

INNOVATIONS IN NEW PUBLIC GOVERNANCE: METHODOLOGICAL ASPECT

Alvydas Raipa

*Kaunas University of Technology, K. Donelaicio str. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas, Lithuania
Email: alvydas.raipa@ktu.lt*

Abstract. Innovations in public governance are directly concerned with reforms and changes as processes of reorganization and modernization of public sector. In this article processes of modern stage evolution of public governance are analyzed influencing paradigm regulations of new public governance and providing the study of innovations importance in the ever changing political/economic/social environment. Innovations in public sector reform should not only be concerned with the improvement of the efficiency and coherence. Not only economic values play an important role in public governance, but also political and social values like liberty, equity and social security as well as the rule of law. There are a lot of directions of public sector modernization, that it why it is important to distinguish between reform and change in public organizations and to analyse the context of innovations development in both – private and public sectors.

Keywords: innovations of governance, the structure of innovations, innovations and reforms, new public governance.

Jel classification: A13, D02, D73, D78, D83, H11, J1, O10, O20

1. Introduction

First theoretical attempts to indicate postulates of new public governance were formed in the start of XXI century by most remarkable European and world public sector theorists (Pollitt 2008; Drechler 2011; Kettl, Fessler 2009; Klijn 2010; Potuček 2004). Analysis of structural indicators of new public governance shows that creation of new ideas and innovation-friendly environment is the main task of new public governance. Innovation as new type of managing performance (Bouckaert, Halligan 2008), as postmodern public administration (Miller, Fox 2007), as result of conditions and indicators of occurring changes are analysed (McNabb 2009; Hill, Lynn 2009). A number of innovative theoretical approaches for the analysis of public sector, implementation new public governance principles, oriented to development intersectoral partnership, networks, cooperation and trust, are created during several last years (Lane 2009).

Evolutions, democratization problems and governance practice of modern theoretical public governance continue traditional discussions the central axis of which is interactions among government structures, determining governance regulations, which standardize the behavior of organizations and individuals or citizens who do not necessarily like all the objective and (especially)

subjective rules, codes of public governance that limit the interests of separate social groups or not always proper state regulation principles – often they are unacceptable at all.

The changes of public governance in scientific literature are understood as the formation of new public management paradigm in 9th-10th decades of the 20th century; and they dominated as incremental evolvement of whole theoretical doctrines to new public governance; today they have many decomposition determinants which hardly can be named as reliable paradigm construction of scientific views; because theoreticians today can only satisfy themselves by the first generalizations of consequences and results of the mentioned evolvement, non plentiful complex research of these processes. Today's practice, society's position are even more oriented to ensuring of more liberal values, such as solution alternatives and activity, freedom of choice and rights, control of governance structures, increase of their social responsibility. Together, these accents of positive liberal ideology as the practice of implementation of new public management has shoved often put the accent on liberalism only as orientation of application of the market models. Sterile (managerial) management style and sometimes artificially moved traditional values of business sector management could not enable the strengthening of society governance humanistic origins, increased

social differentiation, further were expressed by the growth of social risks, social separation factors.

Using innovations and innovative strategies having purposes essentially to facilitate installing new technologies of governance are main directions of perfection of governance (Kettl, Fessler 2009; McNabb 2009). Successful creating innovations into public-private partnership projects depend on the barriers that exist internally and externally (Akintoye, Beck 2009). A number of theorists present various kind of innovative strategies, which authors refer as separation, connection and transcendence, are using in scientific literature (Veenswijk 2005). Modern understanding of governance innovations is related with new dimensions of socially oriented governance, i. e. social security, and corporative social responsibility, formation of citizen's participation at the micro, mezzo and macro levels of governance (Bourgon 2010; Parnell 2008).

