HOW TO MONITOR THE EFFECTS OF MANAGERIAL INNOVATION IN PUBLIC CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS

Mateusz Lewandowski
Institute of Public Affairs, Jagiellonian Universit, Poland
mateusz.lewandowski@uj.edu.pl

Abstract:
It is essential to develop methodology for collection of innovation data in the public sector. It pertains also to monitoring the outputs and outcomes of managerial innovations. As the methodology must be sensitive for public subsector specificity, this paper is focused on public cultural institutions. Among several conceptual frameworks of effectiveness the accountability-based effectiveness has been recognized as the most adequate to underlie investigating managerial innovation outcomes in public cultural institutions.

The managerial innovation outcomes perceived by the interviewed managers of Polish public cultural institutions embraced three dimensions of accountability-based effectiveness. This is accountability for self-development of the institution; development of institution's staff; and acting on the sake of the audience (customers) and local community. Many other dimensions were omitted. Hence, the triangulation of methods is highly recommended, as the interview, even in-depth one, is insufficient.

Keywords: innovation, management, effectiveness, cultural institution, outcome assessment

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make
learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

1.   INTRODUCTION

The impact of innovation on economic growth has been well recognized (Oslo Manual, 2005; Green Paper on Innovation 1994). In turn, it also points a direction for further research, encompassing the impact on non-economic aspects of growth, especially pertaining to innovations in public and nongovernmental organizations.

As emphasized in Oslo Manual (2005, p. 16), it is essential to develop methodology for collection of innovation data in the public sector. Among many aspects of this suggestion, embracing for instance the processes of developing, implementing and enhancing innovations, is the one comprising monitoring of the innovation outputs and outcomes, which itself is a complex phenomenon. It is mainly due to the variety of outcomes and the scope of public sector, which may be perceived from the perspective of a single organization or a system. Moreover, public sector embraces many types of activity with different specificity, like national security, economy, education, health care, social care, or culture etc. Therefore, monitoring the outputs and outcomes of innovations must be sensitive for subsector specificity. Moreover, building a comprehensive and coherent methodology for collection of innovation data in the public sector must follow the induction logic and have rather incremental character. Following this conditions and needs the aim of this paper is to:
1. Find a conceptual framework of effectiveness which might be used for monitoring the outcomes of managerial innovation implemented in public cultural institutions. This framework should embrace especially the perspective of a single institution, not the system.
2. Investigate to what extent the effects of implementing managerial innovation in public cultural institutions, perceived by their managers, and coherent with the chosen framework of effectiveness.

2.   THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF INNOVATION

Innovation has been well explored by researchers representing different fields, such as business and management, economics, organization studies, innovation and entrepreneurship, technology, science and engineering, knowledge management and marketing (Baregheh et al. 2009). Despite, or maybe due to this achievements the definition of the phenomenon still causes problems (Cooper, 1998; Białoń 2010). A classic definition, like Schumpeter's (1934, p.66), consider an innovation as: (a) an introduction of a new production method, product or its quality, (b) the opening up of a new market or a new source for raw materials or semi-manufactures, or (c) the creation of a new organizational structure in industry. Another often quoted definition was given by Damanpour (1996), who conceives innovation as: "a means of changing an organization, either as a response to changes in the external environment or as a pre-emptive action to influence the environment. Hence, innovation is here broadly defined to encompass a range of types, including new products or services, new process technology, new organization structure or administrative systems, or new plans or programs pertaining to organization members" (Damanpour, 1996, p. 694). A more contemporary approach presented in the Oslo Manual (2005) defines an innovation as "the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organization or external relations" (p.46). This definition, however useful and widely applied in research, is not flexible to use in social or cultural contexts. Therefore, it is noteworthy to recall the definition of workplace innovation, which may be considered as a broad definition of innovation – "the intentional introduction and application within a role, group or organization of ideas, processes, products or procedures, new to the relevant unit of adoption, designed to significantly benefit the individual, the group, the organization or wider society" (West & Farr, 1990, p. 9).

Those definitions reflect a basic concept of innovation, however they do not give its comprehensive picture. Thus, some complex models of innovation has been created to. For instance Cooper (1998) claims that every innovation is defined at the same time by three dichotomous dimensions, which are: product versus process, radical versus incremental, and technological versus administrative, however some innovations appear to be uni- or even bi-dimensional in nature. Berghah et al. (2009) examined 60 definitions from aforementioned fields, and synthesized six attributes of the innovation process, such as:
-    stages of innovation: creation, generation, implementation, development, adoption;
-    social context: organizations, firms, customers, social systems, employees, developers;
-    means of innovation: technology, ideas, inventions, creativity, market;

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make
learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

- nature of innovation: new, improve, change;
- type of innovation: product, service, process, technical;
- aim of innovation: succeed, differentiate, compete.

