INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT

Ministerial effectiveness: literature review

A summary review of the literature

Sam Drabble

About this review

This short report provides a summary of the literature to date on ministerial effectiveness in the UK. It forms a companion piece to the Institute for Government's report *The Challenge of being a minister*.

Author Biography:

In October 2010 Sam Drabble began his current role as Research Assistant at RAND Europe. Prior to this he was an intern at the Institute for Government, working primarily with the Learning and Development team on a wide range of projects. Sam has completed a traineeship with Group I (Employers' Group) of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) in Brussels, and has an MA in European studies from Kings College London, where his thesis examined interests and values in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) through the lens of the second Russo-Chechen conflict. He graduated with First Class Honours in Arts Combined from Durham University, where he specialised in 20th century Continental Philosophy. Other research interests include EU Institutions, European Immigration Policy and Political Parties in Europe.

Ministerial effectiveness: Introduction

> *Britain is governed by the creative fiction generated by putting amateur ministers in charge of professional civil servants. Whitehall departments are large, expert, to the outside eye monolithic, and staffed by experienced officials. Onto the top of these organisations are parachuted ministers, largely unversed in administration or departmental subject matter, yet given ultimate command and responsibility for a sizable slice of public life (James, 1999, p.12).*

The multiple roles and demands of being a minister are unique. They must perform both as a leader of a public department and as a political actor of the Cabinet as appointed by the Prime Minister (Cheong, 2009). Every action they perform may have consequences for their standing in the eyes of a plethora of different stakeholders, whose interests are rarely aligned. They must account for their actions to Parliament, the Prime Minister, the public, and often in practise, the media. They must balance the sometimes competing burdens of public responsibility and a desire to further their own careers. Many will come to the role without adequate training or managerial experience, often with little expertise in the subject matter of their department (Rose, 1987; James, 1999). They may believe, like many others, that the insight required to do the job effectively can only be gained through experience (Richards, 2008). It is difficult to think of another profession where an individual could rise to the very top of an organisation, and obtain a position of such pronounced responsibility, having had no previous acquaintance with that line of work.

Against this background it is significant that ministers receive so little operational support, and that so little of substance has been written on the subject of ministerial effectiveness. This state of affairs was acknowledged by Blondel (1985, p.8) in his comment that 'the study of ministers and ministerial careers is in its infancy'. This observation holds true today, with the deficit of literature on the subject yet to be adequately addressed (Berlinski et al, 2007). Existing literature has largely tended to divide a minister's job description into a number of clearly delineated and often competing roles (Chabal, 2003; Marsh et al, 2000), and to sub-divide the ministers performing those roles into types of minister (Cheong, 2009; Headey, 1974). This review will aim to assimilate the existing literature on the varying roles a minister must perform (including the minister as leader, on which relatively little has been written), drawing conclusions as to the skills and qualities necessary in order for a minister to be effective.

Any working definition of 'effectiveness' is greatly complicated in the case of a minister by the variance of stakeholders they represent, and the contrasting roles they must perform. Effectiveness

might normally be construed as the degree to which stated objectives are achieved; a minister will have many competing objectives, and they cannot achieve them all in equal measure. A Prime Minister will want a minister to be effective in promoting the political priorities of the government within their designated department, and to the wider public. Civil servants will want their minister to be effective in advocating the department in Parliament and the Cabinet. Given these differing demands, ministerial effectiveness could be conceived as a minister's ability to perform to a level of competence across the spectrum of ministerial roles, whilst also exercising their time and judgement to make an impact in the areas best suited to their individual abilities.

What do Ministers do?

In order to answer the question of what makes an effective minister, we must first seek clarity on the varying roles and daily functions that the job entails. As the Public Administration Select Committee (PASC) is set to do at the time of writing, we must ask 'what do ministers do?'[1] Rhodes (2004) has noted the relative lack of studies attempting to detail the working lives of ministers in a systematic fashion, with James (1999) attesting that public administration has neglected ministers and their departments. Rose (1987) has also commented that departmental ministers are the least studied part of the executive. There exists a proliferation of ministerial diaries, most notably Benn (1989), Crossman (1975), Kaufman (1980) and Jenkins (1991), but these are of limited use in understanding how a modern day minister divides his time. The diaries of Chris Mullin (2009) are more informative (and equally entertaining), but are confined to the details of a junior minister's role.

In his study 'Everyday Life in a Ministry: Public Administration as Anthropology', Rhodes (2004) sought to address the lack of work by political scientists engaging in the direct observation of politicians. Using a combination of diary analysis, shadowing, elite interviewing and non-participant observation, he hoped to describe the world of three Whitehall permanent secretaries and two ministers 'through their eyes' (2004, p.12). Whilst the daily activities of permanent secretaries were empirically analysed, and found to be divided between policy, management and representative roles, no such analysis of ministers was conducted, although the unrelenting pace of work was highlighted. Cheong (2009) rightly notes that ministers are a difficult group to study empirically – ministers form a small group and frequent re-shuffles hinder stable research. The highly intensive and sensitive nature of ministerial work also results in limited chances for researchers to interview and observe.

Although empirical analyses of how ministers *actually* spend their time are not forthcoming, there is no shortage of qualitative offerings on what ministers do and are expected to do. Marsh et al (2000) conducted interviews with 22 ministers and 146 civil servants between 1974 and 1999, spanning four departments. Their research identified four roles that ministers perform – a policy role, political role (including dealings with the Cabinet, Parliament, Europe and the Party), executive role and a public relations role. Similarly, James (1999) identified five core components to a minister's workload, namely parliamentary duties; acting as a department advocate within Cabinet, at Parliament Committees and EU meetings; public relations; executive work within the department, and policy-making. There is consensus that the requirements on a minister's time are such that they will not be able to master each of these roles (Rose, 1971; Searing, 1995). Unless they are of exceptional calibre, a minister is best served giving an honest appraisal of where his or her strengths lie, and allocating their time accordingly. However it is worth addressing the

[1] PASC launched an inquiry into the number, role and effectiveness of government ministers on 28 July 2010

literature on these roles in more depth, as a minister will have to perform each to some degree of effectiveness if they are to perform well in their new post.

