

The effect of leadership relationships on organizational innovativeness: comparison between bureaucratic and creative organizations

Raminta Pučėtaite¹, Aurelija Novelskaitė², Laura Markūnaitė³

^{1,2,3} Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities, Mūitinės Str. 8, Kaunas, Lithuania

¹ Raminta.pucetaite@khf.vu.lt, ² Aurelija.novelskaite@khf.vu.lt, ³ laura.markunaite@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper presents empirical findings of a study on the impact of leadership relationship on different forms of organizational innovativeness in bureaucratic and creative public sector organizations. The data were collected by a questionnaire survey (respectively, n=747 and n=225) in Lithuania in 2013-2014. The results of linear regression analysis indicate a tendency of a stronger effect of leadership relationship on all forms of organizational innovativeness in creative organizations.

Keywords: bureaucratic organization, creative organization, leadership relationships, Lithuania, organizational innovativeness, public organizations.

Introduction

Considering business globalization and high competition among companies producing similar products and providing similar services at similar prices, some authors highlight relationships within the companies as a cost-cutting and creativity-fostering phenomenon (Zanini, 2007). High-quality relationships within organizations have been found to contribute to positive employee outcomes such as work well-being, job engagement, and organizational commitment (Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008; Cameron, Dutton and Quinn, 2003) which can eventually result in higher levels of creativity, autonomy, experimentation and lead to innovation development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Bhatnagar, 2012), which is crucial under the conditions of hyper competition. In this respect, leadership behaviour is of particular importance. Respectful, fair and reciprocal leadership behaviour can enhance intrinsic motivation, promote pro-active and adaptive skills as well as self-realization and positive self-perception of members of the organization (Hansen, 2011b; Stobbeleir, Ashford and Buyens, 2011; Zhang and Bartol, 2010; Yidong and Xinxin, 2013). On the contrary, empirical studies also inform that unethical leadership (i.e. the leadership that disregards organization's mission and values, employees' rights, dignity, legitimate interests, and laws) may diminish the organization's capability to innovate as it drains the creative, intellectual and

emotional resources of employees (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005; Kets de Vries, 2006).

In this paper we are firstly interested in the relationships between the leader and followers as the ones who can contribute to positive organizational outcomes such as organizational innovativeness. These relationships are in focus of the leader-member exchange (hereafter – LMX) theory, which centres on the leader, followers, and their exchange or dyadic relationships (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Leaders can foster organizational innovativeness by setting the goals and defining organizational practices which potentially motivate (or demotivate) employees to be innovative, providing resources and supporting employees for the realization of their (potentially creative) ideas (Denti and Hemlin, 2012; cf. Kolhoff, Erakovich and Lasthuizen, 2010). However, leadership relationships and their effect on organizational innovativeness have received considerably little attention (Lee, 2008; Uhl-Bien, 2006), and followers, who are an essential component of the leadership concept, are rather often left aside (Collinson, 2006). Hence, **the aim of this paper** is to study the interplay between leadership relationships and organizational innovativeness empirically and address the above-mentioned gaps in the **academic discourse of leadership**. In addition, we attempt to shed some light on the relationship between leadership relationships and organizational innovativeness by studying it empirically in Lithuanian public organizations. Although innovations and their development processes in public sector organizations have received attention from a number of Lithuanian scholars (Bučinskas, Raipa, Giedraitytė, 2012; Domarkas and Juknevičienė, 2010; Giedraitytė and Raipa, 2012; Martinaitis and Nakrošis, 2008), leadership relationships as antecedents to organizational innovativeness have been scarcely studied empirically.

Secondly, in this paper we attempt to broaden empirical knowledge about the impact of the leader-member exchange on organizational

innovativeness in public sector organizations. In this respect we look back on our previous research (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014), which shows that the quality of leadership relationships has an effect on organizational innovativeness in a public sector organization. However, the studied organization represents a bureaucratic organization whose structural characteristics include a hierarchy of authority, centralization of decision making, division of labour, and formalization of duties (Morand, 1995), which was a limitation of the study. Therefore, in this paper we aim to address it by extending our research setting and include cultural organizations which we regard as representatives of creative organizations. Creative organizations constitute a specific field of enquiry because of a particular form of their operation (e.g., more flexible structures and a high degree of mental efforts used in the creation of products) and unique and innovative products (Berzinš, 2012). However, cultural organizations also vary in the degree of flexibility, autonomy, and quality of leadership relationships. Public sector organizations in a post-soviet context, which is the research setting of our study, have preserved high power distance (as defined by Hofstede, 2001), autocratic relationships, abuse of power, manipulation, and unequal and unjust treatment of employees (Milkova, 2011). Thus, the degree of creativity of cultural organizations may also vary. Consequently, the rudiments of soviet arrangements in organizational structures and autocratic relationships may undermine the creativity of employees who should produce products of intellectual, artistic and cultural value. Therefore, if the quality of leadership relationships in a bureaucratic public organization may have little effect on organizational innovativeness as demonstrated by the results of our previous study (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014), it may have a much more detrimental effect in cultural or creative organizations. However, knowledge on these effects in this organizational setting is scarce. Hence, *the secondary aim of our paper* is to contribute to the academic literature on organizational innovativeness in cultural organizations in Lithuania.