As a result of their studies they defined innovation as "the multi-stage process whereby organizations transform ideas into new/improved products, service or processes, in order to advance, compete and differentiate themselves successfully in their marketplace" (p.1334). In turn, Crossnan and Apaydin (2010) presented the most complex multi-dimensional framework of innovation, based on broad literature studies consisting of 525 most cited or up-to-date positions. The model encompasses three determinants, such as:
- individual and group level focused on leadership, encompassing: Chief Executive, Officer's, Top Management Team's and Board of Directors' ability and motivation to innovate;
- organizational level focused on managerial levers, embracing: (a) mission, goals and strategy, (b) structure and systems, (c) resource allocation, (d) organizational learning and knowledge management and (e) organizational culture;
- process level focused on business processes, including: (a) initiation and decision-making, (b) portfolio management, (c) development and implementation, (d) project management, (e) commercialization.

These determinants have an impact on two dimensions of innovations, which were described as (Crossnan and Apaydin, 2010):
- innovation as a process, comprising: (a) individual, group or firm level, (b) driver, such as resources or market opportunity, (c) top-down or bottom-up direction,(d) source, such as invention or adoption, (e) locus – firm or network, and (f) tacit or explicit nature;
- innovation as an outcome, embracing: (a) form, such as product, service, process or business model, (b) incremental or radical magnitude, (c) referent, such as firm, market or industry, (d) administrative or technical type, tacit or explicit nature.

The aforementioned research confirmed that the effect of innovation is one the key research areas. Presented definitions and frameworks of innovation significantly indicate an orientation towards exploration of the phenomenon in business organizations. Hence, a need indicated in Oslo Manual to explore innovations in public sector and methods to assess their impact, is still vital and urgent. From the aforementioned concepts of innovation the most adequate for public organizations is the one given by West & Farr (1990), as it considers the widest scope of innovation effects important to individuals, groups, organizations and wider society. This scope is coherent with the public interest, which is considered to be one of the key distinctions of public management (Kożuch, 2004, p.51). Therefore, it must be taken as a starting point in constructing any method of collecting and assessing data concerning innovation in the public sector.

3.   MANAGERIAL INNOVATION OUTCOMES IN CULTURAL INSTITUTIONS

Building a framework of innovation outcomes in public cultural institutions must refer to previous research. Some researchers indicated that innovations in public sector lead to increased trust and satisfaction (Vigoda-Gadot, Shoham, Schwabsky, 2008). Thus, the innovation outcomes are perceived in terms of people's needs and attitudes. This aspect is important in the context of criticism of New Public Management oriented mainly on the organizational efficiency. This concern was raised for instance by Hess and Adams (2007) or Parsons (2006). Although it is pertaining to the public sector in general, it also applies to public cultural institutions. More specific research focused on culture sphere has been conducted by Garrido and Camarero (2010), who revealed how unexplored this field is. Despite that, some results are known, however they do not encompass only managerial innovation (table 1).

Table 1: Researches on innovation outcomes in cultural organizations

Author	Indicated relation between innovation or innovativeness and its effects
M.J. Garrido and C. Camarero (2010)	Orientation of museums towards knowledge caused: - increases social and economic effectiveness; - implementations of product innovations in big institutions; - implementations of organizational and technological innovation in small and big museums;
M.J. Garrido and	Organizational innovation influence on:

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

C. Camarero (2010)	- technological and product innovations, - efficiency in small organizations - social effectiveness (indirectly).
Gainer, Padanyi (2002)	- marketing orientation has an impact on the marketing orientation of organizational culture, which, in turn, leads to increased customer satisfaction and more effective fundraising; - customer satisfaction has an impact (positive or negative) on the reputation among different stakeholders; - better reputation caused by the artistic level has more impact on financial resources than customer satisfaction;
Wilson, Boyle (2004)	Partnerships with other cultural institutions lead to: - better access to knowledge, and human and financial resources, - better realization of cultural projects and investment projects;

Source: own elaboration.