Innovation in new public governance are analyzed by Lithuanian authors as part of sustainable development (Tvaronavičienė, Degutis 2007), as public-private partnership (Skietrys *et al.* 2008). The basic indicators of innovations are quality and efficiency of implementation practice (Melnikas 2011). One of the most important problems in creation innovative environment is financing of political strategies and programmes (Bivainis, Tunčikienė 2007; Raipa 2011). Strategic planning as methodological tool for the public governance institutions in creating innovative strategies of increasing complexity, role of corporative responsibility in realization of social obligations are analyzed (Jusčius, Snieška 2008). Analysis of Lithuanian innovation policy goals, environment and first results are summarised by data comparison with EU countries (Baležentis, Balkienė 2011). Comparison of change of management models and its impact to development of innovations using new information technologies shows us that it creates new environmental sphere for spread of new ideas, new decisions (Davidavičienė 2008). A number of authors determined main factories and directions of innovative changes towards some wider engagement of citizens into different activities, especially in local level of governance (Tijūnaitienė, Neverauskas, Balčiūnas 2009).

Object of the research is process of creation and implementation of innovations in new public governance.

Goal of the article is to analyse, to explain and to evaluate methodological problems, related with installing innovations in new public governance.

Methods of the research are: meta-analysis, classification, interpretation, simplification, and theoretical modelling, synectic and prognostic methods.

2. Innovation as main indicator of creating new faces of governance

Global society and changes requires from public organizations to reshape the way they carry out their goals and objectives. It is impossible without the development of original ideas, directions and exclusive priorities of public governance organizations performance on delivering services to citizens groups (McNabb 2009; Laegreid, Verhoest 2010).

The postcommunist countries have encountered many challenges related with the new public management evolution to new public governance. Public sector governance, the contemporary mixed – economy welfare state has been designed around affluence, and the capacity to have continuing high levels of public expenditures along with continuing levels of private affluence. The countries of postcommunist world inherited a lot of public sector governance problems, but have encountered even more extreme difficulties including lower level of wealth, declining of economy during the crisis, partly negative impact of implementation main concepts of new public management doctrine, reducing public programmes and public expenditures. All these factors confirmed the growing demands for the fundamental reform of economic, financial, political and social systems (Drechler 2011).

The main aim of reform development for the EU is to become the most effective and competitive knowledge – based on economy, which required various innovative ideas in public governance sphere and institutional internal and external environmental conditions. A very important factor is knowledge economy as determinant of creating new product, new governance technologies and new public services – the main components of innovative governance, i.e. **innovations of public policy formation and implementation**. Innovation driven governance can be useful for society, all groups of interests, and citizens as the encouragement of competitions and partnership between public, private and non - governmental sectors. Through increased competition the public sector can make attempts to increase efficiency, productivity, to improve establishing a new view to the role of strategic orientation of new public governance, to develop new quality of public policy formation, to produce innovative environment conditions for **institutionalizing deeper socially oriented forms of public governance**. Such pro-

cess is connected with the growing accountability and responsibility of public organizations, leaders for implementation changes of society, for creating more efficient governance of all levels of power – state, regional and local, i.e. governance must be able to create and implement innovation-based organizational development, using modern forms, methods and instruments of governance (Christensen *et al.* 2007).

Public governance structures should focus reflection on their internal structure changes as necessary performance. On the other hand, it is very important to change traditional bureaucratic type of governance. First of all it requires improving public governance structures, including legitimation of new forms of intersectoral integration, development of hybridic, multidimensional forms of organization activity. Innovation as a process can be determined as very specific local and historical phenomena of public sector modernization including **not only economic values** – efficiency, finance and budget, **but also values oriented to improvement social spheres of society**. Analysis development of changes and transformations as conditions closely related with innovation definition shows and implies that innovation as process can be analyzed from an evolutionary rather from an revolutionary perspective. It means that the most important tool of analysis should be incrementally based on methodology.

Term “innovation” was coined by Austrian – American economist J. Schumpeter, and the meaning of it is to introduce a new product of service or management technique or anything like that into the market successfully. If a number of attempts are not put into the market successfully it is not an innovation. As mentioned by Drechler (2011), effective and innovation – friendly public administration are anyway the better public administration, but all the more in times of crisis (Drechler 2011).