Parliamentary Role:

Good performance in the House of Commons is vital to a minister's reputation. In a study of backbench and leadership roles in Parliament, based on interviews with 521 of the 630 Members then sitting, Searing (1995) observed that the ability to debate and answer questions effectively in Parliament was central to the regard with which a minister was held by their fellow members. A minister will be expected to answer oral and written questions, speak in prominent debates, answer adjournment debates and appear before select committees. Parliamentary questions (PQs) offer the minister a chance to account for their actions to their parliamentary colleagues, and their effectiveness in doing so will contribute substantially to the success of their ministerial careers.[2] Marsh et al (2000) explain that from a civil servant's point of view, outstanding performances in the House of Commons are held to be vital in strengthening the minister (and therefore the department) in Cabinet. One retired permanent secretary illustrated the point in arguing 'we wanted to win in Cabinet...and (needed) a minister who was good in the House of Commons' (Marsh et al, 2004, p.314). In addition to this, ministers may have to pilot legislation through the House of Commons, and should have a due understanding of legislative process (James, 1999).

Spending one's social time in Parliament is not compulsory - Michael Heseltine gave the impression of not wanting to be there outside official business and discussion of bills, unlike his contemporaries Norman Fowler or Patrick Jenkin, who could often be seen in the Parliament cafeteria (Chabal, 2003). Nonetheless, prudent ministers will make efforts to keep on good terms with party backbench committees that deal with their subjects (Searing, 1995) - this serves not only to appease perceived obligations, but as a means of gaining valuable feedback regarding their own performance which may not be readily available elsewhere. A minister's performance in Parliament will also affect the esteem with which they are held by their own civil servants, who will spend much of their time writing briefs for the minister's Select Committee and House debates. In summary, 'a minister who has not learned how to handle the House of Commons before reaching office is unlikely to remain in office long' (Rose, 1987, p.82).

Executive Role:

Most ministers do not see their role as chief executives of departments – this is the function of the permanent secretary. As Hennessy details, Michael Heseltine was a rare exception, a 'Whitehall freak', as a minister with a strong interest in departmental micro-management (Hennessy, 1989, p.607). The executive role will nonetheless lay claim to much of the minister's time, as there are many decisions within departments that only a minister can take, and they will sign off all key decisions whether they are interested in them or not (James, 1999). A minister will have to take important decisions concerning the operation, organisation and staffing of their departments (Laughrin, 2009). Managerial decisions and personnel management are likely to be instrumental in allowing the minister to achieve their wider policy goals (Marsh et al, 2000).

[2] Ashridge Virtual Learning Centre (2010), Learning Guides, 'Working for Ministers'

Departmental Advocate:

Effectiveness outside the department is a key part of a minister's job. They will need to display sufficient advocacy and negotiating skills to argue the department's case in Cabinet. A minister who cannot win in Cabinet is considered a liability by civil servants, as reflected in the research of Marsh et al (2000). The minister must also fight to win the department's share of public spending in Cabinet Committees and in discussion with Treasury ministers. The department can draft policy, but cannot by themselves ensure it becomes law, and it is incumbent on the minister to gain approval for departmental initiatives. For this reason the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) were very happy to be assigned Peter Mandelson in 1998, considering him a heavyweight who could fight their corner effectively (Marsh et al, 2000). A permanent secretary interviewed by Rhodes (2004) echoed the sentiments that an effective minister must 'go out and argue for resources' (Rhodes, 2004, p.12). Ministers must also maintain good relations with interested parties, pressure groups, companies and individual members of the public. In addition they may be called upon to represent the department in Brussels, and promote British interests further afield.

Policy Role

In his landmark study *British Cabinet Ministers*, Headey (1974) undertook in-depth interviews with 31 Ministers of the British government from 1969 to 1970. His findings identified three possible ministerial roles in policy determination. These consisted of *the policy legitimator* or 'minimalist', who simply signs off on suggestions from officials, then presents and defends the policy as his own; *the policy selector*, who considers the various options detailed by his officials before making up his own mind; and *the policy initiator*, who is more pro-active in challenging departmental wisdom and seeks to establish new policy goals. Headey's study concluded that 22 of the 31 ministers interviewed were policy initiators. Marsh et al (2000) further nuanced these roles to include that of *Agenda Setters*. These were ministers who went further than attempting particular policy initiatives, but rather sought to change the overall agenda and policy line of their departments. Marsh et al (2000) cite the example of Roy Jenkins at the Home Office in the 1960s, who succeeded in shifting the department from an agenda of social conservatism to one of social liberalism, leaving an imprint that lasted well into the 1990s.

When starting in a new department ministers may only have a few basic ideas on policy in that field, and a limited knowledge of the subject matter (a more likely scenario following mid-term re-shuffles). Some may take office with shadow experience in that role, and a firm vision of the policies they want to implement. It is to a degree the minister's prerogative to decide the extent of their involvement in policy making. A minister who is naturally minded to be a policy legitimator may not last long, as they are liable to be found out in a crisis where decisive action is needed. Examples include John Moore at DTI, who was overwhelmed by the task of reforming welfare policy, and Lord Carrington at the Department of Energy, who felt there was little he could do in the face of a major energy crisis (Marsh et al, 2000). Margaret Thatcher expected her ministers to develop their own policies and override the Civil Service if necessary (King, 1994), and ministers have since become increasingly pro-active in their policy role. In his account of *How to be a Minister*, Kaufman (1980) noted that everything a minister does, in some way, goes towards a policy.

A minister's policy role is one of several aspects of their work that could be compromised by a short tenure, particularly concerning implementation. Ministers will want to make a difference and see

their policy through to the end, but will usually no longer be in office by the time secondary legislation is put into effect, and most will leave office without having prepared what happens after the bill they piloted becomes an act (Chabal, 2003). Rose (1971) argued that three years could be considered a minimum time for a minister to carry a policy within their department. This would consist of a year for the minister to understand the technical intricacies of his department sufficiently well to settle the details of a bill; a year to push it through parliament and possibly secure Treasury authorization for expenditure; and a year to establish guidelines for implementing the resulting policy. Today's ministers will likely have between 15 and 20 months to do what they can.[3] Cleary & Reeves (2009) have argued that ministers are less inclined to grapple with difficult policy problems due to the expectation they will be moved on quickly, causing an imbalance of power between ministers and civil servants.

Public Relations

As Des Browne has attested, 'the key ministerial roles are to take decisions and then explain them'.[4] The roles of ministers have changed since the era of Headey's studies. A minister must now apportion more of their time than ever before to presenting and defending policy, the department and even themselves to the media. To be effective a minister must be able to deal with media pressures, and come across well on television if they occupy one of the higher posts (Kaufman, 1980). Both Lord Young and Michael Heseltine saw public relations as central to their wider policy goals, and a key constituent of the policy making process now lies in explaining that policy to the media. Rightly or wrongly, a minister is concerned with publicly visible performance, and being seen to make a difference (Rhodes, 2004).