The effects and comparisons are accomplished by employing the **methods** of analysis and synthesis of academic literature (for defining the conceptual framework and, respectively, developing operational definitions and constructing a data collection instrument) and statistical analysis of collected empirical quantitative data (for defining descriptive characteristics and employing analysis of variance, and accomplishing a series of linear regressions which are calculated by SPSS 22).

Conceptual framework

In this paper we define organizational innovativeness as organizational capacity to engage in creative processes, experiment, apply new approaches and techniques, and generate new ideas and knowledge (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Odoardi, Battistelli and Montani, 2010). We regard innovativeness as different from innovation, which is an outcome of the former. From a conceptual viewpoint, we consider organizational innovativeness (hereafter – Oinn) as a multidimensional construct consisting of five dimensions; namely, product, market, process, behaviour, and strategy (Wang and Ahmed, 2004). Product dimension relates to the newness of an organization's products and services. Market innovativeness concerns new approaches to reaching the target audiences or identifying new audiences. Process innovativeness refers to novelties in production methods, management styles and technologies that are applied to enhance production and management systems. Behavioural innovativeness denotes employees and management's resourcefulness and interest in new ideas and organizational encouragement to think and act originally and creatively. Finally, strategy innovativeness is related to an organization's capability to achieve goals, identify gaps in goals and resources, timely react to changes in the market, and the management's willingness to experiment and search for original approaches to problem solving and showing due appreciation to talented people.

Leader and member exchange theory, which is the other concept used in this paper, focuses on the two-way influence between the leader and followers rather than just on a leader's or followers' influence on the other party. The theory departs from social exchange (Blau, 1964) and role theories (Dienesch and Liden, 1986; Graen and Scandura, 1987) and holds that interrelations between leader and followers may differ depending on the quality of the relationship. LMX theory differentiates relationships by the so-called "in-group" and "out-group" criteria (Anand, Hu, Liden and Vidarthi, 2011). Leadership relationship with "in-group" members which are characterised by loyalty, respect, high trust and reciprocity, therefore, called as high quality or high LMX. Leadership relationship with "out-group" members are characterized by following employment contract, managing by autocratic methods, and a low trust between the parties (Dansereau, Graen and Haga, 1975) and known as low quality or low LMX.

The effect of leadership relationships on organizational innovativeness can be explained by positive organizational scholarship which highlights the importance of high quality connections to positive

employee outcomes such as work well-being, job engagement, and organizational commitment (Bakker and Schaufeli, 2008; Cameron, Dutton and Quinn, 2003) which can eventually result in higher levels of creativity, autonomy, experimentation, and can lead to innovation development (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008; Bhatnagar, 2012). High quality connections are strong and secure, mutually empathic, allow for handling conflicts constructively, openly express one's ideas, and undermine behaviour which impedes creativity (Dutton and Heaphey, 2003, p. 266). Positive emotions are inherent to such relationships and they are accounted for employees' willingness to direct their capabilities and knowledge for organizational goals.

LMX, although based on rational considerations resulting from the other party's accomplishment of role-related tasks in leadership relationships, also entails the emotional component, manifested in trusting attitudes and benevolence to reciprocate the other party. Positive emotions account for higher levels of creativity (Cropanzano and Wright, 2001; Fredrickson, 2003), positive role models demonstrated by one of the parties in leadership relationship may increase the other's intrinsic motivation to advance in one's qualification and be respected for competence and contribution when realizing organizational goals. Therefore, leadership relationships, in particular the ones of high quality, can direct efforts of the leader and followers to creating new services or products, for example, through partnerships with external social actors (Hemlin and Olsson, 2011), engaging in more innovative activity (Mathisen, Einarsen and Mykletun, 2012; Settoon, Bennett and Liden, 1996; Liden, Wayne, and Stilwell, 1993), and findings new ways to serve customers better (Fernandez and Moldogaziev, 2013).

However, in the public sector, not all roles and interactions allow for autonomy or network building with external social actors. As demonstrated by our prior study (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014), leadership can affect organizational innovativeness even in the contexts of low LMX. This is a case when employees have to deal with standardized tasks and procedures, and the accomplishment of a role's functions may require impartiality in decision-making or resources, gaining which would undermine society's trust in public institutions and their servants. On the other hand, behaviour innovativeness may have a dark side of its application: employees may be innovative in finding a solution to customer's problems, but it may be unjust or even illegal in respect to other customers. This could be a different case in creative or cultural organizations. Usually their budgets for creating new products or services

are small, but they have opportunities to attract sponsors or partners for a particular project. Although their human resource management practices are rather standardized and incentives to motivate are scarce, leadership relationships can incite motivation to innovate by involving them into projects which acknowledge their artistic talent. Hence, these organizations may essentially differ in their capacity to engage in creative processes and generate ideas that are necessary for product or process innovativeness.

Data, methods and procedures

The empirical data for the empirical study were collected by the means of a standardized web-based questionnaire from different public organisations in Lithuania in 2013-2014. The questionnaire consisted of three thematic scales: LMX was measured with a 7-item questionnaire recommended by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995), OInn – with a 20-item questionnaire developed by Wang and Ahmed (2004). The instruments are chosen as validated and frequently used in other studies (Anand et al., 2011; Riivari and Lämsä, 2013). The statements of LMX were evaluated in Likert scale from 1 to 5, 1 meaning “totally disagree” and 5 “totally agree”, and OInn - in Likert scale from 1 to 7, 1 denoting “totally disagree” and 7 “totally agree”. The latter scale encompasses the five dimensions of product, market, process, behaviour, and strategy innovativeness, each of which was measured by 4 statements. Some items originally were negatively worded and were reversed for analysis in the overall data. Also the answers “I do not know” were coded as “missing data” and eliminated from further analysis. This, in part, explains an actually smaller sample of answers in the descriptive findings.