Analysing the nature and essence of innovations in public sector is highly debatable, exploring and categorizing of innovations are complicated. A number of attempts have been made by well-known authors to classify public innovations. Popular definitional variety including some determinations and indicators of “innovation” as:

- Product or service innovations, focused on the creation of new public services or products.
- Technological innovations that emerge through the creation and use of new governance technologies.
- Process innovations, focused on the improvement of the quality and efficiency of internal and external environment.
- Organizational and management innovations, focused on the creation of new organizational forms, the introduction of new management methods and techniques, and new working methods.
- Conceptual innovations occur in relation to the introduction of new concepts, frames or reference or even new paradigms that help to reframe the nature of specific problems as well as their possible solutions.
- Governance innovations which are directed in the development of new forms and processes of governance in order to address specific societal problems, such as the governance practices that attempt to enhance the self-regulating, and self-organizing capacities of policy networks.
- Institutional innovations, which are fundamental transformations in the institutional relations between organizations, institutions and other actors in the public sector.

All these innovation types are not exclusive. In practice, different types correlate with each other (Bekkers *et al.* 2011).

Akintoye and Beck (2009) excluded some authors’ attempts to identify innovation success indicators and conditions:

- Strong and unbiased management that were committed to selecting technologies best suited to serve public project goals.
- Early involvement of representatives with authority to commit resources to all parts influenced by the innovation.
- The establishment on effective information flow within the project team to identify and resolve problems arising from the innovation.

These indicators and conditions can be understood as believing that innovation is about creating value and increasing efficiency and is a key driver of competitive advantage (Akintoye, Beck 2009).

Innovation driven governance as process is connected with the growing accountability and responsibility of public organizations, leaders for implementation changes of society, i.e. governance must be able to create and implement innovation-based organizational development, using modern forms, methods and instruments of governance (Christensen *et al.* 2007). Evolution to new public governance formulated new challenges for performance management, total quality devel-

opment, resource management, created new definitions as client satisfaction, cooperation in creating public values, agentification, cultural integration, performance oriented to results, decision making focused on more democratic and humane features implementation in public sector activity (Bovaird, Loffler 2009).

Innovation is an effort made by one or more individuals that produces an economic gain, either by reducing costs or through increased incomes. Innovations can be presented as the actual use of nontrivial change in process, product or system that is novel to the public institution developing the change. Commonly features of understanding innovations as a process are of heterogeneous nature. Accordingly, some innovation success factors are idiosyncratic to the specific environment of the construction organization or procurement path. Existing of differences in interpretation of innovation definitions helps to recognize and explain innovations as organizational structure, determine parts of public governance mechanisms to control and integrate work activities including those which cross organizational boundaries, have a considerable influence to facilitate innovation in combination with participative leadership styles and cultural features.

3. Strategic character of public sector innovations

The process of transformations of the public sector has been accompanied by the development of a number of innovative theoretical approaches.

Nowadays new public management is in transitional way to new public governance as general model of public sector, innovative model, oriented to development intersectoral partnerships, networks, cooperation and trust. Strategic management in new public governance must focus upon the achievement of social objectives. What matters first and foremost is the effectiveness of the agency in meeting its social obligations (Lane 2009).

Innovations are characterized as creating new models of public administration. The new model of governance is government located at the center of a complex collaborative structures, functioning together and focusing on coordination and cooperation as background principles of new public governance doctrine, oriented to development of new strategic innovative principles as main directions to reshape government using innovations and innovative initiatives having purposes essentially facilitate improving efficiency of public services, implanting new technologies, creating new

ideas of implementation strategies and management tools.

Current formation and implementation innovations strategies were determined by Kettl and Fessler (2009) as a line of strategic perspectives of governing social, economic, culture spheres of society:

- The traditional concepts of governance must be changed.
- Traditional government institutions are increasingly surmounted by layers of complex networks of nongovernmental organizations.
- Public administrators must develop and use more interpersonal skills.
- Performance measurement, accountability and performance – based on management that transcend cross – organizational boundaries must be substituted for traditional organization – chart management structures.
- Trust and confidence in government are possible only when the government is transparent.
- Innovative strategies must engage new forms of public participation, greater civic responsibility, eliminate possibilities of conflicts between structural levels.