In his study of life in Whitehall departments, Rhodes (2004) attested that it is hard to overstate the demands placed by the media, both directly and in absence, on the time of senior officials. He likened life in a government department to living in a media goldfish bowl, one 'that can take any problem and make it a crisis' (Rhodes, 2004, p.16). This environment demands of a minister the capacity to absorb crises, and to treat them as if they are 'one offs' (Rhodes, 2004, p.16). Hennessy (2001) identifies the media aspects of crisis management as an important criterion in Prime Ministerial effectiveness. Crises can occur in any department, although as Marsh et al (2000) have highlighted, the media relationship with high status departments such as the Home Office is particularly fractious. It is a rare for a Home Office minister not to have had their agenda affected by a media story, and they may find themselves at the mercy of events beyond their control, with crises developing literally overnight. Douglas Hurd was known for looking forward and keeping an eye on potential crises, and Roy Jenkins was also concerned with the Home Office's media image. Michael Howard claimed his clear, ideologically founded agenda insulated him from media hysteria, although interviews with his senior officials suggested him to be the most media oriented Home Office minister in 30 years (Marsh et al, 2000). As Laughrin (2009) has detailed, the voracious

[3] For more information on average ministerial tenure, see Cleary & Reeves (2009); Bakema, W (1991), The Ministerial Career, in Blondel, J. Thiébault, J.L. (Eds). *The Profession of Government Minister in Western Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

[4] Ashridge Virtual Learning Centre (2010), Learning Guides, 'Working for Ministers'

appetite of 24/7 news cycles and the additional pressure of accountability results in ministers having to constantly explain what they are doing, thinking and planning, even before they have fully thought it through. The 'goldfish bowl of public accountability' has been further increased by obligations under the Freedom of Information legislation.

A study of the roles listed above provides a strong framework for understanding how a minister's time in office will be allocated. In addition they must play a prominent part in the affairs of their party, voting in Parliament and giving speeches at conferences and party functions. This is to say nothing of their full role as constituency MPs, which they will likely hold unless they are members of the House of Lords. It is little wonder then that Laughrin (2009, p.1) has talked of ministerial overload, and the danger of ministers drowning in 'papers and processes'.

The Importance of Adaptability

Having discussed the roles a minister must fulfil, this review will now examine the qualities and skills needed to fulfil these roles effectively. A minister is likely to perform tasks pertaining to a number of these roles in any given day, and it follows that adaptability is one of the core skills for any minister to be effective. As Rhodes (2004) observed, ministers move from one meeting or engagement to the next with barely enough time to read or digest their briefing. It follows that they must be comfortable changing terrain at regular intervals.

Ministers must also be adaptable in the sense that they learn quickly, as an absence of formal training means they will have to learn on the job. The experience acquired as an MP (and in standing to be an MP) does not naturally infer a smooth transition to the role of minister. Many of the requisite skills will be new or greatly expanded, including delegating tasks to others; reconciling personal priorities to those of other ministers and the Prime Minister; analysing vast swathes of information on complex issues and abstracting the key points; and saying what is consistent with government policies, even if unpopular within the party. In his book *New Labour and the Civil Service*, Richards (2003) described New Labour's preparations for office in 1997. This largely consisted of a few training courses at Templeton College, and for some, a reading of Kaufman's *How to be a Minister* and a Fabian Seminar. Some had their own mentors for advice, and Tony Blair was known to have had such a relationship with Roy Jenkins. However Margaret Beckett asserted that in the end 'the only thing that helped was experience' (Richards, 2003, p.80).

A minister must continue to learn and adapt quickly throughout their ministerial career, as they change departments or seek promotion to Secretary of State. Should they make it into Cabinet, a previous stint as Parliamentary Private Secretary (PPS) or junior minister is not guaranteed to impart transferable skills. The role of PPS is sometimes framed as an apprenticeship for a governmental role (Searing, 1995), but no conscious effort is made to provide apprenticeship training. The PPS is appointed by a minister to be his or her assistant, to be the eyes and ears of the minister in the House of Commons, and the tasks they perform in such a role bear little relation to the demands of ministerial office (Searing, 1995). The work of a junior minister will vary greatly according to their department and rank (Minister of State or Parliamentary Under-Secretary). They will work long hours and fulfil varied and demanding tasks, often for little public recognition. Some junior ministers will be assigned clear departmental responsibilities and become known within relevant policy communities, and may enter the political limelight in the process (Theakston, 1987). Although time spent in a junior ministerial role can impart useful skills, particularly if the minister then becomes Secretary of State within the same department, it is historically clear that the job of junior minister was *not* designed as a training ground for higher office (Rose, 1971). An upwardly mobile minister therefore has no choice but to continue learning and to continue to adapt.

The Imperative of Political Skills

Before detailing the other core skills necessary to be an effective minister in the UK, it worth noting that US literature has provided comparative evidence on the skills needed to be a Presidential appointee. Like ministers, presidential appointees must be effective managers of large bureaucratic organisations, and combine these skills with policy expertise in the field of their department. They are also subjected to short tenures and must learn the ropes quickly (Ingraham, 1987). In her discussion of trends in Presidential appointment, Ingraham (1987) highlights the eight sets of skills analyzed by Paul Light (1987): negotiation skills, analytical skills, public speaking and wider communication skills, congressional relation skills, substantive knowledge of relevant policies, familiarity with Washington politics, management skills, and interpersonal skills. Ricucci (1995) analyzed the behaviours, experiences and political environment of six high-ranking bureaucrats, and found seven factors contributing to their effectiveness: political skills, management and leadership skills, situational factors, experience, technical expertise, strategy and personality. The Presidential scholar Fred Greenstein (2000) identified six areas that political leaders should focus on: public communication, organisational capacity, political skill, clear policy vision, cognitive style, emotional intelligence and self-awareness.