The questionnaire was distributed as an e-survey in the selected organizations. It is worth mentioning here that one large public organization was selected for participation in the survey purposively as an analogous survey was carried out in Finland (cf. Riivari and Lämsä, 2013) and the researchers attempted to find as similar organizations as possible in two countries. The other two organizations – state theatres – were also purposively selected because of their administration's willingness to participate in the survey and outspoken openness to improve their leadership practices based on the findings. In all the organizations the top management was contacted and, having agreed on the participation conditions, a link to the e-survey was circulated by communication or personnel management departments. Hence, although participation in the survey was absolutely voluntary and uncontrolled, the channel of dissemination of the questionnaire (i.e. through administration) may have caused some misrepresentation in the collected data

(for example, it may have prompted respondents' intention to give more positive evaluations to the questionnaire statements).

The selected public organization has standardized services, defined procedures and rules to administer and provide them, a hierarchical structure with specified duties for definite content of work that is performed by specialists which have to meet certain qualification requirements to get the job and be promoted. Therefore, we call it bureaucratic following the classical Weber's concept of bureaucracy. The theatres, although organized by hierarchical structure and specialized units for particular work, which is common to bureaucratic organizations, are nevertheless regarded as creative organizations. The work is not built on formal rules and standardized procedures, the majority of employees belong to creative professions where the qualifications for artistic mastery or technical resourcefulness may be factually hard to measure, and the management has to direct organizational resources to produce new products and services to survive that are not only profitable but contain cultural value.

The bureaucratic organization and two theatres constitute two subsamples in this analysis. The theatres are treated as one subsample representing a creative organizational setting in this analysis. In addition to that, the third subsample of Lithuanian museums is used in the analysis as an experimental sample representing an organizational setting characterized by both rather clear hierarchical structure, containing rather formalized processes and products on the one hand, but having the flexibility and freedom to diversify their services or arrange their products (e.g. exhibits) in a creative way on the other hand. Potentially, this organizational setting will be explored in the future as a semi-creative type of an organization. This subsample comes from an attempt to carry out a survey among all museums acting in Lithuania in 2014. Having generated a full list of the museums (N=191), an invitation to take part in the survey was sent to their publicly announced addresses. The response rate was too small to make an independent analysis, yet the present subsample is based on voluntary participation. Hence, the final sample in this analysis is composed of three subsamples whose characteristics are presented in Table 1.

It is important to note that the subsamples are of a different composition. That is, the first subsample comes from one large public organization, which provides highly standardized services; the second subsample (i.e. theatres) involves respondents from two state theatres; and the third is composed of the respondents representing a wide variety of Lithuanian

museums and is treated as experimental in this study as it is at the initial stage of formation. Additionally, it is worth drawing attention to gender distribution inside the subsamples: the first subsample is male-dominated, the second one is female-dominated, and the third subsample is gender-balanced despite a slightly higher proportion of men among the respondents. Moreover, the subsamples differ by age composition: the first is "the oldest" compared to the other two as more than a half of its respondents are in their 50s and older, and the third subsample is "the youngest" as more than a half of the respondents are younger than 30. The only characteristic which is common to all the subsamples is the respondents' education: almost all respondents either have higher education or (believably) are in the process of getting this qualification.

Table 1

| | Sample characteristics | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| | Bureau- cratic organiza- tion | Creative or- ganization (theatres) | Semi- creative or- ganization (museums) |
| The population | 1412 | 425 | 191 |
| Sample size | 78* | 104 | 43 |
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 26%** | 63% | 41% |
| Male | 74% | 37% | 59% |
| n.i. | 8% | 6% | 0% |
| Age | | | |
| 21-30 years | 11 | 37 | 59 |
| 31-40 years | 6 | 14 | 35 |
| 41-50 years | 29 | 23 | 6 |
| 50< years | 53 | 26 | - |
| n.i. | - | 1 | - |
| Education | | | |
| Special secondary | 8% | 4% | 6% |
| Unfinished higher | - | 3% | 21% |
| Higher | 92% | 93% | 73% |
| n.i. | - | 1% | - |

* The sub-sample was generated as a representative 10% of the initial sample (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014) using SPSS 22.0 for Windows.

** Actually, the organization is female dominated; the initial sample (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014) reflected gender distribution in the organization more correctly.

