IDEA MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: A RESEARCH GAP

Elina Mikelsone
BA School of Business and Finance, K. Valdemara Str. 161, Riga, Latvia
elina.mikelsone@ba.lv
Elita Liela
BA School of Business and Finance, K. Valdemara Str. 161, Riga, Latvia
elita.liela@ba.lv

Abstract

Purpose: present an overview of idea management (IM) and organisational effectiveness (OE) literature trends, identify if there is a research gap, and make suggestions for future research in this field.

Approach: the research is based on a literature review. This detailed literature review has considered 75 scientific publications, conference proceedings, books and popular market reports published over 34 years, i.e., from January 1982 to February 2016, in all research fields about IM and more than 130 scientific publications about OE over the last 47 years, i.e., from January 1969 to January 2016.

Findings: it has been concluded that there is a tendency in literature to focus on internal IM, but from 2006 the situation started to change and more external and mixed IM application approaches have been researched; the authors have also summarized the main applied research methods and focuses. From 1969 till 2004 OE literature is fragmentary, but from 2004 there are substantive literature sources about OE. The research results show that OE has become especially topical in the last decade. The most frequently applied and mentioned OE models are the Goal Attained Model and the Competing Values Model, while the most commonly applied approach is the multidimensional approach. The authors have summarized 199 potential OE research dimensions. The results of the research revealed that there is a research gap – no studies focussing on the relationship between IM and OE. This is a topical theme and the authors have highlighted 5 main possible future research directions to bridge IM and OE, which shows that this topic has scientific potential.

Research limitations: data collection from 7 databases within these periods – IM literature from January 1982 to February 2015, OE literature from 1969 to January 2016.

Value: this paper fulfils an identified need to explore if there is a research gap between OE and IM research. The study also aims to clarify the domain of IM and OE by summarizing the main OE dimensions that are normally found in the OE literature and the main elements of IM. The concept of OE is encountered repeatedly in the organisational literature, but few serious attempts have been made to explain the construct either theoretically or empirically – this research has summarized 199 OE dimensions and is the largest scientifically gathered OE dimension list that aims to explain the OE construct. The added value of this research in an IM context: (1) explored the latest literature (published in 2015) on IM and IMS; (2) created a holistic view of IM and IMS. The main contribution of the research – it reviews IM and OE literature tendencies and synthesizes them to outline future research directions.

Paper type – literature review

Keywords – idea management, organisational effectiveness, literature review

INTRODUCTION

One of the main topics in management science is organisational effectiveness (OE) (Goodman & Saks, 1977; Biswas, 2010) and studies are mainly conducted to increase OE (Noruzi & Rahimi, 2010). In recent decades the topicality has grown rapidly based on increasing scientific and practical interest in the topic (Mausolff & Spence, 2008; Lecy, Scmitz & Swedlund, 2012). Researchers have concluded that OE is multidimensional (Angle & Perry, 1981; Campbell et al., 1974; Dension, 1990; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013) and OE dimensions and influencing factors may vary (Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978). The authors of this research would like to explore the level of research on OE and idea management (IM) or its systems (IMS) relations. The authors suppose that IM could influence OE,

Received: 03rd March 2017 Revised: 14th April 2017 Accepted: 10th September 2017

because it is closely related to several results and benefits for an organization. For example, Karanjikar (2007) points out that IM is one of the elements that facilitate success in the information age, and Dorow et al. (2015) have noted that ideas are an endless source of competitive advantage. There are numerous literature sources with a modest literature review (most of this literature review sources have literature review elements) about IM (Rose & Jensen, 2012; Mikelsone & Liela, 2015) and OE (for example, Keeley, 1984; Lewin & Minton, 1986; Cunningham, 1977), but in these studies there is no evidence about the relationship between IM and OE. So the question arises – is there really a research gap? Previous IM literature research (Mikelsone & Liela, 2015) shows that there is, but it is possible that evidence of these connections could be found in OE or the latest IM literature. That is the reason why there is a need for a focused and up-to-date literature review. It is important to research this relationship, because OE and IM have been researched for more than 5 decades and nowadays the scientific topicality of these topics has only grown. OE is one of the main tasks in organizations, while IM could provide benefits in several outcomes through the process of idea generation, evaluation and development. In the last decade many leading world organizations have started to apply web-based IMS. The novelty of this literature review is that it not only focuses on IM and OE literature tendencies but also aims to clarify the domain of OE and IM/IMS by summarizing the main characteristics of IM/IMS and the main OE dimensions. Because these terms lack well-established definitions the authors have created definitions for them. The scientific problem dealt with in this article: to fill the research gap and to research both IM and OE literature to explore their previously scientifically explored connections (is there really a research gap?) and make suggestions for future research.

The research aim: present an overview of idea management (IM) and organisational effectiveness (OE) literature trends and identify if there is a research gap and make suggestions for future research in this field.

Research tasks: (1) to manage research in scientific databases to explore literature about IM and OE and to analyse if there is a research gap; (2) make conclusions and suggestions for future research.

Research method: the research is based on a theoretical research method – literature review.

Research base: literature sources from 7 databases: *Scopus, ScienceDirect, Google Scholar, Sage Journals, EBSCO Academic Search Complete, Emerald, Web of Science*. The research mainly uses secondary sources (scientific papers, books, etc.).

The review is structured as follows. First, the authors explain the scope and process of the review. Second, the authors analyse IM and OE literature trends. Third, they synthesise information to explore if there is a research gap and make suggestions for future research.

Research methodology

The research is based on a theoretical research method – literature review. The literature review was divided into 4 research stages: (1) to research 7 scientific databases to explore literature where "idea management" and "organisational effectiveness" are mentioned; (2) to select literature specifically about IM and OE; (3) to exclude duplicates; (4) to analyse the selected literature. In the first research stage 4,283,216 literature sources in which "idea management" and 1,029,401 literature sources in which "organisational effectiveness" was mentioned were found. In the second research stage literature specifically about IM and OE was selected and duplicates were excluded. 75 IM and 133 OE literature sources passed the third stage.

After Stage 3, the selected literature was analysed in a systematic review using a 3-step approach (Boiral, 2012): 1) development of a review protocol; 2) data extraction (separate IM and OE analysis); 3) and information synthesis (connections between IM and OE, research gaps, and suggestions for future research). The development of a protocol is essential to codify as precisely as possible the way studies have been collected to answer a specific research question, namely: (1) what is IM / IMS and OE – their research tendencies – and (2) is there a research gap?

Research results

1. IDEA MANAGEMENT

In previous studies (Mikelsone & Liela, 2015, 2015a) the authors conducted a detailed literature review on IM. The added value of the present research is as follows: (1) it explored the latest literature (published in 2015) on IM and IMS; (2) it created a holistic view of IM and IMS, since previous studies have analysed different aspects of IM and IMS separately. The authors of the research have concluded

that the latest literature supports and does not conflict with the results of previous research. The holistic view of IM and IMS is reflected in Table 1.

Table 1

Holistic view of IM and IMS

IM – systematic, manageable process of idea generation, evaluation and development					
IM dimensions					
Idea generation (preparation, capture/gathering of ideas, retention, enhancement)		idea evaluation (screening, selection, retention)		Idea development (concept development, distribution of ideas, support during implementation with repeated IM and rewarding, retention)	
IMS – tool, tool kit or complex system which provides a systematic, manageable process of idea generation, evaluation and development					
IMS type					
Passive IMS (domination 1910 – 2000)			**Active IMS (domination – 2000 till now)**		
Functions	*Type of focus*	*General realization*	*Functions*	*Type of focus*	*General realization*
Focus on idea generation	Unfocused process	Suggestion e-mail; real-life activities	Focus on all IM dimensions	Focused process	Web-based platforms; real-life IMS

The results of the authors' previous research (Mikelsone & Liela, 2015a) revealed that definitions of IM have not changed fundamentally over time, but there is a wide variety of definitions of the terms IM and IMS, while there are some fundamental common characteristics – IM is viewed as a process which includes generation, evaluation and development of ideas. But there are some additional features proposed in some of the definitions, for example, Brem and Voigt (2009) – collecting/idea creating, idea profile, sifting, classifying; Boeddrich (2004) – adoption, clustering, screening, selection, improvement of ideas; Coughlan and Johnson (2008) – declared idea communicating stage; Saatcioglu (2002) – seeking of ideas and realization of ideas; Fritz (2002) – storage of ideas; Shani and Divyapriya (2011) – distribution of ideas; Bakker, Boersma, Oreel (2006) – selling and funding of ideas. The authors conclude that these features could be included in the definition of the term IM.