From a British perspective, an analysis of the literature reveals that ministers are commonly prized above all else for their political skills and capacity to deliver strategic leadership. This may at first appear tautological, and it is to an extent an inevitable outlay of the Westminster system. Nonetheless, that is the system in which our minister will operate, and there emerge clear markers for what the priorities of an effective minister should be. In their study of departmental cabinet ministers, interviews conducted with 146 senior civil servants led Marsh et al (2000, p.13) to conclude that the characteristics of an effective minister were 'decisiveness and political judgement'. These are two themes echoed time and again in the literature. When Laughrin asks what specifically a minister brings to office, based on interviews with a number of acting ministers, he finds it is the insight of their political philosophy, and a feel for what is of priority importance to voters – for what is 'politically necessary, practical, acceptable'[5]. James argues that ministers are not required to immerse themselves in the details of a department's work, but are rather required to inject the government's political priorities into the department's thinking, to 'subject officials to the litmus test of political acceptability' (James, 1999, p.14). He goes on to state that a minister's forte lies in political brokerage; whilst the civil service is concerned with the administrative rationale of policy, a minister must be concerned with the public acceptability of policy (James, 1999). An effective minister operates in a dual capacity, striving to serve both their department and the wider government. With lasting insight, Walter Bagehot neatly captured a minister's imperative to act as the political antidote to the Civil Service. Writing on ministerial effectiveness in 1867, he stated that ministers need 'sufficient intelligence, quite enough various knowledge, quite

[5] Ashridge Virtual Learning Centre (2010), Learning Guides, 'Working for Ministers'

enough miscellaneous experience, to represent general sense in opposition to bureaucratic sense'. (James, 1999, p.14).

The prevalence of political skills in a minister's role is supported by Cheong (2009), in his study of 'Suggested Capacities for a Minister's Success'. Cheong sought to build an empirical framework for measuring desirable ministerial capacities and type, in accordance with Saaty's Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), a tool initially developed for the measurement of decision making in the private sector. The study utilised AHP as a measurement tool to calculate a hierarchical preference or priority for otherwise abstract roles and competencies, based on a survey of ministers, high ranking bureaucrats, National Congressmen, professors and scholars with an interest in ministers' leadership in Korea. Cheong divided ministers into three types – a politician type, a bureaucrat type and a profession (expert) type. The findings indicated that the most desirable type is a politician type minister, who possesses 'significant reliability and expectation for ministerial success' (Cheong, 2009, p.145). Politician type ministers scored highly on representativeness, owing to a clear political identity and shared symbolic identity with the Prime Minister, and on political capacity, often sharing a political ideology and policy orientation with their political superiors. Politician type ministers also scored highly on policy capacity and were seen as well placed to balance their dual roles as manager and political actor. Cheong's study suggested that public servants often have a preference towards politician type ministers, whose knowledge, experience and networks in politics give them a unique insight with which to inform policy.

This emphasis on political skills is not to deny the importance of managerial ability. Jean Blondel (1985) argues that ministers must have managerial skills in order to run their departments efficiently and ensure that morale is high. However, the effectiveness of these administrative skills is contingent on the minister possessing political awareness, as the job of a minister is always somewhat more political than the role of an administrator. In view of their link with Cabinet and Parliament, Blondel stresses that ministers 'are ostensibly and indeed, in most cases, really and truly, political' (Blondel, 1991, p.8). Interviews conducted by Cheong (2009, p.148) with academics and former ministers reflected the predominance of political skill, with ministers cast as 'leaders who have political sense to handle policy process with various stakeholders'. Politician type ministers also have advantages in navigating through the complex policy environment of Whitehall. Although ministers must manage, and those with sufficient expertise may be well served in managing policy projects through to their conclusion, the literature situates a minister's added value in their political expertise. As Rose surmised, 'ambitious politicians are more likely to rise to the top of Whitehall through the management of political issues than the management of programme resources' (Rose, 1987, p.10). The same rule applies prior to becoming a minister – the skills that must be shown by an MP seeking advancement are largely political, not administrative.

The Influence of the Westminster Model

By comparison with other Western European nations, British ministers are amongst the least likely to have been chosen for their specialist expertise (Blondel, 1985). Those posts demanding formal qualifications are minor (law officers for example must be qualified lawyers). There is no expectation that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should have received formal training in

economics or finance, and most post-war Chancellors have not done so (Rose, 1971). Preferment in the UK is based largely on parliamentary reputation, with experience running the House of Commons thought to be more useful than experience running a business (James, 1999). This state of affairs is not typical on a global scale - outside of the cabinet systems of government that prevail in Western Europe, ministers are frequently brought in from the outside, and are only marginally concerned with the political implications of their ministerial tasks (Blondel, 1991). King (1994) has argued that British Prime Ministers are less interested in technical expertise when appointing their ministers than the leaders of any other western country. They are more likely to look for qualities such as political acumen, a capacity for hard work, loyalty, acceptability to the party and an ability to perform in the House of Commons.

The imperative of political skills has its basis in the Westminster system, as a result of which British politicians must pride themselves on being generalists, not specialists. As is well documented, traditional convention dictates that each minister must be a Member of Parliament. In his study of Western European Ministers, De Winter (1991) classified an 'outsider' as any minister who had been brought in to government because they were either specialists in the subject field of their department, or had experience of managing a large or complex organisation.[6] Only 2% of British ministers were found to be 'outsiders', compared with 11.7% of German ministers, 16.3% of French ministers and 37.5% of Dutch ministers. Similarly, 95.1% of British ministers are MPs prior to taking up their post, compared to a Western European average of 75.5% (De Winter, 1991). These statistics are not in themselves remarkable, but they have important ramifications for the qualities required to be an effective British minister – as a direct consequence of the Westminster system, one is not expected to have specialist expertise, but rather to have general and adaptable political skills.

This need for political skills is further born out when we consider the quickness of ministerial rotation and the depth of the pool from which ministers are chosen. In the current House of 650 members, 363 are members of the coalition government and formally available for appointment. However the talent pool is in practise far smaller. Rose (1971) has estimated that the number of MPs in the majority party or coalition who are *de facto* ineligible for a ministerial appointment ranges between one-third and two-fifths, with various MPs discounted on the basis of age (too old or too young), poor health, on personal grounds (perhaps extremist views, questionable business associations or sexual delinquencies), or simply a lack of desire to run for office. This means that the pool of potential ministers is so small that a Prime Minister may have to give ministerial roles to over half of those MPs who are not demonstrably unsuitable for the role. Those of high quality from within the talent pool are of high demand, which may be one accounting factor for the shortness of average ministerial tenure – what talent there is must be spread around. In her study of Ministerial Careers in Western Europe, Bakema (1991) found that over 25% of British ministers served under three or more different posts, a proportion second only to Ireland and Italy, two

[6] De Winter, L. Parliamentary and Party Pathways to Cabinet, in Blondel, J. Thiébault, J.L. (Eds) (1991), *The Profession of Government Minister in Western Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

countries where political experience again predominates in the career background of ministers.[7] Bakema observes that all countries where a political background predominates have a high proportion of mobile ministers who shift from department to another. The resultant short tenure only adds to a minister's self conception as a generalist – to be a specialist would entail staying in one department long enough to acquire a specialism. The lesson appears to be that political skills will get a minister noticed, and once in office they will have little opportunity to develop anything other than political skills.