Statistical analysis of the data was accomplished using SPSS for Windows 22.0 software. It starts with descriptive statistics (i.e. means and standard

Table 2

Descriptive characteristics of the subsamples: n, mean, std. deviation

| Items | Type of organization | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------|----------------|--------------------|------|----------------|------------------------|------|----------------|
| | Bureaucratic | | | Creative (theatre) | | | Semi-creative (museum) | | |
| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | N | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| LMX average | 51 | 4.1 | 0.780 | 72 | 3.7 | 1.110 | 30 | 3.5 | 0.805 |
| Organizational innovativeness | | | | | | | | | |
| Product | 45 | 5.8 | 1.234 | 84 | 4.4 | 1.380 | 27 | 4.1 | 1.047 |
| Market | 52 | 5.3 | 0.867 | 84 | 4.3 | 1.390 | 30 | 3.6 | 1.058 |
| Behaviour | 54 | 4.8 | 1.465 | 95 | 4.9 | 1.574 | 30 | 4.1 | 1.374 |
| Process | 49 | 5.2 | 1.348 | 85 | 4.2 | 1.527 | 27 | 3.5 | 1.441 |
| Strategy | 41 | 4.8 | 1.207 | 84 | 3.9 | 1.327 | 31 | 3.6 | 1.077 |
| Valid N total | 24 | | | 45 | | | 24 | | |

deviations) and explorations of statistically significant differences between the subsamples. Because the subsamples in the analysis were of a different size and not big (see Table 1), non-parametric alternative of parametric T-test (i.e. Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U test) was used for exploring differences between the average evaluations of LMX and the types of OInn in the subsamples. Next, trying to reveal possible effect of LMX on the types of OInn, a series of linear regressions (enter method) were accomplished.

Findings

The descriptive statistics (Table 2) show that the highest evaluations of all variables were found in the bureaucratic organization, and the lowest ones in the semi-creative organizations (i.e. museums). Comparing the means of the bureaucratic on the one hand and the creative organizations on the other hand, one can notice the tendency that process innovativeness is evaluated the lowest in the creative organizations while in the bureaucratic organization it is medium high. This may be considered a result of recently implemented quality management standard system, which allows us to assume that employees had to attend some related training, which raises the awareness of current processes and critically reflect them. Based on the evaluations of the respondents, behaviour innovativeness was similarly evaluated by both bureaucratic and creative (theatre) organizations. This result could be expected in the case of the creative organization where the search for original solutions is a part of the creative work. A considerably high evaluation of this form of innovativeness in the bureaucratic organization could be explained by the effect of quality management system which puts emphasis

on employee participation and empowerment and this change may be reflected in the attitudes of the respondents. The lowest evaluations of the phenomena from the museums could be interpreted by the lack of attention from public policy structures: cultural institutions receive little financing, and the inertial processes and structures that can be traced in the internal environment raise obstacles to apply changes in or introduce new services, strategies, processes, etc.

However, not all of the evaluations are statistically significantly different¹. A series of Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U test (Table 3) show that LMX in the bureaucratic public organization is actually (or, in other words, statistically significantly) higher than in the other two subsamples, and it is the same in the theatre and the museum subsamples. Furthermore, almost all forms of organizational innovativeness are evaluated higher in the bureaucratic public organization than in the creative organizations. The only exclusion here is behavioural innovativeness, which, according to the results of the statistical test, is of the same level in the bureaucratic organization and the theatre. In comparing the evaluations of the forms of OInn in the theatre and the museum, only market, behaviour and process innovativeness were evaluated higher in the theatre; the other forms on OInn (i.e. product and strategy) and LMX are of the same level.

¹ A methodological note: As the subsamples are of a different size and rather small (see Table 1), non-parametric alternative to parametric T-test (i.e. Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U test) was used for exploring differences between the average evaluations of LMX and different types of OInn in the subsamples.

Table 3

**Mean differences in the subsamples:
the results of Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U test**

| Items | Types of organization | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|------|-------------------------------------|----------------|------|---|----------------|------|
| | Bureaucratic-Creative (theatre) | | | Bureaucratic-Semi-creative (museum) | | | Creative (theatre)-Semi-creative (museum) | | |
| | N | Mann-Whitney U | Sig. | N | Mann-Whitney U | Sig. | N | Mann-Whitney U | Sig. |
| LMX average | 123 | 1455.5 | .050 | 81 | 426.0 | .001 | 102 | 940.5 | .304 |
| Organizational innovativeness | | | | | | | | | |
| Product | 129 | 844.0 | .000 | 72 | 166.5 | .000 | 111 | 932.5 | .165 |
| Market | 136 | 1307.0 | .000 | 82 | 181.5 | .000 | 114 | 877.0 | .014 |
| Behaviour | 149 | 2735.0 | .501 | 84 | 586.5 | .037 | 125 | 951.0 | .006 |
| Process | 134 | 1285.5 | .000 | 76 | 261.0 | .000 | 112 | 843.0 | .038 |
| Strategy | 125 | 1031.0 | .000 | 72 | 287.5 | .000 | 115 | 1119.0 | .248 |

Table 4.1

LMX effect on the organizational innovativeness: product innovativeness

| | Adjusted R Square | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Bureaucratic | -.030 | (Constant) | 3.933 | .702 | .024 | 5.604 | .000 |
| LMX average | | .017 | .120 | .140 | | .890 | |
| Creative (theatre) | .328 | (Constant) | 1.503 | .416 | .582 | 3.617 | .001 |
| LMX average | | .497 | .089 | 5.589 | | .000 | |
| Semi-creative (museum) | .256 | (Constant) | 1.812 | .572 | .534 | 3.171 | .004 |
| LMX average | | .423 | .136 | 3.097 | | .005 | |

Table 4.2

LMX effect on organizational innovativeness: market innovativeness

| | Adjusted R Square | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Bureaucratic | -.016 | (Constant) | 4.722 | .688 | .095 | 6.863 | .000 |
| LMX average | | .099 | .167 | .594 | | .556 | |
| Creative (theatre) | .267 | (Constant) | 2.028 | .486 | .528 | 4.177 | .000 |
| LMX average | | .623 | .128 | 4.852 | | .000 | |
| Semi-creative (museum) | .422 | (Constant) | .502 | .706 | .666 | .710 | .484 |
| LMX average | | .878 | .197 | 4.468 | | .000 | |

Further, a series of linear regressions² was accomplished in striving to reveal the effect of LMX on different forms of organizational innovativeness. This analysis suggests that leadership relationships possibly have no effect on product innovativeness in the bureaucratic organization but can contribute to increasing it in the theatre and the museums with similar explanative power (Table 4.1.). It is slightly stronger (adj. $R^2=0.33$) in the creative organization than in the semi-creative one.

