133-139.

129.

KNAPP M, HARDY B, FORDER J. Commissioning for Quality: Ten Years of Social Care Markets in England. Journal of Social Policy. 2001 Apr;30(02).

130.

Lunt, Neil. Economic discourse and the market: The case of community care. *Public Administration* [Internet]. 74(3). Available from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=9702216351&site=ehost-live>

131.

Matosevic T, Knapp M, Le Grand J. Motivation and Commissioning: Perceived and Expressed Motivations of Care Home Providers. *Social Policy & Administration*. 2008 Jun;42(3):228–247.

132.

Murray JG. Towards a common understanding of the differences between purchasing, procurement and commissioning in the UK public sector. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*. 2009 Sep;15(3):198–202.

133.

Petsoulas C, Allen P, Hughes D, Vincent-Jones P, Roberts J. The use of standard contracts in the English National Health Service: A case study analysis. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2011 Jul;73(2):185–192.

134.

Wade E. Commissioning reform in the NHS: will he who pays the piper ever really call the tune? *Clinical Medicine*. 2011 Feb 1;11(1):35–39.

135.

Williams I, Bovaird T, Brown H, Allen K, Dickinson H, Kennedy J, Glasby J. Designing whole-systems commissioning: Lessons from the English experience. *Journal of care services management* [Internet]. 2012;6(2):83–92. Available from: http://pure-oai.bham.ac.uk/ws/files/10153987/Designing_whole_systems_commissioning.pdf

136.

Williams I, Bovaird T, Brown H, Allen K, Dickinson H, Kennedy J, Glasby J. Designing whole-systems commissioning: Lessons from the English experience. *Journal of care services management* [Internet]. 2012;6(2):83–92. Available from: http://pure-oai.bham.ac.uk/ws/files/10153987/Designing_whole_systems_commissioning.pdf