The Demands of Accountability

The importance of political skills also resides in the fact of electoral accountability that differentiates a minister's role from the civil servants around them. The minister must account for decisions and sell the government's vision to the public. It follows that they must be both politically astute and an excellent communicator. With so much of a minister's time now devoted to public relations and accounting for the decisions of themselves, their department and the government, anything less than a strong communicator is unlikely to succeed in the role. Rhodes (2004) found that permanent secretaries want ministers who are very good with the public, and a senior civil servant interviewed for Searing's study on roles in the House of Commons articulated the point: 'To be a successful minister, you've got to be good at the despatch box. If you can't get your point of view and policies over by making speeches about them, you're not a good minister – because the efficient administrators are hired, I mean they're the civil servants' (Searing, 1995, p.433).

With accountability comes a necessity to be decisive, and permanent secretaries need ministers who are willing to take ultimate responsibility for the success of departmental operations (Rhodes, 2004). Lord Croham stated his belief that every civil servant wanted a strong minister who gave their own views and made it clear if they disagreed with advice (Hennessy, 1989). Roy Jenkins had the same view, stating that if a minister is 'putty' to the Civil Service they will be 'putty' to everyone else, and no policy will get through at all (Hennessy, 1989, p.494). From the department's perspective, a minister must give clear leadership on what they want, and clarity of decision. As the civil service cannot act alone and lacks the legitimacy to do anything without ministerial authority, the department's nightmare is a minister who cannot make up his mind, in which case administration is liable to stall, and the system seizes up (James, 1999). A minister must also be decisive in times of crisis, and depending on their department, crisis management will take up much of their time. In this sense the minister is required to be a true leader, to make the decisions that need to be made. However an effective minister may want to do more than this. They may want to set the overall strategy and provide an overarching narrative for the work of the department. It is worth consulting leadership literature for notes on why this is beneficial, and how it can be achieved.

[7] Bakema, W (1991), The Ministerial Career, in Blondel, J. Thiébault, J.L. (Eds). *The Profession of Government Minister in Western Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

The Minister as Leader:

For a new minister taking charge of a Whitehall department for the first time, the statistical likelihood is that this will be the first time they have ever managed anything, and leadership will be unfamiliar ground. Political skills are valued in a minister in part because this is what they are expected to have acquired through their apprenticeship as an MP – but ministers are also expected to be leaders, and the typical background of a Westminster minister does not lend itself to developing the requisite skills. The Parliamentary route to office may provide potential ministers with the opportunity to gain technical expertise in a given area, but it does not provide training in management or leadership (Blondel, 1991). Unless a minister has led an organisation as part of their professional career prior to becoming a politician, it is hard to make a case that they have been fully trained for the role they are about to undertake. Rose (1987) has detailed that just under half of British ministers consider that they have a management role in their ministry - motivating officials, improving its organization and monitoring the performance of standard operations. Most come to the role with no experience of management in a large organisation.

The Minister as Entrepreneur

Whilst the UK is low in ministerial 'outsiders', an unusually high number of British ministers have a 'professional' career background (De Winter, 1991).The usual professions from which ministers are drawn (lawyer, lecturer, party official, or latterly political advisers), are less suited to bestowing the leadership skills needed than a background in business (Blondel, 1991; Rose, 1987). However it should be noted that business backgrounds do not always make for successful ministers – Lord Young's time as minister was considered a relative failure, as was that of John Davies, one time head of the CBI, who particularly underperformed in the House of Commons (James, 1999).[8]

Ministers are more likely to come to office holding a set of skills concomitant with the role of an entrepreneur, than with the skills of a leader in the private sector. Ministers are often political, free professionals in a solo occupation – 'sole traders' – who have fought their way to promotion and 'played the game' in the House of Commons. The skills needed to compete with others and rise in a parliamentary party are not the same as those required to provide executive leadership in a large

[8] For more information on the career background of ministers, see Thiebault, J.L, The Social Background of Western European Ministers, in Blondel, J. Thiébault, J.L. (Eds) (1991). *The Profession of Government Minister in Western Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan

bureaucratic organisation (Rose, 1987). This point is illustrated by the high number of ministers in the Coalition government who have a career background as a 'sole trader'.[9]

The most ambitious ministers may match Schneider and Teske's conception of the 'political entrepreneur' – individuals who 'change the direction and flow of politics' (Schneider & Teske, 1992, p.737). They may equally conform to conceptions of a 'public entrepreneur'. Lewis (1980) argues that the public entrepreneur develops a career using, and ultimately transforming, the practises of large scale public-organizations: 'The public entrepreneur...comes to understand that the large complex public organization is the most powerful instrument for social, political and economic change in the political universe' (Lewis, 1980, p.238). Dyson (2001) interviewed 17 successful entrepreneurs from a range of industries and countries, and identified several core qualities which, if adapted to a minister's working context, could contribute to our understanding of effective ministers. They included a sense of self direction and self-awareness (also identified by Hennessy (2001) in his criteria of effective Prime Ministers); selling (in the case of a minister this entails persuading and influencing others, and being able to articulate both their own policy and the government's vision); commitment (aligning oneself with the vision and goals of the government and challenging others to do the same); drive and determination, and directiveness (holding others to account and addressing performance when it fails to reach expectations).

Schofield (2008) has identified a need for the public sector to attract and support entrepreneurs in order to improve. A minister with entrepreneurial skills may have a profound effect on their colleagues' motivation to change, their willingness to engage and their enthusiasm for learning. In his study of managers and leaders, Zaleznik (1977) argued that business leaders have more in common with artists, scientists and other creative thinkers than they do with managers. In light of the necessity for both management and leadership for any organization to succeed, ministers may see their role as providing the creative and entrepreneurial spark, whilst the permanent secretary oversees the management of the department. Also by way of comparison, political appointees in the US are hired with the purpose of providing a new policy direction, perspective and innovative approaches to the public sector (Ingraham, 1987); a minister may want to conceptualise their role within the department in the same terms.

The Minister as Chairman

An entrepreneurial spirit will serve the minister well, but is not in itself a guarantee of leadership capabilities. Some of the qualities an effective minister might cultivate are reflected in the plethora of literature on private sector leadership. There are comparisons to be drawn between the role of a minister and that of a private sector chairman – both roles demand a unique set of skills and qualities, and require their protagonists to take on the role without formal training or development. The chairman takes ultimate responsibility for what the firm does, just as the minister must take ultimate responsibility in his department. The chairman could be said to set the overall vision of the

[9] According to IFG analysis, 36% of Coalition Ministers have a career background as a 'sole trader', defined as a professional or individual working independently and outside of large organisations (including barristers, small business directors and entrepreneurs).

organisation, whilst the CEO takes charge of operations, in the same way as the permanent secretary oversees departmental operations. In their study of private sector chairmen, A.Kakabadse and N.Kakabadse (2008) identified a number of key skills in performing the role effectively. These included delineating boundaries between the role of management and the role of the board; sense making (providing a shared sense of what the organisation stands for and where it would like to be); interrogating the argument (asking questions, providing an alternative view when all are in agreement); influencing outcomes, and living the values of the organisation. Each of these skills could be applied to the minister in the context of their role as head of department.