² A methodological note: Because of the specifics of the subsamples (i.e. difference in size, irregular sampling procedures), regression analysis is used here only to reveal possible tendencies on which further research will be built but not to generalize results.

The effect of LMX on market innovativeness can be found just in the theatre and the museum subsamples. In this case, even a stronger effect can be expected in the semi-creative organization, where LMX explains more than 40% of the variance in market innovativeness (Table 4.2). This could be related to the low financing of cultural organizations in the country which dominantly relies on word-of-mouth, personal resources such as social media means, and internally printed leaflets to promote the organization and attract attention to its services rather than hire marketing and communication professionals or apply costly marketing packages offered by professional agencies.

Table 4.3

LMX effect on the organizational innovativeness: behaviour innovativeness

| | Adjusted R Square | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Bureaucratic | .240 | (Constant) | .596 | 1.214 | | .491 | .626 |
| | | LMX average | 1.050 | .291 | .510 | 3.607 | .001 |
| Creative (theatre) | .398 | (Constant) | 1.731 | .512 | | 3.384 | .001 |
| | | LMX average | .895 | .134 | .638 | 6.681 | .000 |
| Semi-creative (museum) | .408 | (Constant) | .239 | .903 | | .265 | .793 |
| | | LMX average | 1.113 | .256 | .656 | 4.350 | .000 |

Table 4.4

LMX effect on the organizational innovativeness: process innovativeness

| | Adjusted R Square | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Bureaucratic | -.011 | (Constant) | 4.414 | 1.054 | | 4.187 | .000 |
| | | LMX average | .198 | .256 | .130 | .775 | .444 |
| Creative (theatre) | .302 | (Constant) | 1.153 | .580 | | 1.988 | .051 |
| | | LMX average | .794 | .151 | .559 | 5.272 | .000 |
| Semi-creative (museum) | .400 | (Constant) | -.664 | .993 | | -.669 | .510 |
| | | LMX average | 1.153 | .280 | .652 | 4.122 | .000 |

Table 4.5

LMX effect on the organizational innovativeness: strategy innovativeness

| | Adjusted R Square | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Bureaucratic | .024 | (Constant) | 3.568 | 1.021 | | 3.496 | .001 |
| | | LMX average | .339 | .253 | .234 | 1.341 | .190 |
| Creative (theatre) | .305 | (Constant) | 1.240 | .529 | | 2.346 | .023 |
| | | LMX average | .720 | .141 | .563 | 5.097 | .000 |
| Semi-creative (museum) | .370 | (Constant) | .959 | .675 | | 1.421 | .167 |
| | | LMX average | .772 | .188 | .627 | 4.108 | .000 |

Differently, in the case of behavioural innovativeness, the quality of LMX seems to have some effect not only in the theatre and the museum subsamples, but also in the bureaucratic organization (Table 4.3). This finding could be logically expected because leadership quality, which is perceived through the experience of trust, liking, respect and continual exchange of ideas, expectations, and job-related problems, firstly affects employees' attitudes and can result in respective behaviour. For example, if employees feel trusted by their leaders, they are more daring to search for original solutions and are not afraid to experiment in the limits of rules and norms.

In the case of the LMX effect on process innovativeness, LMX has the power to increase this form of OInn in the theatre and the museum subsamples, but not in the bureaucratic organization

(Table 4.4). The absence of the LMX effect on process innovativeness in the bureaucratic organization may be related to standardized services and processes and institutional control over them. Therefore, social interactions cannot be made significant if there is any effect on processes from legal or ethical perspectives. On the other hand, a lack of an identifiable effect could be ascribed to the LMX measurement scale which does not include statements related to feedback giving or discussion of the problems resulting from front-line specialists' interaction with customers.

The same can be said about strategy innovativeness: seemingly, LMX has no effect on it in the bureaucratic organization, while the possibility of such an effect exists in the subsamples of creative organizations (Table 4.5).

This difference in the LMX effect on strategy innovativeness could be explained by the principles by which bureaucratic organizations are managed. As they fulfil the function of regulatory mechanisms, their strategies are not products of internal discussions or close interplay between the leader and followers. Their strategies are often created at governmental level and these organizations have more flexibility to decide on the means to realize the strategy or set goals. Meanwhile creative organizations, aware of their functions to provide cultural services and products and acting with limited resources, still have more freedom to participate in setting the strategies and searching for opportunities to compete in the market of entertainment and leisure products. These tendencies can be said to be reflected in the above presented results.