Interstructural conflict put a heavy burden on higher officials, who must attempt to coordinate the structures under their charge.

Such coordination is very important in the context of prevention of two kinds of errors: duplication, whereby structures waste resources trying to do same things; and all gaps, whereby problems fester because no one is in charge of solving them (Kettl, Fessler 2009).

4. Issues in the implementation of innovations

Theoreticians present a number of problematic issues in the implementation of innovations. Most important of them is pathology of bureaucratic activities, objectives and opportunities for innovative settlement of implementation issues. Next important problem is unfair financing of political strategies, and attention of politicians in the dividing of priorities and preferences.

Implementation of program is closely related with the role of innovations in development of public program from the functional, structural point of view (De Vries 2010). It means that implementation of innovative strategy depend on the **segmentation and fragmentation** level as the main reason of new public management dysfunctions: the lack of accountability and responsibility, the need to improve a number of control forms,

better determining of strategic priorities of new public management development, because the essence of public sector innovations lies in the transformation process (Kettl, Fessler 2009). Context of implementation of innovations requires from public sector to be able to receive flows of information. With the help of strategic planning organizations are formulating their fundamental long-term goals and objectives which are the basis of the actions. Exploring methodological ways and wide range of public sector innovation strategies shows that the theoreticians have noted an increasing complexity, multidimensional approaches, and hybridity. Concepts like diversification, fragmentation, intersectoral integration, social responsibility, networks are general definitions of innovation process.

Theoreticians present three (ideal-typical) coping strategies, which Veenswijk (2005) refers to as **separation, connection and transcendence**. Separation stands for detachment: the decoupling of innovative ideas and groups in relation to civic cultures. Connection focuses on the attachment and homogenization of divergent orientations with regard to the place and meaning of government actions. Transcendence highlights ambiguity and starts from the premise that the essence of public sector innovation lies in the transformation of original core values into a new perspective (Veenswijk 2005). Analysis of the innovation creation and implementation strategies let us to conclude and to determine the most important qualitative features of changes, to create new demands, environment conditions, socially accepted methods, procedures and norms.

5. Innovations as main driver of perfection of new public governance

The modern understanding of role of innovations in new public governance doctrine should be concerned with the improvement of the efficiency and productivity in all levels of public, private structures as main participators of partnership. It requires installing new relations between **public and private sectors**, to create innovative environment in to PPP's projects as long-term multi organization performance. The possibilities for successful implementation of innovations are directly related to through the interaction with clients and government structures. The sustainability of any innovation in PPP's depends upon the barriers, as aligns the interests, lifetime of projects, relationships of partnership practice, efficiency of governance public finances, the level of public and private sectors accountability, quality of risk management (Akintoye, Beck 2009). The main goals

of PPP's projects as mixed public - private structures: committees, board counsels and other forms of managerial activity. Most popular contracting strategic goals of rapidly creation innovation – friendly environment in mutual organizations are:

- To provide the highest quality services at the lowest costs at all levels of implementing PPP's projects.
- To ensure that service providers are held accountable and responsible in providing effective and efficient services.
- Systematically assess the appropriate level of service provision for various interest groups of society.
- Objectively determine whether services should be subject to competitive bid and in what amount.
- To minimize the impact on current employees affected by the competition.
- To provide a level playing field for all the potential service providers.