In a previous study based on an analysis of 70 literature sources (Miķelsone & Lielā, 2015a), the authors created a definition of the term IMS – IMS is a tool, tool kit or complex system that provides a systematic, manageable process of idea generation, evaluation and development. This definition is supported by the latest literature sources. The authors concluded that IM is a wider and more uncertain term than IMS and describes the process, while IMS is a more specific sub-term of IM and describes a method or a tool that provides a systematic approach to IM.

The authors have created a holistic overview of general IM and IMS research and application approaches and their research methods. The holistic view of IM and IMS research and application approaches and their research methods can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Holistic view of the main IM/IMS research and application approaches

Approach	Focuses	Methods	Approach	Focuses	Methods
Social For example, Bailey and Horvitz, 2010; Barczak, Griffin and Khan, 2009; Bjork and Magnusson, 2009; Boeddrich, 2004; Coughlan and Jahanson, 2008; Flynn et al., 2003; Galbrait, 1982; Gish, 2011; Green, Bean and Snavely, 1983; Nilsson, Elg and Bergman, 2002; Pundt and Schyns, 2005; Saatcioglu, 2002; Tung, Yuan and Tsai, 2009; Van Dijk and Van Den Ende, 2002; Vandenbosch, Saatcioglu and Fay, 2006	Creation of new IMS, classification, model Evaluation of IMS effectiveness influencing factors Correlations Factor analysis Good practises IMS application and participant analysis	Literature review Simulation Interviews Questionnaire Observation Case studies Statistics	***Internal IM*** For example, Aagaard, 2012, 2013; Bansemir et al.,2009; Bassiti and Ajhoun, 2013; Bergendahl and Magnusson, 2014; Bettoni et al., 2010; Deichmann, 2012; Fatur et al., 2009; Glassmann, 2009; Iversen et al., 2009; Klein et al., 2010; Lower and Heller, 2014; Moss et al., 2011; Perez et al., 2013; Poveda et al., 2012; Selart and Johansen, 2011; Shani et al., 2011; Vagn et al., 2013; Zejnilovic at al., 2012	IMS tests Creation of new IMS, classification, model Evaluation of IMS effectiveness influencing factors Correlations Good practises IMS application and participant analysis	Focus group Literature review Simulations Interviews Questionnaire Observation Cases studies Statistics
Structural For example, Aagaard, 2012, 2013; Applegate, 1986; Azrolan and Pavlins, 1998; Bakker, Boersma and Oreel, 2006; Bothos, Apostolou and Mentzas, 2012; Brem and Voigt, 2007, 2009; Fritz, 2002; Wood, 2003; Gamlin, Yourd and Paric, 2007; Goyal and Sampath, 2007; Yu, Chen and Shen, 2006; Lindross, 2006; Lu and Mantei, 1991; Rowbotham and Bohlin, 1996; Summa, 2004; Voigt and Brem, 2006; Zejnilovic, Oliveria and Veloso, 2012	IMS tests Creation of new IMS, classification, model Evaluation of IMS IM effectiveness influencing factors Correlations Factor analysis Good practises	Focus group Literature review Simulation Interviews Questionnaire Observation Case studies Statistics	***Mixed IM*** For example, Baez and Convertino, 2012; Brem et al., 2007; Brem et al., 2009; Enkel et al., 2009; Fritz, 2002; Narvaez and Gordoni, 2015; Nilsson et al., 2002; Sandriev and Pratchenko, 2014; Sandstrom and Bjork, 2010; Voigt et al., 2006; Westerski and Iglesias, 2012	Correlations Good practises Literature review Interviews Creation of new IMS, classification, model IM effectiveness influencing factors	Questionnaire Cases studies Statistics
			External IM For example, Bothos et al., 2008, 2012; Tung et al., 2009; Westerski et al., 2011,2013, 2013a	Creation of new IMS Correlation Good practises Crowdsourcing	Literature review Interviews Questionnaire Observation Case studies Statistics

There is a tendency in literature to focus on internal IM, but from 2006 the situation started to change and more external and mixed IM application approaches have been researched. This could be explained by the growing popularity of open innovation, crowdsourcing, etc. Both structural and social perspectives of IM/IMS are researched. This research proves that the most common methods for researching different IM/IMS research and application approaches are literature reviews, interviews, questionnaires, case studies and statistical methods.

The research results prove that there is no evidence of exploration focused on the relationship

between IM and OE in recent IM literature.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The concept of OE is encountered repeatedly in organisational literature, but there is only a rudimentary understanding of what is actually involved in the concept. In fact, although effectiveness is generally considered a desirable attribute in organizations, few serious attempts have been made to explain the construct either theoretically or empirically. So the objectives of this research are as follows: (1) analysis of general data about OE in literature; (2) perspective and OE model analysis; (3) OE dimension analysis.

2.1. GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS

The results reflect that OE is in the scope of researchers and mainly researched in the USA (43%), India (10%) and the UK (10%).

The first literature source that mentioned OE according to this research was published in 1969. From 1969 till 2004 literature is fragmentary, but from 2004 there are substantive literature sources about OE. The research results show that OE became especially topical in the last decade; this tendency is consistent with the Scopus (2016) data analysis, where a wider range of literature sources are included, for example, papers with accessible abstracts only.

Additional data in Scopus (2016) shows that the authors most cited about OE are R. E. Quinn and K. S. Cameron; the research results also show that the most used articles are "Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis" (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983) and "Organizational Life Cycles and Shifting Criteria of Effectiveness: Some Preliminary Evidence" (Quinn & Cameron, 1983). Therefore, these authors could be considered the most influential researchers of OE. Also, Cameron (2010) has noted the leading researchers of OE – P. R. Lawrence, W. Lorsch, E. Yuchtman, S. E. Seashore, J. L. Price, D. Lawless, R. M. Steers, J. P. Campbell, W. R. Scott, R. E. Quinn, K. S. Cameron, A. Lewin, and J. W. Minton – and these authors are often cited in the researched literature as well.

2.2. PERSPECTIVE AND CONTENT ANALYSIS

Although there is evidence of increasing scientific interest in OE in the last decade, the scientific research is still characterized by a paucity of empirical studies, since more than half of all researched literature sources are theoretical sources. The authors have analysed OE literature according to several aspects: (1) theories applied and OE models applied or mentioned; (2) methods and focuses; (3) OE dimensions.

2.2.1. THEORIES AND OE MODELS

The authors have summed up and sorted literature and theories used in literature to understand basic sources of OE. The authors conclude that scientific knowledge is represented primarily in business and management literature (98%), but there are also articles in engineering, medicine, and psychology. The most frequently used theories and approaches in literature are classical theory (for example in Burnes, 1998), social capital theory (for example, Nelson et al., 2007; Pors, 2008), the human relations approach, the culture-excellence approach, contingency theory (for example in Burnes, 1998), organisational theory (Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013), etc.

Different aspects can also be seen in literature related to OE, for example, creativity (for example in Bratnicka, 2015), job satisfaction (for example in Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Biswas, 2010; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011), employee engagement (for example in Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013a; Rieley, 2014), knowledge management (for example in Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Yang & Wan, 2004), organisational commitment (for example in Angle & Perry, 1981; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011); organisational affective commitment subscale (for example in Ashraf & Khan, 2013), organizational culture (for example in Gregory et al., 2009; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Nazi & Lone, 2008; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011), organizational citizen behaviour (for example in Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013; Walz & Niehoff, 2000), information culture (for example in Choo, 2013), leadership (for example in Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Santra & Giri, 2008), non-profit OE (for example in Herman & Renz, 1999; Eisenger, 2002; Nobbie & Brudney, 2003; Sowa, Selden & Sandfort, 2004; Shilbury & Moore, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015; Liket & Mass, 2015;

Willems, 2015), etc. The authors conclude that idea management is represented mainly in business and management literature and there are a lot of specific angles on how to explore OE.

Despite the large scientific interest in this topic there is no consensus on what OE is and how to correctly measure it. So there are different kinds of OE models. According to the research the most frequently applied and mentioned models are the Goal Attained Model and the Competing Values Model, while the most commonly applied approach is the multidimensional approach (for example in Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Lecy et al., 2012; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Ziebicki, 2013; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Boiral, 2012; Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015; Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015; Jiang & Liub, 2015; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2014; Naor et al., 2014), which reflects the multidimensional concept of OE. The authors have gathered some of the most commonly used and mentioned OE models and approaches (see Table 3).