The Importance of Personality

Having surveyed the empirical literature on leadership and organizational effectiveness, Hogan and Kaiser (2005, p.1) emphasise the importance of personality in leadership, stating that 'who we are is how we lead'. If Prime Ministers are indeed seeking to identify strong leaders to be their ministers, the literature suggests varying accounts of the qualities they should be looking for. In a qualitative and quantitative review of personality and leadership, Judge et al (2002) found extraversion to be the most consistent correlate of leadership. Openness to experience and conscientiousness were also found to have a strong positive correlation, with neuroticism negatively correlated. Mintzberg (1975) has argued for the importance of introspection and self evaluation in strong leadership, with Goleman (1998) stressing the need to display emotional intelligence.

In a cornerstone of leadership literature, McClelland and Burnham (1976) divide managers into three types – affiliative managers, motivated by the need to be liked rather than the need to get things done; managers motivated by the need to achieve; and institutional managers, found to be the most effective, who focus on building power through influencing the people around them. Other characteristics of the institutional manager include a strong belief in the importance of centralized authority; a capacity for work and willingness to sacrifice their own self-interest; a keen sense of justice, and an avoidance of egotism. Contrary to popular belief, the best managers were found to actively like power and to seek to use it. In another well known study, Collins (2001) studied the leaders of eleven high performing companies over a five year period, and found their leaders to be united by a combination of qualities Collins termed 'Level 5 leadership' – namely a blend of 'extreme personal humility with intense professional will' (Collins, 2001, p.3).

Hogan and Kaiser (2005) have identified four themes that regularly appear in leadership theories literature – integrity, competence, decisiveness and vision. Whilst an effective minister would naturally hope to possess each of these qualities, decisiveness and vision are perhaps the most specific to a minister's role. Minister's can make a difference if they develop their own style at the head of the Ministry (Chabal, 2003), with Bose stating that vision and political skill supersede communication skills in importance – without vision a minister will have little substance to their communications (Theakston, 2010). Theakston (2010) has observed that this is one area where the leadership of Gordon Brown was found wanting, as he failed to set a plausible narrative in which to situate his actions, and also failed in communicating a sense of direction. This was in contrast to Margaret Thatcher, who was adept at projecting and selling her own ideas and linking them to a grander narrative.

Leading in the Public Sector

If a minister wants to lead and implement change in their department, they must have a clear agenda and vision of what they want to do (Marsh et al, 2000). This notion is supported by the literature on public sector leadership. The importance of vision is emphasised in the work of Javidan and Waldman (2003), who conducted a survey of 203 middle and upper-class managers and asked them to assess their superiors in the Canadian public sector. They found that the core behaviours of charismatic leaders included articulating a future vision, to be accomplished over a period of time; building credibility and commitment to that vision; and creating emotional challenges and encouragement for followers. There is evidence that ministers may already be competent in this aspect of their role – Brookes (2007) studied the capability reviews of four central departments, and found that ministers can be adept at setting strategy, although they were less successful in displaying the passionate and inspiring leadership required to implement those strategies.

Ministers will have to cope with the relentless pace of change in the public sector (Gill, 2009; Schofield, 2008), and work hard to negate the widespread perception that top level leadership in the public sector falls short of the standards set elsewhere (Gill, 2009). Research suggests that in order to do so, they should seek to engage their staff at every opportunity. In her studies of public sector worker attitudes to leadership, Almo-Metcalfe (2008) asserts that having passed through trait theory, situational theory and heroic leadership theory (casting the leader as charismatic, visionary and transformational), the current state of leadership literature now lends an emphasis on staff engagement. Public sector workers conceive of their 'leader as servant', and judge their worth in terms of what that leader can do for them. Such a conception of effective leadership would include respect for others and their development, delegating in order to empower potential, and working with stakeholders in order to produce a united vision based on openness and transparency (Almo-Metcalfe, 2008).

Michael Heseltine is an example of a minister who appeared to understand the importance of staff engagement, wanting officials to feel part of the department and informed of the changes he was making (on one occasion Heseltine showed a video to the whole department followed by a question and answer feedback session, a strategy also used by Lord Young and Peter Lilley) (Marsh et al, 2000). Heseltine negotiated with his PPS and permanent secretary to ensure they would stay with him throughout the duration of his time at the Department of Environment (DOE), allowing him to engender an atmosphere of trust (Chabal, 2003). He was also able to cultivate a close relationship with his junior ministers based on a culture of exclusivity (Chabal, 2003). A vital element to any minister's success will be their interactions with the team around them, and their ability to delegate. Dunleavy and Steunenberg (2006) have stressed the importance and dangers of delegation in leadership, whilst De Ver has noted that leadership regularly involves forging formal or informal coalitions with leaders and elites, in order to solve collective problems (De Ver, 2009).

A minister will have to form coalitions with a wide range of different actors. To this end they will rely heavily on their private office, led by their private secretary, which will come to form a conduit linking the minister to the department and the outside world. The private office will determine the most relevant documents and people for the minister to see by sifting through the many requests that come their way, in addition to collaborating with the department on the functions the minister should attend, briefing on who they should see and what they should say (James, 1999). A

minister's most important relationship will likely be with their permanent secretary, with whom they are often seen to be mutually dependent, particularly at times of departmental crisis (Rhodes, 2004).

Situational Leadership

A minister should be clear around their conception of leadership, and adapt themselves to the requirements of each individual situation. Goffee and Jones (2006) note that leadership is essentially situational; the required leadership response is always contingent on the situation. This is particularly relevant to the role of a minister, due to the variance of ministerial tasks and decisions to be carried out in any given day. In his study of political leadership, Blondel (1987) stresses the importance of the environment in which leadership operates, conceiving of leadership as a relation between people in a given social situation. Persons who can lead in one situation may not be so in another. De Ver (2009) argues that the majority of conceptions of leadership neglect the importance of context, and the political nature of leadership. From a developmental perspective, leadership is best understood as 'a political process that is contextually contingent' (De Ver, 2009, p.8). Adaptability again comes to the fore, as an effective minister must adapt their leadership style according to the specific pressures confronting them.