In determining which kind of services to put out for bid, were used various kinds of tests, as innovative indicators to find the potential for **outsourcing, optimization, benchmarking, maintaining, consolidating bidding of contracts**. These indicators focused on the main tasks in achieving admitting mistakes in the public – private partnership process, improving competition, protecting responsiveness and accountability of top level managers. Multisectoral integration can be described as the increasing use of **institutional hybridity**. Hybridic organization approach includes concessions, strategic partnership as institutional and contractual partnership, and risk allocation between sectors. Main innovation directions in realizing PPP is the perceiving efficiency of the private sector and inefficiency of the public sector. Theoretical view to PPP forms includes three kinds of efficiency: allocative efficiency, technical efficiency; and x efficiency, i.e., the prevention of a wasteful use of inputs (Akintoye, Beck 2009). An important indicator of level of conditions for creating innovations in the new public governance stage is quality of **performance management construct** as a synonym, (such as “oriented to results”, “managing for results”) closely related with creating and implementing innovations, such understanding focus the key public management systems functions and structures to systemic changes, creating innovative forms of specifying distinctive models, their components and relationships. Current treatment in theoretical studies refers it without identifying of classification and decomposition or either use in typology constructs as a synonym such “oriented for results”, “managing for results”.

Sophisticated understanding of performance management as a phenomena is closely related with creating innovations in public governance, because such understanding focus on the key public management systems functions and structure (organizational behaviour, environment, management all kind of resources etc., but also changes, the nature of new innovative forms of specifying distinctive models (Bouckaert, Halligan 2008). Performance based management as an innovative system is being accountable and responsible for its results, as ideal type of definition of governance system, which does not exist in reality, this may result in:

- The financial function rotating from a horizontal to a vertical and linking financial and other information.

- Guidance and steering: from ex ante to ex post.
- New interaction between organization and its external environment, focused to creation new types of relations.
- Cascading down of organizational objectives to almost an individual level (Bouckaert, Halligan 2008).

Performance management has to be located within a broad construction of organizational life, which recognizes that performance management cannot be considered in isolation from other factors that make up public management G. Bouckaert and J. Halligan defined performance based management as four ideal types:

Table 1. Four ideal types of managing performance (Bouckaert, Halligan 2008)

	Traditional Pre-performance	Ideal type: Performance Administration	Ideal type: Managements of Performance	Ideal type: Performance Management	Ideal type: Performance Governance
Measuring	Intuitive, subjective	Administrative data registration objective, mostly input and process	Specialized performance measurement systems	Hierarchical performance measurement systems	Consolidate performance measurement systems
Incorporating	None	Some	Within different Systems for specific management functions	Systemically internal integration	Systemically internal and external integration
Using	None	Limited: reporting, internal, single loop	Disconnected	Coherent, comprehensive, consistent	Societal use
Limitations	Functional unawareness	Ad hoc, selective rule based	Incoherence	Complex, perhaps not suitable as stable system	Uncontrollable, unmanageable

The modern understanding of innovations of public governance first of all is related with new evaluation criteria, and how the dimensions of **socially oriented policy** are implemented. The new public governance faces huge challenges in social security, new forms of social responsibility, citizens accessibility. Consideration of citizens only as customers does not encourage fast democratization, creation new innovative ideas and tools of implementation new public management doctrine, which reveal plenty of dysfunctions, the biggest part of which is related with one or other way of social aims of society and problems when analyzing them (Groeneveld, Van de Wale 2010).The main features of modern socially oriented public governance is greatly grown social fragmentation of society, new social stratification. Beside positive growth of such social fragmentation and interaction among separate social structural parts, theoreticians defined raising effect of various forms of

social tension fields, structural conflicts. The successful functioning of modern social systems strongly depends on development of new innovative types of governance as social nets, i. e. more dynamic systems. **The basic indicators of modern public governance environment quality level** of social process can be named in the following way:

- In all spheres of social life the interaction of formal and non formal structures has grown.
- Intersectoral (of all three society sectors) integration.
- The transformation of horizontal and vertical connections of organizational systems in various social life spheres.
- The expressive changes of direct and recurrent connections, their multidimensional changes in various social life fields (Melnikas 2011).

New public governance raises new requirements for creating new innovative forms of implementation new types of social responsibility of public institutions as new multidimensional definition. Social responsibility as organizational behaviour is based on normative and ethical considerations, moral philosophical principles, political and social conscience, more consistent ethical performance, multidimensional integration and corporate strategy (Parnell 2008).