Table 3

OE methods and approaches

	Model	Focus and approaches	Dimensions / sub-models	Applied or mentioned in, for example:
Multidimensional / one dimensional	**Goal Attained Model**	Evaluation of ability to achieve goals, for example, cost-benefit analysis, MBO, output analysis, goals and means	Productivity, efficiency, profitability	Cunningham, 1976; Pors, 2008; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Lecy et al., 2012; Alastair, Coldwell & Callaghan, 2013; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Biswas, 2010; Nayak & Mishra, 2005
	Functional Model	Social consequences analysis. Need-satisfaction analysis	Social benefits – client and societal benefits, need satisfaction	Cunningham, 1976; Pors, 2008; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Amagoh, 2015
Multidimensional	**Competing Values Model**	Identification of key variables and determination of how variables are related – for a particular group, different priorities	Rational goal model, internal process model, open system model, human relations model	Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Burnes, 1998; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Gregory et al., 2009; Choo, 2013; Shoraj & LLaci, 2015; Chermac, Bodwell & Glick, 2015; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Shilbury & Moore, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015
	Systems (Resource) Model	Analysis of resource distribution efficiency among various subsystems' needs	Efficiency, stress, ability to acquire resources, revenue, expenditures	Cunningham, 1976; Nelson et al., 2007; Pors, 2008; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Upadhay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Lecy et al., 2012; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Vance & Tesluk, 1999
	Open Systems Model	Analysis with a focus on flexibility and external orientation	Flexibility, growth, resource acquisition and external support	Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983
	Reputational approach	Analysis of perception of stakeholders	Subjective measures of perception of multiple key stakeholders	Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Lecy, Scmitz & Swedlund, 2012; Willems, 2015
	Internal Process Model	Analysis of organisational environment	Control, stability, information management, communication	Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Steers, 1977a; Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Rohraugh, 1983
	HR Model	Analysis with an internal focus	Cohesion, morale, flexibility, HR development, recruitment	Sharma & Kaur, 2011; Quinn & Baugh, 1983; Pors, 2008

But there are also different models applied and mentioned in the literature, for example, the Structural Functional Model, which characterises systems' ability to forestall threatened aggressions or deleterious consequences from the actions of others (for example in Cunningham, 1976); the Organizational Development Model, which reveals organisations' problem solving and renewal capabilities, the ability to work as a team and to suit the needs of its members (for example in Cunningham, 1976); the Managerial Process Model, which explores the ability to perform certain managerial functions effectively (for example in Cunningham, 1976); the individual or team effectiveness approach (for example in Machi, 1977; Tuffield, 1975, Smith & Kleine, 1987; Rieley, 2014; Vance & Tesluk, 1999); contingency models (for example in Burrell & Morgan, 1979); population ecology models (for example in Aldrich, 1979); the social justice model (for example in Keeley, 1978); an evolutionary model (for example in Zammuto, 1982); a power model (for example in Hrebiniak, 1978); a political economy model (for example in Nord, 1983).

2.2.2. METHODS AND FOCUSES

The authors also collected the most frequently used research methods in the literature sources. It has been concluded that the most frequently used data collection method is questionnaires, while among data analysis methods, statistical methods are most common. This classification is adapted from the classification developed by Beisell-Durrant (2004). The authors also conclude that the main focuses in the researched literature are as follows: (1) theoretical research on OE aspects; (2) empirical research on OE measurements and predictors. See the collected methods, objectives and some studies where they were applied in Table 4.

Table 4

Most frequently used methods and focuses in the researched literature

	Subcategory	Examples of objectives (main focuses)	Research examples
Data Collection	Interviews	To study the relationship between organizational effectiveness and efficiency, commitment, etc. To examine the assessment of OE in a specific context.	For example in Ziebicki, 2013; Cameron, 1978; Angle & Perry, 1981; Yang & Wan, 2004; Rai, Sinha & Singh, 2006; Grabowski et al., 2015
	Focus groups Workshops	To collect OE data. To discuss the results of the research.	For example in Grabowski et al., 2015; Liket & Mass, 2015
	Questionnaire	To examine links between OE and different factors, such as communication processes in SMEs, management processes, people, social capital, organisational culture, employee motivation, involvement climate, innovation, leadership style, face-to-face communication, commitment, knowledge management. To discover important OE elements. To investigate the role of performance measurement systems in organisational effectiveness. To explore the effects of OE on several subjects. To create an assessment of OE in a specific context. To assess mediators in OE and other factors.	For example in Nelson et al., 2007; Jackson, 1998; Pors, 2008; Tuffield, 1975; Upadhay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Rieley, 2014; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Cameron, 1978; Riordan, Vandeberg & Richardson, 2005; Angle & Perry, 1981; Santra & Giri, 2008; Pee & Kankanhalli, 2015; Chidambaranathan & Swarooprani, 2015; Gregory et al., 2009; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Gerschewski & Xiao, 2015; Kwantes & Boglarsky, 2014; Rahimi & Vahedi, 2011; Yilmaz & Ergun, 2008; Kim, Kim & Kim, 2011; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Shoraj & LLaci, 2015; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005; Pounder, 1999; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Cameron et al., 2011; Walz & Niehoff, 2000
	Observation	To collect data to evaluate OE.	For example in Grabowski et al., 2015
	Audit	To analyse OE evaluation experience.	For example in Zairi, Cooke & Whymark, 1999
	Case studies	To examine factors influencing OE.	For example, Hayes & Praksam, 1991
Data Handli	Analysis of documents	To study the relationship between OE and other factors. To measure OE.	For example in Ziebicki, 2013; Collins-Camargo, Ellet & Lester, 2012; Grabowski et al., 2015

Basic	Statistical	Regression analysis – to create a hierarchical model of criteria of OE. To investigate correlates and predictors, mediators of OE. Factor analysis – to create a hierarchical model of criteria of effectiveness. To examine relationships between OE and dimensions, the mediating role. To examine OE measures. Principal component analysis – to examine OE measures, to analyse factors. Correlations – to explore correlations. Structural equation modelling – to examine the relationships between and among variables. To test direct and indirect influence on OE. To examine the anticipated model.	For example: Willems, 2015; Upadhay, Munir & Blount, 2014; Mahoney & Weitzel, 1969; An, Yom & Ruggiero, 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Ashraf & Khan, 2013; Riordan, Vandeberg & Richardson, 2005; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Parhizgar & Gilbert, 2004; Walz & Niehoff, 2000; Shilbury & Moore, 2006 Santra & Giri, 2008; Braun, Ferreira & Sydow, 2013 Rahimi & Vahedi, 2011; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011; Nayak & Mishra, 2005; Gelade & Gilbert, 2003 Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Kataria, Rastogi & Garg, 2013; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2012; Ullah & Yasmin, 2013; Zheng, Yang & McLean, 2010; Biswas, 2010
	Benchmarking	To identify how to achieve OE, determine which of the factors are actually related to OE.	For example, in Jackson, 1998; Mason, Chang & Griffin, 2005
	Literature reviews	To consolidate the previous literature. To explore theories. To examine OE variables. To explore routes to OE. To examine the relationship between OE and variables such as transformative leadership, creativity, information culture. To develop a theoretical framework. To create a retrospective analysis of OE. To review problems of OE, model review. To clarify the logic of participant interest notions of OE. To create models and demonstrate how to use them. To create proposals. To evaluate tools which help to leverage organizations to OE.	For example in Redshaw, 2000, 2001; Burnes, 1998; Downey-Ennis &Harrington, 2002; LiBrian & Kleiner, 2001; Smith & Kleine, 1987; Lowe & Soo, 1980; Shepherd, 1989; Pounder, 2001; Wadongo & Abdel-Kader, 2014; Bratnicka, 2015, Amagoh, 2015; Kataria, Garg & Rastogi, 2013; Boiral, 2012; Steers, 1975; Keeley, 1984; Connolly, Conlon & Deutsch, 1980; Cunningham, 1976; Kilmann & Herden, 1976; Lewin & Minton, 1986; Zooga, Peng & Woldu, 2015; Choo, 2013; Jiang & Liub, 2015; Cross, Ernst & Pasmore, 2013; Yukl, 2008; Chermac, Bodwell & Glick, 2015; Vance & Tesluk, 1999; Bharadwaj, 2014; Boisot & McKelvey, 2011; Skrivastavat & Agrawal, 2003; Sowa, Selden & Sandfort, 2004; Liket & Mass, 2015

2.2.3. OE DIMENSIONS

There are many OE models, but there are even more OE dimensions, which we could use as indicators for OE. Accordingly research scientists seem to agree that OE is multidimensional (Angle & Perry, 1981; Campbell et al., 1974; Steers, 1977) and the determinants of OE vary (Steers, 1977a; Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, 1978). To sum up, OE is a broad concept encompassing a wide variety of dimensions. And its multidimensionality has made it difficult for researchers to reach consensus about its precise measurement. Also, Ziebicki (2013) claimed that OE is mostly presented as a multidimensional criterion and this makes it possible to identify various types of outputs and indicate reasons for a specific level of performance in a given organizational system. Secondly, OE has no objective reality, but is conceptualized based on one's point of view. For example, economists or financial analysts define OE more in financial terms such as profits or return on investment, while employees define it more in such terms as motivation, control, flexibility, etc.