Political Leadership

As public sector leadership roles carry high levels of accountability (and often lower levels of direct authority), the need for political awareness and influencing skills is heightened. A report entitled 'Leading Change in the Public Sector' by the Chartered Management Institute (2003) identified the need to develop leaders 'with the capacity to manage the political dimension' (Charlesworth et al, 2003, p.13). Leaders would be prized for 'an ability to see and communicate the big picture, make connections, be credible with different groups and broker relevant political and strategic relationships' (Ibid, p.13). Political skills are now starting to be recognised in the literature as elements of effective management, and they are all the more significant in the role of minister as leader.

Hartley et al (2007) conducted a significant study into the skills needed to lead with political awareness, commissioning a national survey of directors, senior and middle managers from the membership of the Chartered Management Institute. This was in addition to three focus groups with 41 managers in London, Birmingham and Cardiff, and 12 detailed interviews with managers from a variety of organizations. Skills were disaggregated into a political skills framework consisting of strategic direction and scanning; building alignment and alliances; reading people and situations; interpersonal skills and personal skills. Significantly, managers who had worked outside the UK reported higher scores in all dimensions, and managers who had worked in a different industrial sector attained higher total scores on political skill. Working with influential people within the organization (or in the minister's case, the government) was found to be the most important situation for the use of political skills. The development of political skills was found to be highly dependent on learning by experience – 88% of correspondents reported that learning from mistakes had been valuable in developing their political skills, with 86% highlighting the experience they had gained in the job and 85% citing experience gained from handling crises.

It is difficult to extract core lesson pertaining to ministerial effectiveness from leadership literature, such is the wealth of diverse and occasionally contradictory research on the subject. However some key points do emerge. An effective minister must delineate the roles and expectations of themselves and their permanent secretary; it will help if they are extroverted, open, and with a capacity for self evaluation and emotional intelligence; they must have a clear narrative and vision for what want to achieve, and the requisite communication skills to relay this message to their staff, with whom they must engage; they must harness their entrepreneurial abilities; they must continually adapt their leadership style to the demands of each situation; and as political leaders, they will be valued above all for their political skills, which they must continue to develop with experience.

Conclusion:

The literature on ministerial effectiveness is replete with areas for further exploration. As previously highlighted, empirical analyses of the qualities needed to make an effective minister are rare, with Cheong (2009) a notable exception. Quantitative surveys of how ministers spend their time are equally sparse. Further research should be encouraged into the career backgrounds of British ministers (and MPs more widely), to gain a clearer understanding of where today's ministers are coming from, and the skills and competencies they are likely to bring with them to the role. The fact that many ministers receive little training prior to starting the role is widely acknowledged, but less has been said about the conspicuous lack of developmental support that ministers receive once in their new post, with few suggestions as to how either situation can be improved.

Relatively little has been written on the leadership qualities that are specific to a minister's role, and the practises through which a minister can lead effectively within their own department. Similarly, there is little on public attitudes to the question of what makes an effective minister. The importance of ministerial teams, and of interactions between the minister and those closest to them, is at times underplayed. The literature has largely failed to address the increasing importance of media performance in ministerial effectiveness, the delicacy of remaining at once sensitized and responsive to media pressures, and the consequences of today's insatiable multi-media and 24/7 news culture for the demands of being a minister.

The fact that so few studies have sought to identify effective ministers, and to trace the qualities that unite them, is testament to the ambiguities of ministerial effectiveness. There is no one way for a minister to identify themselves as effective, in part because a minister cannot be divorced from their time and place. Michael Heseltine is universally identified in the literature as a particularly effective minister, and yet some of his practises, including his strong interest in managing the internal processes of the department, were unique to him and not widely recommended for other ministers to follow.

Blondel (1991) has argued that ministerial roles are characterised by the duality of the minister's political and representative importance, together with the administrative and technical requirements of the role. This paper has outlined that the literature on British ministers places their significance and effectiveness firmly on the political side of this duality. The Westminster system naturally gives rise to ministers who are prized for their political skills, including the ability to negotiate policy with stakeholders, to communicate the government's vision to the public, and to gauge the political and public acceptability of policy. Ministers are also valued for strong and decisive political leadership, creating a vision for the department and communicating a set of clear and achievable objectives. Specialist expertise and technical skills, though valued, carry less of a premium.

Five key roles have been outlined in which a minister can expect to spend the majority of their time, and an effective minister will be adaptive in performing to a level of competency in each of these.

The political skills nurtured lower down the system should stand a minister in good stead in their role as departmental advocate, although not all ministers will be capable of setting about this task with the requisite forcefulness. The policy role of a minister is highly nuanced, and will vary widely according to the experience, expertise and confidence of the minister involved. Regardless of these variants, the minister will be held responsible for any policy failings, no matter their involvement in policy formulation, and they must be able to defend their decisions. Strong political and communication skills will aid the minister in their parliamentary and public affairs roles, although here the stakes are extremely high, as poor performances could prove fatal to the minister's esteem in the eyes of Parliament, the Cabinet, the Prime Minister or the wider public.

Against this background, the minister's executive role emerges as the least significant within the Westminster system. However it is important to draw distinctions between the minister as chief executive, which they are not expected to be, and the minister as leader, which they must be, in the political and uniquely ministerial applications of the term. A minister's political skills may help them in their representative roles, but many will have to learn how to provide their department with effective political leadership.

The role of a minister within the Westminster system is intrinsically multifaceted. A minister is expected to set an agenda and strategic vision for their department; they are expected to ensure the government's vision is reflected within their department; and they are expected to relay both visions simultaneously to Parliament and the outside world, exuding competence, belief and responsibility. Such a balancing act demands high levels of political skill and awareness. The above is a description of the minister's role as it currently stands in the literature. It is not to say that a shift in emphasis of ministerial abilities to specialist and technical expertise would not produce better political outcomes – that is a question of some urgency and an invitation for debate.

Bibliography

Almo-Metcalfe, B. (2008). The impact of engaging leadership on performance, attitudes to work and wellbeing at work: A longitudinal study, *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 22 (6)

Ashridge Virtual Learning Centre (2010). Learning Guides, 'Working for Ministers'

Benn, T. (1989). *Against the Tide: Diaries 1973 – 1976* (London: Hutchinson).

Berlinski, S. Dewan, T. Dowding, K. (2007). ''The Length of Ministerial Tenure in the United Kingdom, 1945-97'', Political Economy and Public Policy Series

Blondel, J. (1985). *Government Ministers in the Contemporary World* (London: SAGE).