Conclusions and discussion

In this paper we were interested in the potential difference in the effect of leadership relationships on organizational innovativeness and its different forms in organizations which we characterized as bureaucratic and creative based on the standardization of services, roles and tasks, the specialization of employees, and the extent of the hierarchy of their structure. The average evaluations of LMX and the forms of OInn were higher in the bureaucratic organization; yet, the effect of LMX could be identified just on behaviour innovativeness in that kind of organizational setting. This implies that opportunities for leadership relationships to affect the product, market, or strategy innovativeness are lower when services are standardized and strategies are formulated externally at the governmental level. It relates to our prior study of this organization with a sample of 757 respondents which yielded statistically significant although with weak regression coefficients (Pučėtaitė and Novelskaitė, 2014), except for behaviour innovativeness. Hence, the findings of this study in a smaller sample are a natural outcome. In the studied creative organizations, the model of LMX affecting different types of OInn was statistically significant with slight variations in explanative power. In this respect, the study builds a background for further research of leadership relationship, its quality, and different forms of organizational innovativeness.

The results bear managerial implications. On the one hand, the absence of the effect of leadership relationships on process innovativeness in the bureaucratic organization raises some concerns. Usually, public organizations are required to innovate processes to meet customer needs in a more efficient way. Here, the evaluations of this innovativeness form were among the highest, which indicates awareness

of the improvement processes. As processes include relational and participative practices, it is rather strange that leadership relationships do not affect employees' perceptions of process innovativeness in this kind of an organization. There is some risk that a reform-incited urge on improving the processes may be taken rather formally, without stepping out from the comfort zone.

The impact of LMX on OInn forms in creative organizations could have both positive and negative implications to these organizations. The positive aspect is that leadership relationships which are of high quality (i.e. rely on trust, respect and social interaction) have the power to motivate employees to develop their capacity or perceive themselves as capable of innovation. Considering the low financing to cultural organizations in Lithuania, theatres and museums may gain from leadership relationships which are professionally and personally enriching to both parties. On the other hand, the statements in LMX do not necessarily reflect a quality of relationship that builds on competence or the quality of performed tasks by leaders and followers. Agreements on the statements could be given by followers who are in nepotistic and, thus, dysfunctional relationships with the leader. If nepotism is widespread in the society, such relationships could be taken as a norm and considered of high quality. The impact of these relationships on OInn may be detrimental in the long run. Therefore, institutional practices of monitoring, justly assessing, and rewarding employees and leaders are needed as safeguards for productive organizational innovativeness.

The study has some limitations. The subsamples were considerably small; therefore, regression analysis was used only for revealing possible tendencies for further explorations, but not for stating generalizable conclusions. Further research with a larger sample is needed to derive more generalizable conclusions. Additionally, data should be collected giving consideration to a more equal distribution of gender, age and education, which is not the case in this study. As the LMX scale suggested by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) is rather limited in capturing the variety of aspects of the quality of leadership relationships (Anand et al., 2011), other research methods, preferably qualitative, should be used when studying it. They would considerably improve the measurement of the phenomenon, which is also culturally sensitive and "good relationships" may have different perceptions in different cultural settings. Qualitative research methods would also advance the knowledge of organizational innovativeness in creative organizations in Lithuania. The what-knowledge on innovative processes, marketing

techniques or strategy could bear meaningful managerial implications to making the performance of these organizations more efficient.

Acknowledgements

This paper is a result of the research carried out by the first two authors under the Global Grant measure (No. VP1-3.1-ŠMM-07-K-03-042), financed by the European Social Fund.

References

1. Anand, S., Hu, J., Liden, R.C., Vidyarthi, P.R. (2011). Leader-member exchange: Recent research findings and prospects for the future. In Bryman, A., Collinson, D., Grint, K., Jackson, B., Uhl-Bien, M. (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership* (311-325). London: Sage Publications.
2. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13 (3), 209–223.
3. Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). Editorial. Positive organizational behavior: Engaged employees in flourishing organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 147–154.
4. Berzinš, G. (2012). Strategic management in creative industry organizations: Specifics in strategic decision making. *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai*, 62, 7-23.
5. Bhatnagar, J. (2012). Management of innovation: role of psychological empowerment, work engagement and turnover intention in the Indian context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23 (5), 928–951.
6. Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: Wiley.
7. Broekel, T., Brenner, T. (2011). Regional factors and innovativeness: an empirical analysis of four German industries. *Annals of Regional Science*, 47, 169–194.
8. Bučinskas, A., Raipa, A., Giedraitytė, V. (2012). Inovacinių procesų valdymo viešajame sektoriuje dekompozicija: metodologinis aspektas. *Tiltai*, 2, 1-13.
9. Cameron, K., Dutton, J.E., Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
10. Cho, H.-J., Pucik, V. (2005). Relationship between innovativeness, quality, growth, profitability, and market value. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 555–575.
11. Collinson, D. (2006). Rethinking followership: A post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17 (2), 179-189.
12. Cropanzano, R., Wright, T.A. (2001). When a 'happy' worker is really a 'productive' worker: a review and further refinement of the happy-productive worker thesis. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53, 182-99.
13. Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34 (3), 555-590.
14. Dansereau, F., Graen, G., Haga, W.J. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organisations. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
15. Denti, L., Hemlin, S. (2012). Leadership and innovation in organizations: A systematic review of factors that mediate or moderate the relationship. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 16 (3), 1-20.
16. Dienesch, R., Liden, R. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11 (3), 618-664.
17. Domarkas, V., Juknevičienė, V. (2010). Inovacijų vaidmuo viešojo administravimo organizacijų veikloje absorbcinio gebėjimo aspektu. *Viešoji politika ir administravimas*, 31, 77-90.
18. Dutton, J.E., Heaphey, E.D. (2003). The power of high-quality connections. In Cameron, K., Dutton, J.E., Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) *Positive organizational scholarship: foundations of a new discipline* (263-278). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
19. Fernandez, S., Moldogaziev, T. (2013). Using employee empowerment to encourage innovative behavior in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23, 155-187.
20. Fredrickson, B. L. (2003). Positive emotions and upward spirals in organizations. In Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J., Quinn, R. (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (164–175). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
21. Giedraitytė, V., Raipa, A. (2012). Inovacijų įgyvendinimo trukdžiai šiuolaikiniame viešajame valdyme. *Viešoji politika ir administravimas*, 11 (2), 187-197.
22. Graen, G., Scandura, T. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organising. In Cummings, L., Staw, B. (Eds.), *Research in Organisational Behaviour* (175-208), 9. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
23. Graen, G., Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (2), 219-247.
24. Hansen, M.B. (2011a). Antecedents of organizational innovation: The diffusion of new public management into Danish local government. *Public Administration*, 89 (2), 285-306.
25. Hansen, S.D. (2011b). Ethical leadership: A multifoci social exchange perspective. *The Journal of Business Inquiry*, 10 (1), 41-55.
26. Hemlin, S., Olsson, L. (2011). Creativity-stimulating leadership: A critical incident study of leaders' influence on creativity in research groups. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20, 49–58.
27. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
28. Hogan, R., Kaiser, R.B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9 (2), 169-180.