Those research results indicate several useful findings concerning monitoring the outcomes of innovations from the perspective of a single institution, such as:
- including positive and negative factors;
- containing internal and external factors;
- encompassing the chain of innovation outcomes including the effects of innovations and changes caused by the initial innovation;
- embracing the large scope of outcomes, reflecting the interests of numerous stakeholders.
-

First two conclusions seem rather obvious and do not need further explanation. The other two are the dimensions of the same problem – what is the best scope of innovation effects, that should be monitored in public cultural institutions? First perspective is pertaining to a situation that one innovation leads directly to other innovations, thus causes outcomes indirectly. These should not be taken into account, as it would cause serious monitoring problems, like multiplying the real outcomes, and in turn falsify the research results. The second perspective narrows the problem to the scope of stakeholders which should be taken into account. This leads to a question which framework of effectiveness is the most appropriate for this purpose.

There are several approaches to the organizational effectiveness (Love and Skitmore, 1996; Kelley, 1978; Cameron, 1986, p. 542), however they can be grouped in three main categories (Bielski, 1996). First one perceives effectiveness from the perspective of the relation between the input and output and achieving the aims which were planned. The second one emphasizes the ability of the organization to survive and develop. In this approach the key role may play the ability to gain the necessary resources and/or to increase or maintain the optimal system efficiency, and/or to build advantageousness relations with the environment. The third approach is synthesis (to some extent) of two previous ones, and is based on the assumption that there is no one, universal criterion of effectiveness, and therefore many of them must be applied. The collation of those approaches is presented in table 2.

Table 2: General frameworks of effectiveness

Approach	Representing authors	Dimensions of effectiveness
Goal Attainment (praxeological)	T. Kotarbiński, J. Zieleniewski, W. Kieżun	a) effectiveness, b) advantageousness, c) efficiency
System orientation	E. Yuchtman, S.E. Seashore	a) ability to gain resources from the environment, b) survival and development
	D. Katz, R.L. Kahn	a) level of exploitation of gained resources, b) system efficiency, c) survival and development
Multicriteria orientation	M. Bielski	a) material effectiveness, b) economic effectiveness , c) system effectiveness, d) „political" effectiveness, e) political effectiveness, f) cultural effectiveness, g) behavioral effectiveness
	J.M. Pennings,	a) goals, b) constraints, c) referents

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

P.S. Goodman	

Source: own elaboration based on Bielski 1996, pp.104-123.

This division is similar to the one described by Love and Skitmore (1996), which distinguishes: (1) the goal attainment approach; (2) the systems resource approach; (3) the strategic constituencies approach; and (4) the competing values approach. The first one is the same as proposed by Bielski (1996), while the next two point to two dimensions (resource oriented and constituencies oriented) which Bielski (1996) included in the systems approach. The competing values approach seems to perceive conditions of effectiveness as the effectiveness itself. However, one of the assumptions of the competing values approach is that organizations at the same time can be evaluated in different ways (Love and Skitmore 1996, p.8) which is similar with multicriteria approach.

As West & Farr (1990) indicated in their definition of innovation, and as Kożuch (2004) perceives the public interest as the main and universal purpose of public organizations, only multicriteria approach to effectiveness is adequate to investigate and evaluate the outcomes of managerial innovations in public sector. Moreover, this approach seems to be open for various stakeholders perspectives, and thus is compatible with several important premises of contemporary management. These are: balancing the interests of different groups, reflected by such concepts as sustainable development, territorial management, corporate social responsibility, organizational publicness, and the criticism of global management context, reflected by negative aspects of market managerialism or attitude to the "other" reflected by the clash of civilization (Lewandowski, 2011). In fact, the concept of effectiveness based on the stakeholders theory (not necessarily called like that) is not new (Conolly, Conlon, Deutsch, 1980; Keeley 1978) and underlies for instance the strategic constituencies approach, which actually represents the system approach and multidimensional one. Strategic constituencies approach has been criticized though, because (Kulikowska-Pawlak, 2010, p. 78):
- effectiveness may be variously perceived, depending on the strength of particular stakeholders group;
- almost every activity meets the expectations of different stakeholders, but in different extent;
- organizational resources are limited, thus increasing satisfaction of one group of stakeholders is at the expense of satisfaction of the others.