Blondel, J. (1987). *Political Leadership: Towards a General Analysis* (London: SAGE)

Blondel, J. Thiébault, J.L. (Eds) (1991). *The Profession of Government Minister in Western Europe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

Brookes, S. (2007). ''360° Degree Leadership in the Public Sector: Developing an Approach to Collective Leadership'', Leading the Future of the Public Sector: The Third Transatlantic Dialogue,

University of Delaware, USA, May 31-June 2, 2007

Chabal, M. (2003). Do Ministers Matter? The Individual Style of Ministers in Programmed Policy Change, *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 69, 29-49

Charlesworth, K. Cook, P. Crozier, G. (2003). ''Leading Change in the Public Sector: Making the Difference'', Chartered Management Institute

Cheong, J. (2009). Suggested Capacities for Minister's Success: An Empirical Approach Based on Saaty's AHP , *International Journal of Public Administration,* 32, 136-151

Cleary, H. Reeves, R. (2009). ''The 'culture of churn' for UK ministers and the price we all pay'', Research Briefing, DEMOS, 12 June 2009

Collins, J. (2001). Level 5 Leadership: The Triumph of Humility and Fierce Resolve, *Harvard Business Review*

Crossman, R. (1975). *The Diaries of a Cabinet Minister: Minister of Housing* (Vol.1) (London: Jonathan Cape)

De Ver, H.L. (2009). ''Conceptions of Leadership: A Background Paper for the Leadership, Elites and Coalitions Research Programme (LERCP)''

Dowding, K. Dumont, P. (2007). ''Hiring and Firing Ministers'', Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference, 6-9 September 2007

Dunleavy, P. Steunenberg, B. (2006). ''The elusive qualities of leadership: leaders and decision delegates''. PSPE working papers, 01-2007

Dyson, C. (2001). What Makes a Great Entrepreneur?, *Competency and Emotional Intelligence Quarterly,* 8 (4)

Gill, R. (2009). ''Leadership in the public sector – is it different?'', Research Focus, The Leadership Trust

Goffee, R. Jones, G. (2006), *Why Should Anyone be Led by You? What it Takes to Be an Authentic Leader* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press)

Goleman, D. (1998). What Makes a Leader?, *Harvard Business Review*

Greenstein, F.I. (2000), *The Presidential System: Leadership Style from FDR to Barack Obama* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

Hartley, J. Fletcher, C. Wilton, P. Woodman, P. Ungemach, C .(2007). ''Leading with political awareness: Developing leaders' skills to manage the political dimension across all sectors'', Chartered Management Institute

Hartley, J. Branicki, L. (2006). ''Managing with Political Awareness: A summary review of the literature'', Chartered Management Institute

Headey, B. (1974), *British Cabinet Ministers: The Role of Politicians in Executive Office* (London: Allen and Utwin)

Hennessy, P. (2001). *The Prime Minister: The Office and its Holders Since 1945* (London: Penguin)

Hennessy, P. (1989). *Whitehall* (London: Fontana)

Hogan, R. Kaiser, R. (2005). What We Know About Leadership, *Review of general Psychology*

Ingraham, P. (1987), Building Bridges or Burning Them? The President, the Appointees and the Bureaucracy, *Public Administration Review*, 47 (5), 425-435

James, S. (1999). *British Cabinet Government* (London: Routledge).

Javidan, M. Waldman, D. (2003). Exploring Charismatic Leadership in the Public Sector: Measurement and Consequences, *Public Administration Review,* 63 (2), 229-242

Jenkins, R. (1991). *A Life at the Center* (London: Macmillan)

Judge, T. Bono, J. Ilies, R. Gerhardt, M. (2002). Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review, *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 87 (4), 765-780

Kakabadse, A. Kakabadse, N. (2008). *Leading the Board: The Six Disciplines of World-Class Chairmen* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Kaufman, G. (1980). *How to be a Minister* (London: Faber & Faber)

King, A (1994). Ministerial Autonomy in Britain, in Laver, M. Shepsle, K. (Eds). *Cabinet Ministers and Parliamentary Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Laughrin, D. (2009). Swimming for Their Lives – Waving or Drowning? A Review of the evidence of Ministerial Overload and of Potential Remedies for it, *Political Quarterly,* 80 (3), 339-350

Lewis, E. (1980). *Public Entrepreneurship: Towards a Theory of Bureaucratic Power* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)

Light, P (1987), When worlds collide: The political-career nexus, in C.Mackenzie (Ed.), *The in and outers: Presidential Appointees and the Problems of Transient Government in Washington*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press).

Marsh, D. Richards, D. Smith, M. (2000). Re-Assessing The Role of Departmental Cabinet Ministers, *Public Administration,* 78 (2), 305-326

McClelland, D. Burnham, D. (1976). Power is the Great Motivator, *Harvard Business Review*

Mintzberg, H .(1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact, *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1975

Rhodes, R. (2004). Everyday Life in a Ministry: Public Administration as Anthropology, *American Review of Public Administration,* 2 (1), 1-23

Riccucci, N. (1995), ''Execucrats'', Politics, and Public Policy: What Are the Ingredients for Successful Performance in the Federal Government, *Public Administration review,* 55 (3), 219-230

Richards, D. Kavanagh, D. (2003). Prime Ministers, Ministers and Civil Servants in Britain, *Comparative Sociology*, 2 (1), 175-195

Richards, D. (2008). *New Labour and the Civil Service: Reconstituting the Westminster Model* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)

Rose, R .(1971). The Making of Cabinet Ministers, *British Journal of Political Science,* 1 (4), 393-414

Rose, R. (1987). *Ministers and Ministries: A Functional Analysis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Schneider, M. Teske, P. (1992). Toward a Theory of the Political Entrepreneur: Evidence from Local Government, *The American Political Science Review,* 86 (3), 737-747

Schofield, C (2008). Key Challenges facing Public Sector Leaders, *The Ashridge Journal,* Autumn 2008

Searing, D. (1995). Backbench and Leadership Roles in the House of Commons, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 48 (3), 418 - 437

Sorcher, M. Brant, J. (2002). Are You Picking the Right Leaders?, *Harvard Business Review,* February 2002

Theakston, K. (2010). ''Gordon Brown as Prime minister: Political Skills and Leadership Style'', PSA Conference Paper 2010

Theakston, K. (1987). *Junior Ministers in British Government* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)

Van Wart, M. (2003). Public Sector Leadership Theory: An Assessment, *Public Administration Review*, 63 (2), 214-228

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and Leaders: Are they Different?, *Harvard Business Review*