Researchers counted 30 dimensions in 1960s and early 1970s OE studies (Nayak & Mishra, 2005), but in this research we have concluded that there are more than 199 possible dimensions. These dimensions are analysed according to several factors: if they are (1) subjective (not directly measurable indicators, such as employee satisfaction, quality of work life, organizational climate, etc. (Sharma & Kaur, 2011) / objective (generally contended monetary success indicators (Ashraf & Khan, 2013) – these are monetary or numeric measures, for example, profit, production rate, etc. (Sharma & Kaur, 2011), (2) internal (an internal, micro emphasis on the functioning and development of the organization's

people and their activities (Grabowski et al., 2015)) / external (an external, macro emphasis on the functioning and development of the organization as part of the larger environment (Grabowski et al., 2015), (3) financial/non-financial, (4) if they are universal. See 199 dimensions and their apportionment by type (subjective/objective and external/internal) in Figure 1.

Objective

Internal		**External**
	Delivery (on time); business results; cash flow; cash out; employee turnover rate; new product development; operating efficiency ratio; operating expense/employee; operating expense/revenue; product maximization; productivity through people; profit margin; programme effectiveness; scrap material per unit; sub-units' performance; technical efficiency; turnover; units produced; vehicle hour; viability; absenteeism; average assets; compensation; controllable expenses; creating efficient output from limited means available; efficiency; equity; expenses; financial performance; growth; increasing resourcefulness (open system); individual employee performance / efficiency; innovativeness / innovation / innovation capabilities; internal efficiency; optimal use of available resources; overall performance; performance management; personal effectiveness; productivity; achieving goals; stability; survival	Autonomy; broadening of the market base; cost minimization; cost of capital; cost of raw materials; demand; labour costs; market share; product price leadership; profit generated and profitability; repeat business; return on investments; revenues; sales achieved; sales per advertising dollar; stock return; funding; inventory cost; achieving goals
	Accuracy of customer orders; appropriateness; aspects of identity; beliefs; bias for action; bringing the planned strategic actions to a good end; leveraging of resources; close to customers; cohesion; commitment and involvement; commitment towards learning and development; deployment of predefined strategy; determine reward distribution; employees' levels of ambiguity regarding customers; equipment supply; evaluate the effects of change; immediate supervision; improving internal processes; independence of board; leadership contingency fit; leadership for quality; leadership management; legitimization; management of scarce resources; need for independence; organizational environment fit; productivity through worker satisfaction; programme effectiveness; project design, implementation, evaluation; provide information for decision-making; quality and its improvement; reliability; responsiveness; employee retention; right decisions at the right times for the right reasons, satisfaction through attention to needs, selectivity; staff attitude; staff complaints; stakeholder involvement; sub-units' performance; supervisor support; supplier welfare; task orientation; teamwork; technical excellence; timely implementation of change; transformative leadership; turnover rate attraction of talent; unity of command and direction; viability; ability to accomplish core mission; ability to identify problems or opportunities; clarity; clear authority and discipline; competitive attainment; competency; congruence of internal processes; consensus; control; core functions; creating efficient output from limited means available; culture; decision-making; disciplinary actions; discretion; employee self-esteem; employee well-being; employee-perceived adaptability; flexibility; governance; grievances; increase of expertise and employee development; increased employee versatility / flexibility; increasing resourcefulness (open system); individual employee performance / efficiency; initiation of ideas and practises; innovativeness / innovation / innovation capabilities; integration or its errors; internal efficiency; internal equilibrium; interpersonal relationships; job satisfaction; keeping the vision and mission up to date; leanness; long-term sustainability; management effectiveness; manager-perceived adaptability; motivation; order; optimal use of available resources; organisational commitment; organisational management; organizational attachment; organizational climate; organizational structure and governance; overall performance; performance management; personal effectiveness; physical comfort; planning (also strategic) and goal setting; self-control; productivity; structure/strategy congruence; values; work pressure; workforce morale; working conditions and job demands; achieving goals; stability; survival	Ability to cope with users' and non-users' expectations and needs; autonomy; citizen orientation; civil participation; community satisfaction with organization; competition; community improvement; cooperation; customer complaints; customer satisfaction; enforcing changes to our society; environmental control; environmental impact; external focus; external reporting purposes; extra role behaviour; industrial action; investor attraction; new market development; quality of life; reputation; satisfaction of supplier with organization; satisfying clients; social responsibility; societal transformation; supply; turn away eligible clients; accessibility via various channels; adaptability; advantages; differentiation; networks and partnerships; open communication; openness; willingness to recommend; achieving goals

Subjective

Figure 1. OE dimensions (their focus – subjective/objective and internal/external)

The results reflect that the most common type of OE dimensions are subjective-internal dimensions and there are less external dimensions. Evaluating dimensions by criteria – financial or non-financial type of dimension – the authors conclude that there are mostly non-financial dimensions (74% of all explored dimensions); there are only 36 financial indicators and 21 mixed indicators. 40% of all dimensions are universal, while 58% are applied in only some contexts, 4 dimensions' universality depends on their application.

It should be noted that some researchers (for example, Evan, 1976; Scott, 1977; Cameron, 1986, Daft, 1998; Nazi & Lone, 2008; Cameron et al., 2011) do not separate definitions of performance measures and organisational effectiveness and the authors of this paper support this approach.

To sum up, OE dimensions may be subjective or objective, internal or external, financial or non-financial, universal or not universal, or mixed types, but the most common OE dimensions are subjective, internal, non-financial and not universal. This situation reflects that OE evaluation is mostly connected with specific contexts of organisations. Based on the research the authors would like to define OE as a multidimensional measurement that may consist of financial/non-financial, internal/external, subjective and objective dimensions, which reflects the achievements of the organisation, while the dimensions of OE may be different in different contexts.

3.IDEA MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS – A RESEARCH GAP?

Based on separate overviews of IM and OE literature, the authors revealed that there is a research gap: there are no focused researches or discussions on connections between IM and OE in the researched literature sources. There is also little theoretical guidance as to how IMS application and effectiveness materialize within organizations and even less direction on how to conceptualize and examine the effects of IMS on effectiveness. At the end of this article the authors will try to some degree to offer advice on how to begin to fill this gap, based on the research conducted.

By synthesizing IM and OE literature the authors have concluded that through conducting a detailed literature review, evidence of possible associations between IM and OE elements could be found. For example, Mahoney and Weitzel (1969) have mentioned that the degree of initiation of ideas and practices appears as independent criteria of effectiveness. This is the only evidence of connections between IM and OE in the researched literature. Initiation of ideas is only one part of IM, so it is important to investigate if the whole IM process impacts OE. But in IM literature studies have been focused on several elements which are explored as OE dimensions in this research, for example, cooperation (Tung et al., 2009), innovation (Vagn et al., 2013; Enkel, Grassmann & Chesbrough, 2009), creativity (Bakker et al, 2006; Van Dijk & Van Den Ende, 2002), leadership (Deichmann, 2012), and involvement (Bansemir et al., 2009). The authors would like to argue that this means that IM/IMS could be researched as a mediator in connections between these elements and OE. Overall, the authors have concluded that there is great potential to research IM/IMS and OE, as there have been no focused studies that explore both of the elements together.

There are fundamental research questions that are currently unexplored in the literature. Addressing these fundamental questions is relevant to advance theory and to develop interventions and tools to measure the influence of IM/IMS on OE: (1) Is IM/IMS connected with OE? (2) What are the primary emergent processes that account for the influence of IM/IMS on OE? Based on the research overview, the authors have synthesized future research directions. See the 5 main directions in Table 5.

Table 5

Theoretical Perspective in Future IM/IMS and OE Research

Elements	Focus	Potential Research methods
IM/IMS application, OE	To research IM/IMS and OE connections as IMS application in practice has frequently been considered pertinent in elevating organizational outcomes. To research possibilities to increase OE with IM/IMS. The factors that influence an organisation's decision to apply IMS are a fertile ground for investigation.	Quantitative data analysis, longitudinal regression analysis Interviews (with thematic and content analysis), questionnaires, case studies
Mediators in IM/IMS and OE relations	To research mediators in IM/IMS and OE connections (for example, idea creator characteristics, idea characteristics, communication, openness, etc.).	Quantitative data analysis, longitudinal regression analysis
Active IMS, passive IMS, OE	To research the influence of different types of IMS (active and passive IMS) on OE.	Qualitative case studies Longitudinal studies (both qualitative and quantitative)
IM elements and OE	To research the main IM dimensions (idea generation, evaluation, continued IM) which have the greatest influence on OE.	
IM/IMS application, OE, leadership	To explore what the process is through which leaders can promote IMS application that increases OE. To explore if and how leaders' characteristics influence IMS application and OE.	Qualitative case studies Longitudinal studies (both qualitative and quantitative)

In Table 5, the five most important research directions are highlighted; they should be considered in creating the basis for IM and OE studies. Methods mentioned in the table are only sample methods that have been applied most frequently for similar studies on IM and OE.