6. Conclusions

The modern stage of public governance is very complicated and raises many questions for theorists and practitioners; also causing various often appearing systemic-structural problems that most often have dynamic and rarely static characteristics of problem systems. Theoretical conceptualization of new public management and its practical realization is estimated very contrarily today. One specialists see the importance of this paradigm as public sector marketization ideology and evaluate the spreading or implementation of market models to the practice of public governance at the end of the 20th century more positively not trying to accent dysfunctional peculiarities of new public governance model application in practice; these dysfunctional peculiarities are displayed by mechanistic transformation of private business management principles into the methodological arsenal of public sector activity, too high segmentation of public sector institutions, i.e. too high dispersion of business models in public space what weakens the place and role of the state and its institutions forming and realizing strategic aims and tasks of the state. One of the most important reasons of negative image of the new public management is insufficient orientation of this model to social expectations of society, hypertrophic belief that the market model can solve most society problems – unemployment, social separation, huge differences in social stratification.

Innovations in new public governance is seen as complex of tools, instruments and methods i.e. methodological construct for improving the managing performance and enhancing government's legitimacy with citizens. Public sector innovation theory and best practice requires further investigations, because its internal and external environment – new public governance and activity of new types of governance organizations are only in the first stages of evolution from new public management to new public governance doctrine.

Innovation – friendly environment can be created by attempts to develop new forms of intersectoral organization units as public – private,

and public - private – non governmental sector integration product, as main factor of improving the role of contracting strategies. New forms of hybridical and net structures use ways in which productive activity is financed the process that are used to decide what will be produced and the normative standarts, used to evaluate the innovative level of performance.

Public sector innovations must change social conditions of public sector by changing the social structures and processes, and creating conditions for improvement social security systems, installing corporative social responsibility of organizations and there personnel for realizing main tasks of socially oriented public governance, and for implementing strategic perspectives, related with increasing role and place of innovative character of public decisions. It means that innovations in new public governance will be defined as an original and fundamental transformation of an organization's core tasks.

References

- Akintoye, A.; Beck, M. 2009. *Policy, management and finance of public – private partnerships*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 469 p. ISBN-9781-4051-7791-7.
- Baležentis, A.; Balkienė K. 2011. Analysis of Lithuanian innovation policy priorities in the context of European Union initiatives, *Viešoji politika ir administravimas* [Public Policy and Administration] 10(2): 212–230.
- Bekkers, V.; Edelenbos, J.; Steijn, B. 2011. Linking innovation to the public sector: Context, concepts and challenges. In Bekkers, V.; Edelenbos, J.; Steijn, B. (Ed.) *Innovation in the public sector*. Basingstoke; Palgrave Macmillan. 3–32. ISBN-9780-2302-8452-4.
- Bivainis, J.; Tunčikienė, Ž. 2007. Integrated approach to strategic planning in public institutions, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 8(4): 245–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16111699.2007.9636176>
- Bouckaert, G.; Halligan J. 2008. *Managing performance. International comparisons*. London: Routledge. 440 p. ISBN-1004-1523-94-5.
- Bourgon, J. 2010. The history and future of national building? Building capacity for public results, *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 76(2): 197–218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0020852309365666>
- Bovaird, T.; Löffler, E. 2009. Understanding public management and governance, in Bovaird, T.; Löffler, E. (Ed.) *Public management and governance*. London: Routledge. 3–14. ISBN-9780-4154-3043-2.
- Christensen, T.; Laegreid, P.; Ronnes, P. G.; Rovik, K. A. 2007. *Organization theory and the public sector. Instrument, culture and myth*. London: Routledge. 191 p. ISBN-9780-4154-3381-9.