Nevertheess, literature research revealed that multidimensional stakeholders oriented framework of effectiveness is essential to assess organizational effectiveness, and thus the outcomes of managerial innovation. In contemporary literature devoted to management another framework has been proposed – an accountability-based effectiveness (Lewandowski 2011, 2013a). It is based on the assumption, that creation of effectiveness rules must include the needs of stakeholders, but does not imply maximization of their satisfaction. Instead, the most important is the balance and moral obligation to respond to everyone or anything impacted by the organizations activity (Lewandowski 2011). The most important is the moral context, which means that an organization, and people constituting it, have an obligation based on their role not on their choice. No one chooses if to be or not to be accountable for one's own actions. One is responsible because it is the nature and essence of the relation between action and consequence. This assumptions refer to recalled by MacIntyre (2007, p.63) *agathos* concept – to be *agathos* means „to do, what is ones duty, do it well, using one's capabilities and skills necessary for what this person is duty bounded to do in others sake". Thus, this approach allows for instance to apply the 'harm less' attitude, suggested by Kelley (1984). The dimensions of accountability-based effectiveness are presented in table 3, where they are divided into internal and external factors.

Table 3: The dimensions of accountability-based effectiveness

Organizational envirionment type	Dimensions of accountability-based effectiveness
Internal	- Owners; - Organizational survival and development; - Staff

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make
learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

External	- Customers and local community;
	- Majesty of the law ;
	- Natural environment;
	- Economy;
	- Policies (labour, social etc.)
	- Other organizations and institutions;

Source: own elaboration based on Lewandowski 2011, 2013a.

The accountability-based effectiveness has been chosen to be collated with the results of managerial innovation implemented in public cultural institutions due to the fact that it is one of the most contemporary and ethics oriented frameworks of effectiveness. I also allows to capture the conflicts of interests between dimensions. Moreover, it has been also applied in strategic management evaluation (Lewandowski, 2013b).

4.   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the literature or previous research exploring innovation several methods have been used, such as:
- innovation landscape methodology (Ross, Kleingeld, Lorenzen, 2004);
- content analysis (Baregheh, Rowley, Sambrook, 2009);
- questionnaires and experiment (Anderson, De Dreu, Nijstad, 2004);
- literature-based indicators of innovation output – LBIO (Oslo Manual, 2005).
-

Although useful for different scientific purposes these methods are not very helpful in examining if a chosen framework of effectiveness is useful for monitoring the outcomes of managerial innovation implemented in public cultural institutions. The exception is a questionnaire, which was used in this research.

It had a form of an in-depth and partially standardized interview with ten managers from top and middle level management directly engaged in the implementation process of innovation. Collected data was interpreted according to the method described as a condensation of matter. The interview consisted of five questions:
1. What results did you expect after implementing managerial innovation?
2. What are the real results of implementation this managerial innovation? What may be perceived as positive?
3. What has changed in your institution due to the implementation of managerial innovation?
4. What other changes in management, small or big ones, were caused by the implementation of managerial innovation?
5. How would you describe the relations between implementation of managerial innovation and effectiveness of your institution?

The research was conducted in three public cultural institutions in Poland. They were chosen among about 30 institutions due to the fact of meeting the following criteria:
- managerial innovation was implemented after 2005 and this process was completely or significantly finished by the end of 2010;
- institutions had various organizational complexity;
- institutions implemented different type of managerial innovation;
- institutions were located in different regions of Poland;
- implemented managerial innovation was pertaining to the whole institution.

These organizations were Cracow City History Museum, Museum of Art in Łodź, and Culture Center in Legnica (Muzeum Historyczne Miasta Krakowa, Muzeum Sztuki w Łodzi, Legnickie Centrum Kultury). Implemented managerial innovations are respectively: strategic management, total quality management (based on ISO), reengineering.

5.   ACCOUNTABILITY-BASED EFFECTIVENESS VERSUS MANAGERIAL INNOVATION OUTCOMES - THE RESEARCH RESULTS

The managerial innovation outcomes perceived by the interviewed managers of Polish public cultural institutions embraced only three dimensions – accountability for (1) self-development of institution; (2)

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

development of staff; (3) audience (customers) and local community. The results are presented in table 4, and are already collated with the framework of accountability-based effectiveness.