29. House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications
30. Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (2006). The spirit of despotism: understanding the tyrant within. *Human Relations*, 59 (2), 195-220.
31. Kolhoff, E., Erakovich, R., Lasthuizen, K. (2010). Comparative analysis of ethical leadership and ethical culture in local government: The USA, the Netherlands, Montenegro and Serbia. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23 (7), 596-612.
32. Lee, J. (2008). Effects of leadership and leader-member exchange on innovativeness. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23 (6), 670-687.
33. Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Stilwell, D. (1993). A longitudinal study on the early development of leader-member exchanges. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 662-674.
34. Lumpkin, G.T., Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 135-172.
35. Martinaitis, Ž., Nakrošis, V. (2008). Explaining innovations in the Lithuanian public sector: New public management, administrative culture and structural capacities. *Lithuanian Political Science Yearbook* (83-97). Vilnius: Vilnius University Institute of International Relations and Political Science.
36. Mathisen, G.E., Einarsen, S., Mykletun, R. (2012). Creative leaders promote creative organizations. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33 (4), 367-382.
37. Milkova, V. (2011). E. Špokaitė: nacionalinei baletu mokyklai iškilo grėsmė (October 5, 2011). Kauno diena. Available online: <http://kauno.diena.lt/naujienos/laisvalaikis-ir-kultura/kultura/espokaite-nacionalinei-baletu-mokyklai-iskilo-gresme#.U--vDfmSxqU>.
38. Morand, D. A. (1995). The role of behavioral formality and informality in the enactment of bureaucratic versus organic organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20 (4), 831-872.
39. Odoardi, C., Battistelli, A., Montani, F. (2010). Can goal theories explain innovative work behaviour? The motivating power of innovation-related goals. *Bollettino Di Psicologia Applicata*, 261-262, 3-17.
40. Pučėtaitė, R., Novelskaitė, A. (2014). The effect of leader-member exchange on organizational innovativeness: findings from a Lithuanian public sector organization. *Economy and Business*, 8, 159-171.
41. Riivari, E., Lämsä, A.-M. (2013). Does it pay to be ethical? Examining the relationship between organisations' ethical culture and innovativeness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, DOI 10.1007/s10551-013-1859-z.
42. Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organisations: The differential effects of perceived organisational support and leader member exchange. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 219-227.
43. Stobbeleir, K.E.M. de, Ashford, S.J., Buyens, D. (2011). Self-regulation of creativity at work: The role of feedback-seeking behaviour in creative performance. *Academy Management Journal*, 54 (4), 811-831.
44. Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 654-676.
45. Wang, C.L., Ahmed, P.K. (2004). The development and validation of the organizational innovativeness construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7 (4), 303-313.
46. Yidong, T., Xinxin, L. (2013). How ethical leadership influence employees' innovative work behavior: A perspective of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 441-455.
47. Zanini, M.T. (2007). *Trust within organizations of new economy: A cross-industrial study*. Wiesbaden: Springer, Deutscher Universitaets-Verlag.
48. Zhang, X.M., Bartol, K.M. (2010). Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation, and creative process engagement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53 (1), 107-128.

Pučėtaitė, R., Novelskaitė, A., Markūnaitė, L.