- Davidavičienė, V. 2008. Change management decisions in the information age, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 9(4): 299–307.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/1611-1699.2008.9.299-307>
- De Vries, M. S. 2010. *The importance of neglect in policy-making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 203 p. ISBN-9780-2302-4290-6.
- Drechler, W. 2011. Public administration in time of crisis, in Kattel, R.; Mikulowski, W.; Peters, B. G. (Ed.) *Public administration in time of crisis. 18th NISPAcee international annual conference*. Warsaw, Poland 12–14 May 2010. Selected papers. Bratislava: NISPAcee, 2011, 15–25. ISBN-9788-0890-1356-2.
- Groeneveld, S.; Van de Wale, St. 2010. A contingency approach to representative bureaucracy: power, equal opportunities and diversity, *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 76(2): 239–258.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0020852309365670>
- Hill, C. J.; Lynn, L. E. 2009. *Public management. a three dimensional approach*. Washington D.C: CQ Press. 490 p. ISBN-9788-7289-348-1.
- Jusčius, V.; Snieška, V. 2008. Influence of corporate social responsibility and competitive abilities of corporations, *Inžinerine ekonomika - Engineering Economics*, 3(58): 34–44.
- Kettl, D. F.; Fessler, J. 2009. *The politics of administrative process*. Washington D.C: CQ Press. 582 p. ISBN-9780-8728-9599-7.
- Klijin, E. 2010. Trust in governance networks: looking for conditions for innovative solutions and outcomes, in Osborne St. (Ed.) *The new public governance*. London: Routledge. 303–321. ISBN-9780-4154-9463-2.
- Laegreid, P.; Verhoest, K. 2010. Introduction: Reforming public sector organizations, in Laegreid, P.; Verhoest, K. (Ed.) *Governance of public sector organizations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. 1–18. ISBN-9780-2302-3820-6.
- Lane, J. E. 2009. *State management*. London: Routledge. 183 p. ISBN-0415-4923-4-3.
- Mcnabb, D. 2009. *The new face of government. How public managers are forging a new approach to governance*. New York: CRC Press. 280 p. ISBN-9781-4200-9387-2.
- Melnikas, B. 2011. New challenges to bureaucracy: processes of internationalization, network, inter-sector convergence, in Raipa, A. (Ed.) *Biurokratija demokratinėje visuomenėje* [Bureaucracy in democratic society]. Kaunas: Technologija. 255–275. ISBN-9786-0902-0176-3.
- Miller, H. T.; Fox, Ch. J. 2007. *Postmodern public administration*. New York: M. E. Sharpe. 157 p. ISBN-0765-6170-5-6.
- Parnell, J. 2008. Sustainable strategic management: constructs, parameters, research directions, *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management* 1(1): 35–45.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJSSM.2008.018125>
- Pollitt, Ch. 2008. *Time, policy, management*. Oxford: University Press. 213 p. ISBN-9780-1992-3772-2.
- Potuček, M. 2004. The capacities to govern in Central and Eastern Europe, in Potuček, M. (Ed.) *The capacity to govern in Central and Eastern Europe*. Bratislava: NISPAcee. 91–110. ISBN-8089-0131-7-1.
- Raipa, A. 2011. The possibilities of diagnosis of new public governance indicators, *Viešoji politika ir administravimas* [Public Policy and Administration] 10(2): 167–182.
- Rosenbaum, A. 2011. The post-governance world: constituting challenges, new opportunities, in Dwivedi, O. P. (Ed.) *Public administration in a global context*. IASIAat50. Bruxelles: Bruylant. 153–180. ISBN-9782-8027-3344-7.
- Skietrys, E.; Raipa, A.; Bartkus, E. 2008. Dimensions of the efficiency of public-private partnership, *Inžinerine ekonomika - Engineering Economics*, 3(58): 45–49.
- Tijūnaitienė, R.; Neverauskas, B.; Balčiūnas, S. 2009. Motivation expression of citizens participation in organizations of citizen society, *Inžinerine ekonomika - Engineering Economics* 1(61): 65–74.
- Tvaronavičienė, M.; Degutis, M. 2007. If approach to innovations differs in locally and foreign firms: case of Lithuania, *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 8(3): 195–202.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16111699.2007.9636169>
- Veenswijk, M. 2005. Cultural change in the public sector: innovating the frontstage and backstage, in Veenswijk, M. (Ed.) *Organizing innovation*. Amsterdam: IOS Press. 3–14. ISBN-1586-0357-8-9.