SUMMARY

For this article, the authors reviewed the literature on IM and OE to identify if there is a research gap and make suggestions for future research in this field. The researched literature has presented valuable insights on each of the terms separately, both empirically and conceptually. Even Mahoney and Weitzel (1969) have mentioned that the degree of initiation of ideas and practices appear as independent criteria of OE. This is the only evidence of connections between IM and OE in the researched literature. But it should be noted that initiation of ideas is only one part of IM, so it is important to investigate if the whole IM process impacts OE.

Despite the wide range of literature about IM and OE, there is a research gap – there are no focused studies or discussions on connections between IM and OE. There is also little theoretical guidance as to how IM/IMS application and effectiveness materialize within organizations and even less direction on how to conceptualize and examine the effects of IM/IMS on OE.

There are a number of major observations that can be derived from peer-reviewed journals and proceedings. First, this study outlines that there is a tendency in literature to focus on internal IM, but from 2006 the situation started to change and more external and mixed IM application approaches have been researched. Based on this conclusion, the authors would like to recommend that in the future, research on both internal and external idea management should be explored to get a holistic and up-to-date look at IM. Second, the study highlights that the most common methods for researching IM/IMS and their application approaches are literature reviews, interviews, questionnaires, case studies and statistical methods, while to research OE, the most frequently used data collection method is questionnaires, and among data analysis methods, statistical methods are most common. The authors recommend researching IM and OE by applying longitudinal studies (both qualitative and quantitative) if IMS are applied continuously and case studies if IMS have been applied only for specific events and the main performance data are fixed. Third, based on the overview of the literature, the authors have defined the terms IM, IMS and OE – IM is a wider and more uncertain term than IMS and describes the process, while IMS is a more specific sub-term of IM and describes a method or a tool that provides a systematic approach to IM. OE is a multidimensional measurement which may consist of financial/non-

financial, internal/external, subjective and objective dimensions, which reflects the achievements of the organisation, while the dimensions of OE may be different in different contexts. Fourth, it has been concluded that the OE models most frequently applied and mentioned are the Goal Attained Model and the Competing Values Model, while the most commonly applied approach is the multidimensional approach. The authors would like to argue that, even though these are the most commonly applied models, for each new study, the researcher should evaluate which model and which dimension of the 199 updated dimensions of OE to research.

In the last section of the paper the authors highlighted 5 important research directions to bridge the gap between IM/IMS and OE. To bridge this gap, it is important to answer the question of whether IM/IMS application is connected with OE. To explore these connections, the authors suggest 5 important future research directions: (1) to research IM/IMS and OE connections and possibilities to increase OE with IM/IMS; (2) to explore mediators in IM/IMS and OE connections; (3) to explore how different IMS types influence OE; (4) to research the main IM dimensions (idea generation, evaluation, continued IM) which have the greatest influence on OE; (5) to research the impact of management and leadership on IM/IMS application and OE. The authors would like to recommend researching IM and OE connections holistically by exploring not only how IM/IMS relates to OE, but also overall input factors that influence the IM/IMS process. The authors would also like to recommend creating an IM effectiveness evaluation framework and investigating if it has a direct influence on OE.

This paper fulfils an identified need to explore if there is a research gap between OE and IM research. The study also aims to clarify the domain of IM and OE by summarizing the main OE dimensions that are normally found in the OE literature and the main elements of IM. This research has summarized 199 OE dimensions and constitutes the largest scientifically gathered OE dimension list that aims to explain the OE construct. The added value of this research in an IM context is as follows: (1) it explored the latest literature (published in 2015) on IM and IMS; (2) it created a holistic view of IM and IMS. The main contribution of the research is that it reviews IM and OE literature tendencies and synthesizes them to outline future research directions.

REFERENCES

1. Aagaard, A. (2012), "Idea Management in support of Pharmaceutical Front End of Innovation", *International Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 12(4), 373-386.
2. Aagaard, A. (2013), "A theoretical model of supporting open source front end innovation through idea management", *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 7(4), 446-465.
3. Alastaire, D., Coldwell, L. & Callaghan, W. (2013), "Specific Organizational Citizenship Behaviours and Organizational Effectiveness: The Development of a Conceptual Heuristic Device", *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 44 (3), 347-267.
4. Aldrich, H. E. (1979), *Organizations and Environments*, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Amagoh, F. (2015), "Improving the credibility and effectiveness of non-governmental organizations", *Progress in Development Studies*, 15 (3), 221-239.
6. An, J. Y., Yom, Y. H. & Ruggiero, J. S. (2011), "Organizational Culture, Quality of Work Life, and Organizational Effectiveness in Korean University Hospitals", *Journal of Transcultural Nursing,* 22(1), 22-30.
7. Angle, H & Perry, J. L. (1981), "An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26 (1), 1-14.
8. Applegate, L. M. (1986), "Idea management in organization planning (brainstorming, strategy)", dissertation, University of Arizona, Arizona.
9. Ashraf, F. & Khan, M. A. (2013), "Organizational Innovation and Organizational Effectiveness Among Employees of Cellular Companies", *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research,* 28 (1), 1-24.
10. Azrolan, N. & Pavlins M. S. (1998), "Idea management: Restructuring technology-based research to help achieve corporate goals", *Drug News Perspect,* 11(3), 180-184.
11. Baez, M. & Convertino, G. (2012), "Innovation Cockpit: A Dashboard for Facilitators in Idea Management", in *ACM 2012 conference proceedings of the international conference in Seattle, Washington, USA*, NY: ACM, 47-48.

12. Bailey, B. P. & Horvitz, E. (2010), "What's Your Idea? A Case Study of a Grassroots Innovation Pipeline within a Large Software Company", in *CHI2010 proceedings on the 28th annual CHI conference on human factors in computing systems in Atlanta, USA, 2010*, NY: ACM, 2065-2074.
13. Bakker, H., Boersma, K. & Oreel, S. (2006), "Creativity (Ideas) Management in Industrial R&D Organizations: A Crea-Political Process Model and an Empirical Illustration of Corus RD&T", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15 (3), 296- 309.
14. Bansemir, B. & Neyer, A. K. (2009), "From idea management systems to interactive innovation management systems: Designing for interaction and knowledge exchange", *Wirtschaftsinformatik Proceedings*, 1(1), 860-870.
15. Barczak, G., Griffin, A. & Kahn, B. K. (2009), "PERSPECTIVE: Trends and Drivers of Success in NPD Practices: Results of the 2003 PDMA Best Practices Study", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26 (1), 3-23.
16. Bassiti, L. & Ajhoun, R. (2013), "Toward an Innovation Management Framework: A Life-cycle Model with an Idea Management focus", *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, 4(6), 551-559.
17. Beissel- Durrant, G. (2004), "A Typology of Research Methods within the Social Sciences", working paper, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute, University of Southampton, Highfield, November.
18. Bettoni, M., Bernhard, W., Eggs, C. & Schiller, G. (2010), "Idea Management by Role Based Networked Learning", in *11th European conference on knowledge management proceedings of the international conference,* London: Academic Publishing Limited, 107-116.
19. Bharadwaj, A. (2014), "Planning Internal Communication Profile for Organizational Effectiveness", *IIM Kozhikode Society &Management Review,* 3(2), 183–192.
20. Biswas, S. (2010), "Relationship between psychological climate and turnover intentions and its impact on organisational effectiveness: A study in Indian organisations", *IIMB Management Review,* 22 (1), 102-110.
21. Bjork, J. & Magnusson, M. (2009), "Where Do Good Innovation Ideas Come From? Exploring the Influence of Network Connectivity on Innovation Idea Quality", *Journal of Product Innovation Management,* 26(1), 662-670.
22. Boeddrich, H. J. (2004). "Ideas in the Workplace: A New Approach Towards Organizing the Fuzzy Front End of the Innovation Process", *Creativity and Innovation Management,* 13(4), 274-285.
23. Boiral, O. (2012), "ISO 9000 and Organizational Effectiveness: A Systematic Review", *QMJ,* 19 (3), 16-37.
24. Boisot, M. & McKelvey, B. (2011), "Connectivity, Extremes, and Adaptation: A Power-Law Perspective of Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Management Inquiry,* 20(2), 119–133.
25. Bothos, E., Apostolou, D. & Mentzas, G. (2008), "A Collaborative Information Aggregation System for Idea Management", in *Conference on Internet and Web Applications and Services proceedings of the international conference in Athens*, Athens: IEEE, 289-296.
26. Bothos, E., Apostoulou, D. & Mentzas, G. (2012), "Collective intelligence with web-based information aggregation markets: The role of market facilitation in idea management", *Expert Systems with Applications,* 39(1), 1333-1345.
27. Bratnicka, K. (2015), "Creativity and effectiveness in organizations. A new approach to an old question", *Management,* 19 (1), 22-45.
28. Braun, T., Ferreira, A. I. & Sydow, J. (2013), "Citizenship behavior and effectiveness in temporary organizations", *International Journal of Project Management,* 31 (1), 862–876.
29. Brem, A. & Voigt, K. I. (2007), "Innovation management in emerging technology ventures – the concept of an integrated idea management", *Journal of Technology, Policy and Management*, 7(3), 304 - 321.
30. Brem, A., & Voigt, K. I. (2009), "Integration of market pull and technology push in the corporate front end and innovation management- Insights from the German software industry", *Technovation,* 29(1), 351-367.
31. Burnes, B. (1998), "Recipes for organisational effectiveness. Mad, bad, or just dangerous to know", *Career Development International,* 3 (3), 100-106.

32. Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. (1979), *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life,* London: Heinemann.
33. Cameron, K. (1978), "Measuring Organizational Effectiveness in Institutions of Higher Education", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 23 (1), 604- 632.
34. Cameron, K. S. (2010). *Organizational effectiveness*. US: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
35. Cameron, K., Mora, C., Leutscher, T. & Calarco, M. (2011), "Effects of Positive Practices on Organizational Effectiveness", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 47(3), 266–308.
36. Cameron, K. S. (1986), "Effectiveness as paradox: consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness", *Management Science,* 32(5), 539-553.
37. Campbell, J., P., Bownas D., A., Peterson N. G. & Dunnette M. D. (1974), *The Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness: A Review of Relevant Research and Opinion,* NPRDCTR 75-1, San Diego: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.
38. Chermac, T. J., Bodwell, W. & Glick, M. (2015), "Two Strategies for Leveraging Teams Toward Organizational Effectiveness: Scenario Planning and Organizational Ambidexterity", *Advances in Developing Human Resources,* 12(1), 137-156.
39. Chidambaranathan K. & Swarooprani, B. S., (2009) "Knowledge Management as a Predictor of Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Demographic and Employment Factors", *The Journal of Academic Librarianship,* 41 (1), 758-763.
40. Choo, C. W. (2013), "Information culture and organizational effectiveness", *International Journal of Information Management,* 33 (1), 775-779.
41. Collins-Camargoa, C., Ellett, C. D. & Lester, C. (2012), "Measuring organizational effectiveness to develop strategies to promote retention in public child welfare", *Children and Youth Services Review,* 34 (1), 289-295.
42. Connolly, T., Conlon, E. J. & Deutsch, S. J. (1980), "Organizational Effectiveness: A Multiple-Constituency Approach", *Academy of Management Review*, 5 (2), 211-217.
43. Coughlan, T. & Johnson, P. (2008), "Idea Management in Creative Lives", in *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems proceedings of the international conference,* NY:ACM, 3081-3086.
44. Cross, R., Ernst, C. & Pasmore, B. (2013), "A bridge too far? How boundary spanning networks drive organizational change and effectiveness", *Organizational Dynamics,* 42 (1), 81-91.
45. Cunningham, J. B. (1977), "Approaches to the Evaluation of Organizational Effectiveness", *Academy of Management Review,* July, 463-474.
46. Daft, R. L. (1998), *Organization Theory and Design*, 6th ed., OH: Southwestern College Publishing.
47. Deichmann, D. (2012), "Idea Management: Perspectives from Leadership, Learning, and Network Theory", dissertation, ERIM, Netherlands.
48. Dension, D. R. (1990), *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness,* New York: John Wiley & Sons.
49. Dorow, P. F., Davila, G., Varvakis & G., Vallejos, R. V. (2015), "Generation of Ideas, Ideation and Idea Management", *NAVUS-REVISTA DE GESTAO E TECNOLOGIA*, 5(2), 51-59.
50. Doweney-Ennis, K. & Harrington, D. (2002), "Organisational effectiveness in Irish health-care organisations", *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal,* 12 (5), 316-322.
51. Eisenger, P. (2002), " Organizational Capacity and Organizational Effectiveness Among Street-Level Food Assistance Programs", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 31 (1), 115-130.
52. Enkel, E., Grassmann, O. & Chesbrough, H. (2009), "Open R&D and open innovation: exploring the phenomenon"*, R&D Management,* 39(4), 311-316.
53. Evan, W. M. (1976), "Organizational theory and organizational effectiveness: an exploratory analysis", in Spray, S. L. (Ed.), *Organisational Effectiveness: Theory-Research-Utilization*, Kent State University Press, Kent, OH.
54. Fatur, P. & Likar, P. (2009), "The development of a performance measurement methodology for idea management", *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 6(4), 422-437.
55. Flynn, M., Dooley, L., Sullivan, D. & Cormican, K. (2003), "Idea management for organizational innovation"*, International Journal of Innovation Management,* 7(4), 1-26.
56. Fritz, M. (2002), "Idea management enabler", *EContent,* 25(8), 50.

57. Galbraith, J. R. (1982), "Designing the innovating organization", *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(3), 5-25.
58. Gamlin, J. N., Yourd, R. & Patric, V. (2007), "Unlock creativity with "active" idea management", *Research Technology Management,* 50(1), 13-16.
59. Gelade, G. & Gilbert, P. (2003), "Work Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: The Application of Data Envelopment Analysis in Organizational Research", *Organizational Research Methods*, 6 (4), 482-501.
60. Gerschewski, S. & Xiao, S. S. (2015), "Beyond financial indicators: An assessment of the measurement of performance for international new ventures", *International Business Review,* 24 (1), 615–629.
61. Gish, L. (2011), "Experience with idea promoting initiatives: why they don't always work", in *18th Conference on Engineering Design: Impacting Society through Engineering Design proceedings of the international conference*, Copenhagen: Design Society, 83-92.
62. Glassmann, B. S. (2009),"Improving idea generation and idea management in order to better manage the fuzzy front end of innovation", dissertation, Purdue University, Lafayette.
63. Goodman, P. S. & Saks, A. M. (1977), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness,* San Francisco: Jossey – Bass.
64. Goyal, A. & Sampath, K. (2007), "Institutionalizing innovation: look to employees for the next great idea", *Ivey Business Journal*, 71(8), 1-5.
65. Grabowski, L., Neher, C., Crim, T. & Mathiassen, L. (2015), "Competing Values Framework Application to Organizational Effectiveness in Voluntary Organizations: A Case Study", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(5), 908–923.
66. Green, S. G., Bean, S.A. & Snavely, B. K. (1983), "Idea management in R&D as a human information processing analog", *Human Systems Management,* 4(2), 98-112.
67. Gregory, B. T, Harris, S. G., Armenakis, A. A. & Shook, C. L. (2009), "Organizational culture and effectiveness: A study of values, attitudes, and organizational outcomes", *Journal of Business Research,* 62 (1), 673-679.
68. Herman, R. D. & Renz, D. O. (1999), "Theses on Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 28 (2), 107-126.
69. Hrebiniak, L. G. (1978), *Complex organizations.* St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company,
70. Iversen, H., Kristensen, K., Liland, C. S., Berman, T., Enger, N. & Losnedahl, T. (2009), "Idea Management: A Life- cycle Perspective on Innovation", available at: http://www.ict-21.ch/com-ict/IMG/pdf/39_IdeaManagement_Kjetil_Kristensen_FINAL.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
71. Jackson, S. (1998), "Organisational effectiveness within National Health Service (NHS) Trusts", *International Journal of Health Care Quality Assurance*, 11 (7), 216-221.
72. Jiang, J. Y. & Liub C. W. (2015), "High performance work systems and organizational effectiveness: The mediating role of social capital", *Human Resource Management Review,* 25 (1), 126–137.
73. Karanjikar, M. R. (2007), "Funnel-reverse-funnel: the future model of idea management in new product development", *Futures Research Quarterly,* 23 (3), 21-26.
74. Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013), "Employee Engagement and Organizational Effectiveness: The Role of Organizational Citizenship Behavior", *IJBIT,* 6 (1), 102-113.
75. Kataria, A., Garg, P. & Rastogi, R. (2013a), "Psychological Climate and Organizational Effectiveness: Role of Work Engagement",*The IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 12 (3),33-46.
76. Kataria, A., Rastogi, R. & Garg, P. (2013), "Organizational Effectiveness as a Function of Employee Engagement", *South Asian Journal of Management,* 20 (4), 56-73.
77. Keeley, M. (1978), "A social justice approach to organizational evaluation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), 272-292.
78. Keeley, M. (1984), "Impartiality and Participant-Interest Theories of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29 (1), 1-25.
79. Kilmann, R. H. & Herden, R. P. (1976), "Towards A Systemic Methodology For Evaluating The Impact Of Interventions On Organizational Effectiveness", *Academy of Management Review,* July, 87-98.