Lyderystės santykių poveikis organizacijos novatoriškumui: lyginamoji biurokratinės ir kūrybinės organizacijų analizė

Santrauka

Organizacijų novatoriškumas, kaip gebėjimas kurti novatoriškas idėjas, eksperimentuoti, įsitraukti į kūrybinius procesus (Lumpkin ir Dess, 1996), yra svarbi inovacijų, kaip šių gebėjimų realizavimo rezultatų, prielaida, su kuria siejamas šalies ir regionų konkurencingumas bei darnus vystymasis (Broekel ir Brenner, 2011; Cho ir Pucik, 2005). Poreikis būti novatoriškoms aktualus ne vien privačiojo, bet ir viešojo sektoriaus organizacijoms, kurios dėl sektoriuje vykstančių reformų iš įvairių suinteresuotųjų šalių patiria vis didesnį spaudimą didinti paslaugų kokybę,

optimizuoti procesus ir būti atskaitingos mokesčių mokėtojams (Domarkas ir Juknevičienė, 2010; Hansen, 2011a). Šios tendencijos suponuoja būtinybę identifikuoti ir stiprinti veiksnius, didinančius novatoriškumo gebėjimą. Anksčiau organizacijų novatoriškumo veiksnių tyrimai rodo, kad organizacinio lygmens veiksniai yra vieni iš reikšmingiausių stiprinant organizacijos novatoriškumą (Damanpour, 1991), o lyderystės santykiai, analizuojami lyderio ir pasekėjų mainų teorijoje (angl. *leader member exchange*, LMX – Graen ir Uhl-Bien, 1995), gali daryti ypač didelę

įtaką organizacijos novatoriškumui dėl lyderių turimos galios kurti organizacijoje aplinką, įgalinančią pasekėjus atskleisti savo kūrybinį potencialą.

Remdamosi anksčiau vienoje viešojo sektoriaus organizacijoje, atitinkančioje biurokratinės organizacijos savybes (Morand, 1995), atlikto tyrimo rezultatais (Pučėtaitė ir Novelskaitė, 2014), kurie rodo, jog lyderystės poveikis organizacijos novatoriškumui reiškiasi visų jo formų – produkto, rinkos, elgesio, proceso ir strategijos (Wang ir Ahmed, 2004) – atžvilgiu, autorės siekia išplėsti šio poveikio tyrimo kontekstą, įtraukdamos į lyginamąją analizę ir kultūros organizacijas (teatrus ir muziejus), kurios traktuojamos kaip kūrybinės organizacijos dėl jų kuriamo kūrybiško intelektualinio produkto, darbo turinio, darbuotojams reikalingų gebėjimų ir galimybių taikyti inovatyvius vadybos metodus. Kūrybinių organizacijų išorinė aplinka yra palankesnė eksperimentuoti, įsitraukti į kūrybinius procesus, atnaujinti paslaugas ir produktus, todėl joje lyderystės santykiai gali turėti didesnę reikšmę organizacijos novatoriškumo formoms. Tuo siekiama sukurti pagrindą tolesniems viešojo sektoriaus organizacijų novatoriškumo tyrimams, atsižvelgiant į jų veiklos vidinius veiksnius. Be to, straipsniu siekiama išplėsti empirines žinias apie Lietuvos kultūros organizacijas organizacijos novatoriškumo aspektu.

Empirinis tyrimas vykdytas e. apklausos būdu, naudojant klausimyną, 2013–2014 m. Klausimyną sudarė 3 dalys: lyderystės santykiai buvo vertinami naudojant Grae ir Uhl-Bien (1995) rekomenduotą instrumentą, kurį sudaro teiginių vertinimas pagal 5 balų Likerto skalę (1 – visiškai nesutinku, 5 – visiškai sutinku), organizacijos

novatoriškumas – naudojant Wang ir Ahmed instrumentą iš 20 teiginių (po 4 kiekvienam novatoriškumo tipui), vertinamų pagal 7 balų Likerto skalę (1 – visiškai nesutinku, 7 – visiškai sutinku), ir sociodemografinės respondentų charakteristikos. Tyrimas atliktas dviejų tipų – biurokratinio ir kūrybinio – Lietuvos organizacijose. Siekiant praplėsti tyrimo lauką, į duomenų analizę įtraukta grupė duomenų, surinktų pusiau kūrybinėse organizacijose (muziejuose). Ši imtis nėra reprezentatyvi ir naudojama tik išskiriamoms tendencijoms pagrįsti. Tyrimo metu iš biurokratinės organizacijos gauti 757 atsakymai; kadangi kūrybinių organizacijų dydis (ir atitinkamai generalinė aibė) buvo reikšmingai mažesnis, iš biurokratinės organizacijos imties buvo suformuota mažesnė, naudojant SPSS 22.0 programinę įrangą. Iš viso tyrimo dalyvavo 225 respondentai.

Atlikus duomenų analizę galima teigti, kad nors respondentų sąmoningumas lyderystės santykių kokybės ir organizacijos novatoriškumo formų atžvilgiu didesnis standartizuotas paslaugas teikiančioje biurokratinėje viešojo sektoriaus organizacijoje, lyderystės santykių įtaka visoms organizacijos novatoriškumo formoms labiau reiškiasi kūrybinėse organizacijose – čia ji statistiškai stipresnė ir reikšmingesnė nei biurokratinėje organizacijoje. Pastarojoje lyderystės santykių poveikis reiškiasi tik elgesio novatoriškumo atžvilgiu. Atsižvelgiant į imties apribojimus, ateityje svarbu išplėsti imties dydį kūrybinėse organizacijose, taip pat tirti organizacijos novatoriškumo formas taikant kokybinius tyrimo metodus.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: biurokratinė organizacija, kūrybinė organizacija, lyderystės santykiai, Lietuva, organizacijos novatoriškumas, viešojo sektoriaus organizacijos.

The article has been reviewed.

Received in 19 September 2014, accepted in 11 December 2014