Table 4: Managerial innovation outcomes collated with the accountability-based effectiveness framework

Category of the output and outcome	Before implementation	After implementation
Accountability for self-development of institution		
Management	- lack of management, chaos; - old fashioned, vertical structure and short term planning and acting; - inefficient organizational structure; - demotivating system of prizes and bonuses;	- increased staff motivation and engagement; - enabling the control system by monitoring the achievement of aims and tasks; - better decision making (decisions based on analysis and diagnosis) and planning (vision, long term planning); - improved coordination – putting the tasks in order, well organized work;
Efficiency of the organization and staff	- no attention to costs; - overstaffing;	- good cooperation between the departments, smooth realization of tasks where more departments were involved; - increased organizational potential, team capable to handle big projects and world class events; - effective and efficient communication including the appearance of bottom-up direction, better transfer of information and more staff initiative;
Institution's ability to survive	- inability to undertake and finalize many types of projects; - stagnation and lack of novelty in the offer; - inadequate knowledge; - insufficient competences pertaining to new technologies; - insufficient financial and material resources;	- ability to gain key resources (financial, material and knowledge); - self-assessment and self-improvement of staff; - increased innovativeness (ability to create and realize an innovative cultural projects); - better effectiveness; - institution's development; - better recognition and improved image;
Accountability for development of staff		
Interpersonal relations	- bad atmosphere at work; - internal conflicts;	- better interpersonal relations; - team spirit and good atmosphere at work;
Existential needs	- Low salaries;	- increased salaries; - avoiding of dismissals;
Self-realization		- satisfaction from ambitious projects; - increased self-esteem and feeling that one's work matters;
Development	- lack of career planning and staff development patterns;	- development of staff through trainings;
Accountability for audience (customers) and local community		
Product	- lack of novelty;	- increased quality of cultural offer;
Audience and community	- lack of realizing elementary tasks;	- increased general attendance; - increased attendance on "difficult" events;
Customer		- orientation towards customer;

Source: own elaboration based on research.

It is noticeable, that although there are internal and external factors mentioned, both groups comprise only the positive outcomes of implementing managerial innovation. Apart from that, the interviewed managers did not indicate any accountability for:
- compliance with the law (except one statement pointing to difficulties with settling the EU founds, gained for a project which was a consequence of increased organizational potential);
- acting ecologically for the sake of natural environment;
- having an impact on the economy;
- supporting public policies;
- the consequences to other organizations and institutions;

There are several probable reasons which might have been the cause of omitting those groups of outcomes: (1) managers do not think in such categories, (2) the questions somehow suggested the answers, (3) such outcomes did not occur, (4) managers forgot about them (interviewees didn't know

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

the questions before). The parts of utterances which were not the answer for the specific question, but were given to explain the context or the situation of the institution in the process of implementing managerial innovation, imply that actually there occurred some outcomes that may pertain to the omitted dimensions of accountability-based effectiveness. For instance implementing managerial innovations lead to the creation of a workplaces. In turn, such an outcome impacts the labor policy by decreasing the unemployment (here more important than the number is the fact).

6.   CONCLUSIONS

The research indicated main categories of managerial innovation outcomes important for managers of researched public cultural institutions in Poland. Referring to the accountability-based effectiveness these categories comprised accountability for self-development of the institution; development of institution's staff, and for audience (customers) and local community. In turn, large part of potential outcomes has not been revealed. It might have been caused by the effectiveness construct which the managers had in their minds or it was implied by the questions, or the managers simply forgot about them. Otherwise, it seems that the outcomes simply did not occur. It allows to form several conclusions pertaining to the methodology of monitoring the outcomes of managerial innovation implemented in public cultural institutions:

1. There is a need for a complex effectiveness framework, which would allow to encompass the variety of managerial innovation outcomes or verify that they did not occur. Moreover, it should also be sensitive for subsector specificity. Such a framework might be the accountability-based effectiveness.

2. Although the accountability-based effectiveness framework is adequate for this purpose, the factual research must be based on some more advanced and extended methods, as the interview, even in-depth one, is insufficient. Therefore triangulation of methods is highly recommended.

3. The framework of effectiveness used as an instrument to monitor the innovation outcomes allows to collect the information. It's interpretation is up to any individual getting familiarized with them. Thus, effectiveness framework is like a thermometer, which shows the temperature. The same temperature may be perceived as cold by one individual, and at the same time as warm by the other.

In the end it is essential to notice the limitations of conducted research, which was limited to (1) one type of innovation (managerial); (2) one country specificity (Poland); (3) one subsector of public sector (culture). Therefore, the indicated conclusions should be empirically verified in other subsectors, countries and for other types of innovations.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Anderson, N., De Dreu, C., Nijstad, B. (2004). The routinization of innovation research: a constructively critical review of the state-of-the-science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25,* (2).

2. Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., Sambrook, S. (2009). Towards a multidisciplinary definition of innovation. *Management Decision*, *47,* (8).

3. Białoń, L. (ed). (2010). *Zarządzanie działalnością innowacyjną*. Warszawa: Placet.

4. Bielski, M. (1996). *Organizacje – istota, struktury, procesy*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

5. Cameron, K.S. (1986). Effectiveness As Paradox: Consensus and Conflict in Conceptions of Organizational Effectiveness. *Management Science, 32*(5), 539-553.

6. Connolly, T., Conlon, E.J., Deutsch, S.J. (1980). Organizational Effectiveness: A Multiple-Constituency Approach. *The Academy of Management Review, 5*(2), 211-217.

7. Cooper, J. (1998). A multidimensional approach to the adoption of innovation. *Management Decision*, *36*(8).

8. Crossan, M., Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovations: a systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Management Studies 47*(6).

9. Damanpour (1996)

10. Gainer, B., Padanyi, P. (2002). Applying the marketing concept to cultural organizations: An empirical study of the relationship between market orientation and performance. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing,7,* (2).

Active Citizenship by
Knowledge Management & Innovation
19–21 June 2013 · Zadar, Croatia

make
learn

Management,
Knowledge and Learning
International Conference 2013

11. Garrido, M., Camarero, C. (2010). Assessing the impact of organizational learning and innovation on performance in cultural organizations. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing 15*(3).

12. Green paper on Innovation. (1995). Retrieved from http://europa.eu/documents/comm/green_papers/pdf/com95_688_en.pdf.

13. Hess, M., Adams, D. (2007). Innovation in public management: the role and function of community knowledge. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal 12(1).* Retrieved from http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/hess_adams_innovate_public_manage8final.pdf.

14. Kelley, M. (1978). A Social-Justice Approach to Organizational Evaluation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 23*(2), 272-292.

15. Kelley, M. (1984). Impartiality and Participant-Interest Theories of Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 29*(1), 1-25.

16. Kożuch, B. (2004). *Zarządzanie publiczne w teorii i praktyce polskich organizacji*. Warszawa: Placet.

17. Kulikowska-Pawlak, M. (2010). Pojmowanie efektywności organizacji – definiowanie, pomiar. In A. Frączkiewicz-Wronka (Ed.), *Pomiar efektywności organizacji publicznych na przykładzie ochrony zdrowia*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Katowicach.

18. Lewandowski, M. (2011). Sprawność zarządzania z perspektywy humanistycznej. *Współczesne Zarządzanie nr 1/2011*.

19. Lewandowski, M. (2013a). Introduction to Academic Entrepreneurship. In A. Szopa, W. Karwowski, P. Ordóñez de Pablos (Ed.), *Academic Entrepreneurship and Technological Innovation: A Business Management Perspective*, IGI Global.

20. Lewandowski, M. (2013b). *Zarządzanie strategiczne w instytucjach kultury*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Con Arte.

21. Love, P.E.D., Skitmore, M.R. (1996). Approaches to Organisational Effectiveness and Their Application to Construction Organisations. In A. Thorpe, (Ed.), *Proceedings 12th Annual Conference and Annual General Meeting*. The Association of Researchers in Construction Management, Sheffield Hallam University. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00004524

22. MacIntyre, A. (2007). *Czyja sprawiedliwość? Jaka racjonalność?* Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

23. Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data, 3rd Edition. (2005). Luxembourg: OECD, Statistical Office of the European Communities. DOI: 10.1787/9789264013100-en

24. Parsons, W. (2006). Innovation in the public sector: spare tyres and fourth plinths. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal Vol.*, 1*1*(2)*.* Retrieved from http://www.innovation.cc/peer-reviewed/parsons20innovate202a.pdf.

25. Ross V., Kleingeld A., Lorenzen L. (2004). A topographical map of the innovation landscape. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 9*(2)*.* Retrieved from http://www.innovation.cc/scholarly-style/ross-kleingeld-lorenzen-9-2.pdf [odczyt: 20.12.2010].

26. West, M. A., Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation at work. In M. A.West, & J. L. Farr (Ed.), *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. Chichester: Wiley.Wilson, L., Boyle E. (2004). The role of partnerships in the delivery of local government museum services. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management, 17*(6).

27. Vigoda-Gadot E., Shoham A., Schwabsky N., Ruvio A. (2008). Public sector innovation for Europe: a multinational eight-country exploration of citizens' perspectives. *Public Administration, 86*(2).