80. Kim, J. H., Kim, C. S. & Kim, J. M. (2011), "Analysis of the effect of leadership and organizational culture on the organizational effectiveness of radiological technologist's working environments", *Radiography*,17 (1), 201-206.
81. Klein, D. & Lechner, U. (2010), "Ideenmanagement im Rahmen von organisatorischem Wandel", *in MKWI 2010–IKT-gestützte Unternehmenskommunikation proceedings*, Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 1831-1842.
82. Kwantesa, C. T. & Boglarsky, C. A. (2007), "Perceptions of organizational culture, leadership effectiveness and personal effectiveness across six countries", *Journal of International Management,* 13 (1), 204–230.
83. Lecy, J. D., Scmitz, H. P. & Swedlund, H. (2012), "Non-governmental and not-for-profit organizational effectiveness: a modern synthesis", *Voluntantas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations,* 23 (2), 434-457.
84. Lewin, A. Y. & Minton, J. W. (1986), "Determining organizational effectiveness: another look, and an agenda for research", *Management Science,* 32 (5), 514-538.
85. LiBrian, L & Kleiner, H. (2001), "Expatriate-local relationship and organisational effectiveness: a study of multinational companies in China", *Management Research News,* 24 (3/4), 49-56.
86. Liket, K. C. & Maas, K. (2015), "Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness: Analysis of Best Practices", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 44(2), 268–296.
87. Lindross, M. (2006), "Developing Front-End idea management and information processing", working paper [39], Innovation Management Institute, Helsinki University of Technology, 6 March.
88. Lowe, E. A. & Soo, W. F. (1980), "Organisational Effectiveness — A Critique and Proposal", *Managerial Finance,* 6 (1), 63-77.
89. Lowe, M. & Heller, J. E. (2014), "PLM Reference Model for Integrated Idea and Innovation Management", *Product Lifecycle Management for a Global Market, IFIP Advances in Information and Communication Technology*, 442(1), 257-266.
90. Lu, I. M. & Mantei, M. M. (1991), "Idea Management In a Shared Drawing Tool", *in the Second European Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work proceedings of the international conference*, Rotterdam: Springer Netherlands, 97-112.
91. Machin, J. (1977), "Using the Expectations Approach to Improve Managerial Communication and Organisational Effectiveness", *Management Decision,* 15 (2), 259-277.
92. Mahoney, T. A. & Weitzel, W. (1969), "Managerial Models of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 14 (3), 357-365.
93. Mason, C. M., Chang, A. C. F. & Griffin, M. A. (2005), "Strategic Use of Employee Opinion Surveys: Using a Quasi-Linkage Approach to Model the Drivers of Organisational Effectiveness", *Australian Journal of Management,* 30 (1), 127-143.
94. Mausolff, C. & Spence, J. (2008), "Performance measurement and program effectiveness: a structural equation modeling approach", *International Journal of Public Administration,* 31 (6), 595-615.
95. Mikelsone, E., Liela, E. (2015),"Literature Review of Idea Management: Focuses and Gaps", *Journal of Business Management,* 9(1), 107-122.
96. Mikelsone, E., Liela, E. (2015a), "Discussion on the Terms of Idea Management and Idea Management Systems", *Journal of Regional Formation and Development Studies*, 3(17), 97-110.
97. Moss, B., Beimborn, D., Wagner, H. T. & Weitzel, T. (2011), "The role of innovation governance and knowledge management for innovation success", in *the 44th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Science proceedings,* Kohla: IEEE, 1-10.
98. Naor, M., Jones, J. S., Bernardes, E. S., Goldstein, S. M. & Schroeder, R. (2014), "The culture-effectiveness link in a manufacturing context: A resource-based perspective", *Journal of World Business,* 49 (1), 321–331.
99. Naravaez, J. L. M. & Gardoni, M. (2015), "Harnessing idea management in the process of technology transfer at Canadian Space Agency", *International Journal on Interactive Design and Manufacturing,* 9(33), 1-11.
100. Nayak, B. & Mishra, B. B. (2005), "Impact of leadership style on organizational effectiveness", *Management & Labour Studies,* 30 (1), 90-103.

101. Nazi, N. A. & Lone, M. A. (2008), "Validation of Denison's model of organisational culture and effectiveness in the Indian context", *VISION – The Journal of Business Perspective,* 12 (1), 49-58.
102. Nelson, S., Brunetto, Y., Farr-Wharton, R. & Ramsay, S. (2007), "Organisational effectiveness of Australian fast growing small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)", *Management Decision,* 45 (7), 1143-1162.
103. Nilsson L., Elg, M. & Bergman, B. (2002), "Managing ideas for the development of new products", *International Journal of Technology Management*, 24(5/6), 498-513.
104. Nobbie, P. D. & Brudney, J. L. (2003), "Testing the Implementation, Board Performance, and Organizational Effectiveness of the Policy Governance Model in Nonprofit Boards of Directors", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32 (4), 571-595.
105. Nord, W. R. (1983), A political-economic perspective on Organizational Effectiveness. In K. S. Cameron and D. A. Whetton (Eds.), *Organizational Effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models*, New York: Academic Press.
106. Noruzi, M. R. & Rahimi, G. R. (2010), "Multiple Intelligences: A New Look to Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Management Research,* 2 (2), 1-15.
107. Parhizgar, A. M. & Gilbert, G. R. (2004), "Measures of organizational effectiveness: private and public sector performance", Omega, 32 (1), 221-229.
108. Pee, L. G. & Kankanhalli, A. (2015), "Interactions among factors influencing knowledge management in public-sector organizations: A resource-based view", *Government Information Quarterly*, 33 (1), 188-199.
109. Perez, A., Larrinaga, F. & Curry, E. (2013), "The Role of Linked Data and Semantic-Technologies for Sustainability Idea Management", in Counsell, S. (Ed.), *Software Engineering and Formal Methods*, Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 306-312.
110. Pors, N. O. (2008), "Trust and organisational effectiveness", *Performance Measurement and Metrics,* 9 (1), 59-68.
111. Pounder, J. (1999), "Organizational Effectiveness in Higher Education Managerial Implications of a Hong Kong Study", *BEMAS*, 27 (4), 389-400.
112. Pounder, J. S. (2001), "New leadership and university organisational effectiveness: exploring the relationship", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22(6), 281 – 290.
113. Poveda, G., Westerski, A. & Iglesias, C. A. (2012), "Application of Semantic Search in Idea Management Systems", in *Conference for Internet Technology Secured Transactions proceedings of the international conference in London,* UK, London: IEEE, 230-236.
114. Pundt, A. & Schyns, B. (2005). "Führung im Ideenmanagement - Der Zusammenhang zwischen transformationaler Führung und dem individuellen Engagement im Ideenmanagement", *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie,* 4(2), 55-65.
115. Quinn, F. F. & Thorne, D. M. (2014), "The Influence of organizational effectiveness and other correlates on the job satisfaction of staff employees at four year institutions of higher education", *Business Studies Journal*, 6 (2), 67-84.
116. Quinn, R. E. & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983), "Spatial model of effectiveness criteria: towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis", *Management Science*, 29 (3), 363-277.
117. Quinn, R. E. & Cameron, C. (1983), "Organizational life cycles and shifting criteria of effectiveness: some preliminary evidence", Management Science, 29 (1), 33-51.
118. Rahimi, G. & Vahedi, M. (2011), "A study of the relationship between senior line and staff managers' development in Ministry of Education and organizational effectiveness in the Educational System of Iran", *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 29 (1), 927-931.
119. Rai, S., Sinha, A. K. & Singh, A. K. (2006), "Value realization and organizational effectiveness: culture related imperatives", *Management & Labour Studies,* 31 (1), 32-48.
120. Redshaw, B. (2000), "Evaluating organisational effectiveness", *Industrial and Commercial Training,* 32 (7), 245-248.
121. Redshaw, B. (2001), "Evaluating organisational effectiveness", *Measuring Business Excellence,* 5 (1), 16-18.
122. Rieley, J. B. (2014), "Building Alignment to Improve Organizational Effectiveness", *Global Business and Organizational Excellence,* July/August, 6-16.
123. Riordan, C. M., Vandenberg, R. J. & Richardson, H. A. (2005), "Employee involvement climate and organizational effectiveness", *Human Resource Management,* 44 (4), 471-488.

124. Rose, A. & Jensen, V. (2012), "A literature review of idea management", paper presented at the 9th NordDesign conference proceedings DS 71 of NordDesign, Aarlborg University, Denmark. 22-24 August, available at: https://www.designsociety.org/publication/35610/a_literature_review_of_idea_management (accessed: 10 January 2016).
125. Rowbotham, L. & Bohlin, N. (1996), "Structured Idea Management as a Value-Adding Process", available at: http://www.adlittle.com/uploads/tx_extprism/1996_q2_31-36.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
126. Saatcioglu, A. (2002), "Using grounded inquiry to explore idea management for innovativeness", paper presented at Academy of Management Proceedings, available at: http://proceedings.aom.org/content/2002/1/C1.19.abstract (accessed: 10 January 2016).
127. Sandriev, A. R. & Pratchenko, O. V. (2014), "Idea management in the system of innovative management", *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 5(12), 155-158.
128. Sandstrom, C. & Bjork, J. (2010), "Idea management systems for a changing innovation landscape", *International Journal of Product Development,* 11 (3/4), 310-324.
129. Santra, T. & Giri, V. N. (2008), "Effect of Organizational Structure on Organizational Effectiveness through Face-to-Face Communication", *The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 7 (2), 28-38.
130. Scott, W. R. (1977), "Effectiveness of organizational effectiveness studies", in Goodman, P. S. and Pennings, J. M. and Associates (Eds), *New Perspectives on Organizational Effectiveness*, Jossey-Bass, London.
131. Selart, M. & Johansen, S. T. (2011), "Understanding the Role of Value – Focused Thinking in Idea Management"*, Creativity and Innovation Management*, 20(3), 196-206.
132. Shani, N. & Divyapriya, P. (2011), "A Role of Innovative Idea Management in HRM", *International Journal of Management,* 2(1), 69-78.
133. Sharma, M. & Kaur, G. (2011), "Workplace empowerment and organizational effectiveness: an empirical investigation of Indian banking sector", *Academy of Banking Studies Journal,* 10 (2), 105-120.
134. Shepherd, R. (1989), "Training for Organisational Effectiveness", *Industrial and Commercial Training,* 21(1), 14 -18.
135. Shilbury, D. & Moore, K. A. (2006), "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness for National Olympic Sporting Organizations", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 35 (1), 5-38.
136. Shoraj, D. & Llaci, S. (2015), "Motivation and Its Impact on Organizational Effectiveness in Albanian Businesses", *SAGE Open*, April-June, 1-8.
137. Skrivastavat, S. K. & Agrawal, S. (2003), "The role of power, politics and management in organisational effectiveness", *Management & Labour Studies*, 28 (2), 153-157.
138. Smith, G. R. & Kleine, B. H. (1987), "Differences in Corporate Cultures and their Relationship to Organisational Effectiveness", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal,* 8 (5), 10 - 12.
139. Sowa, J. E., Selden, S. C. & Sandfort, J. R. (2004), "No Longer Unmeasurable? A Multidimensional Integrated Model of Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 33 (4), 711-728.
140. Steers, R. M. (1977), "Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 22 (1), 46 - 56.
141. Steers, R. M. (1977a), Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View, Santa Monica: Goodyear.
142. Steers, R. M. (1975), "Problems in the Measurement of Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 20 (1), 546-558.
143. Stevens, J. M., Beyer, J. B., & Trice, H. M. (1978), "Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment", *Academy of Management Journal,* 21 (1), 380 - 396.
144. Summa, A. (2004), "Software tools to support innovation process – focus on idea management", working paper [29], Innovation Management Institute, Helsinki University of Technology, 15 June.

145. Tuffield, D. (1975), "Organisation behaviour", *Industrial and Commercial Training,* 7 (4), 164 - 166.
146. Tung, W. F., Yuan, S. T. & Tsai, J. R. (2009), "A custom collaboration service system for idea management of mobile phone design", *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing,* 19(5), 494-509.
147. Ullah, I. & Yasmin, R. (2013), "The Influence of Human Resource Practices on Internal Customer Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness", *Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce,* 18 (2), 1-28.
148. Upadhay, B., Munir, R. & Blount, Y. (2014), "Association between performance measurement systems and organisational effectiveness", *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 34 (7), 853 - 875.
149. Vagn, A. R., Clause, C. & Gish, L. (2013), "Towards a new perspective of managing ideas in front-end innovation as actor networks", paper presented at the 63. International Conference on Engineering Design, 19-22 August, Seoul, Korea, available at: http://orbit.dtu.dk/ws/files/58958235/ICED_13.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
150. Van Dijk, C. & Van Den Ende, J. (2002), "Suggestion systems: transferring employee creativity into practicable ideas", *R&D Management,* 32(5), 387-395.
151. Vance, R. J. & Tesluk, P. E. (1999), "A systems perspective on employee involvement and organizational effectiveness"*, Group & Organization Management,* 24 (3), 269-270.
152. Vandenbosch, B., Saatcioglu, A. & Fay, S. (2006), "Idea management: A systematic view", *Journal of Management Studies,* 43(2), 259-288.
153. Voigt, K. I. & Brem, A. (2006), "Integrated Idea Management in Emerging Technology Ventures", in *IEEE International Conference on Management of Innovation and Technology proceedings of the international conference in Singapore, China*, Singapore: IEEE, 211-215.
154. Wadongo, B. & Abel-Kader, M. (2014), "Contingency theory, performance management and organisational effectiveness in the third sector", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management,* 63 (6), 680 – 703.
155. Walz, S. M. & Niehoff, B. P. (2000), "Organizational citizenship behaviours: their relationship to organizational effectiveness", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 24 (3), 301-319.
156. Westerski, A. & Iglesias, A. (2012), "Mining sentiments in idea management systems as a tool for rating ideas", paper presented at the International Conference on the Design of Cooperative Systems (COOP2012) of the Large-Scale Idea Management and Deliberation workshop,30 May – 1 June, Marseille, France, available at: http://www.gi2mo.org/files/papers/coop2012/opinions_coop2012_paper.pdf (accessed: 10 January 2016).
157. Westerski, A. (2013a), "Semantic Technologies in Idea Management Systems: A Model for Interoperability, Linking and Filtering", dissertation, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Madrid.
158. Westerski, A., Dalamagas, T. & Iglesias, C. A. (2013), "Classifying and comparing community innovation in Idea Management Systems", *Decision Support Systems*, 54(1), 1316-1326.
159. Westerski, A., Iglesias, C. A. & Nagle, T. (2011),"The road from community ideas to organisational innovation: a life cycle survey of idea management systems", *International Journal of Web Based Communities,* 7(4), 493-506.
160. Willems, J. (2015), "Building Shared Mental Models of Organizational Effectiveness in Leadership Teams Through Team Member Exchange Quality", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* Published online before print, 1–25.
161. Wood, A. (2003), "Managing Employees' Ideas. From Where do Ideas Come?", *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 26(2), 22-26.
162. Yang, J. T. & Wan, C. S. (2004), "Advancing organizational effectiveness and knowledge management implementation", *Tourism Management,* 25 (1), 593–601.
163. Yilmaz, C. & Ergun, E. (2008), "Organizational culture and firm effectiveness: An examination of relative effects of culture traits and the balanced culture hypothesis in an emerging economy", *Journal of World Business,* 43 (1), 290–306.

164. Yu, F. Z., Chen, J. & Shen, H. H. (2006), "Idea Management Model for NPD Fuzzy Front End: Empirical Analysis Based on All-key-elements Innovation in TIM", *Chinese Journal of Management*, 3(5), 573-579.
165. Zairi, M. Cooke, M. & Whymark, J. (1999), "Best practice organisational effectiveness in NHS Trusts", *Journal of Management in Medicine,* 13 (6), 436-449.
166. Zammuto, R. F. (1982), *Assessing Organizational Effectiveness,* Albany: NY State University of New York Press.
167. Zejnilovic, L., Oliveira, P. & Veloso, F. (2012), "Employees as User Innovators: An Empirical Investigation of an Idea Management System", *SSRN Electronic Journal,* 1(1), 1-38.
168. Zheng, W., Yang, B. & McLean, G. N. (2010), "Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: Mediating role of knowledge management", *Journal of Business Research,* 63 (1), 763–771.
169. Ziebicki, B. (2013), "Relations between organizational effectiveness and efficiency in public sector units", *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 8 (1), 102-110.
170. Zooga, D. B., Peng, M. W. & Woldu, H. (2015), "Institutions, resources, and organizational effectiveness in Africa", *The Academy of Management Perspectives,* 29 (1), 7-31.