SIX SMARTNESS DIMENSIONS IN CULTURAL MANAGEMENT: SOCIAL/CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT PERSPECTIVE

Audronė PAULIUKEVIČIŪTĖ[1, *], Robertas JUCEVIČIUS[2]

[1]*Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Kaunas University of Technology,*
K. Donelaicio Str. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas, Lithuania
[2] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Kaunas University of Technology,*
K. Donelaicio Str. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas, Lithuania

Abstract. Cultural management as a complex process is constantly facing social/cultural challenges (policy shifts, creativity, interest coherence, the rise of technological capital, cultural emigration, etc.) that affect the growing need and importance for smartness in management. There is a lack of inter-disciplinary research on smartness in the context of cultural management. The goal of this article is to ground smartness dimensions in cultural management in the context of changing the social/cultural environment. Strategy, Creative Development, Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector, Empowered Cultural Sector Parties, Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital as well as the Culture of Shared Value Creation are presented in this article as six smartness dimensions in cultural management (the management of cultural sector and the cultural policy implementation at the state level). The object of the work – smartness dimensions in cultural management. Principal objectives: critically analyse a variety of concepts of cultural management; reveal the importance of smartness in cultural management in the context of changing social/cultural environment; explore the characteristics of smartness dimensions in cultural management. Methods employed: critical literature analysis and meta-analysis. Research conducted by authors of this article allowed to ground smartness dimensions as factors, possibly determining a more successful cultural management.

Keywords: smartness dimensions, cultural management, cultural sector.

JEL Classification: Z1, Z18, D78, D73, H11, O3, O35, O38.

Introduction

It would be difficult to start the analysis of cultural management (sometimes in English scientific literature expressed as culture management) without typically starting with an at least brief epistemological analysis of the term *Culture* (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017; Štreimikienė, 2016) (from the Latin *colere*, to till). *Culture* as "*cultivation of the soul*" (according to the classical Roman politician and philosopher Marcus Tullius Cicero) now is

---

*Corresponding author. E-mail: *audrone.pauliukeviciute@ktu.lt*

understood differently. Founder's of cultural anthropology Edward Tylor's 1871 work, "*Primitive Culture*", provides the first formal definition of culture: "complex whole, which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by a human as a member of society" (Street, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*). Raymond Williams (whose work laid the foundations for the field of cultural studies) in his famous *"Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society"* has expressed that *culture* is one of two or three most complicated words in the English language (Williams, 1977; Mulcahy, 2006). Culture can be seen as a process (Pauliukevičiūtė, 2011; Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2014) of becoming educated/cultured, it can also be seen as the cultivation of intellectual and aesthetic sensibilities (Williams, 1977; Mulcahy, 2006).

Variety of concept culture meanings, links to other terms and interpretations of creativity, arts, beliefs, institutional climate, behaviour patterns and many more strengthens the general complexity of the definition (Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2011; Pruskus, 2013). To sum up, three common directions of understanding culture can be seen from the scientific literature: predominant attitudes and behavior that characterize the functioning of a group or organization; intellectual and artistic activity and the works produced by it; a high degree of taste and refinement formed by aesthetic and intellectual training (Donskis, 2009). In both political and managerial discourse, culture is commonly used and identified as the arts (Kangas, 2008; Mulcahy, 2006). Authors of this article identify culture as a specific sector (domain/field) of arts, which is influenced by both: policy and management at the state level and require modern smart managerial decisions (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016).

The scientific problem in this article is addressed with three fundamental questions and arguments. First, by trying to understand how smartness can be useful in the cultural sector management in general, the rhetoric question is asked: is cultural management changing according to changes in social/cultural environment and how can it be conceptualised from the state policy implementation level; second, is it possible to define challenges in cultural management context regarding the changing social/cultural environment and third, do changing cultural and social conditions (including the rise of creative economy, modernization of cultural management and other) require smartness competences in cultural sector system (can it be seen through six smartness dimensions). The new creative (still rational) type of management, smart management, in the cultural sector, could possibly be based on expression of smartness dimensions in cultural sector (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016; Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017). The object of the research – smartness dimensions in cultural management.

The goal of this article is to ground smartness dimensions (Strategics, Creative Development, Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector, Empowered Cultural Sector Parties, Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital as well as the Culture of Shared Value Creation) in cultural management also considering the context of ever-changing social/cultural environment. Objectives: critically analyse a variety of concepts of cultural management; reveal the importance of smartness in cultural management in the context of changing social/cultural environment; explore the characteristics of smartness dimensions in cultural management. Methods of the research are critical literature analysis and meta-analysis.

1. The spectrum of cultural management concepts

There are plenty of cultural management concepts (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017) like there are different concepts of management and a numerous number of term *culture* explanations and interpretations. *Cultural management* concept is often linked to the general management in the culture sector (Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2012), or *arts management* (basically understood as management of cultural institutions and/or organizations, practically using all management functions: planning, organising, implementing, monitoring). Still, it is important to state, that *cultural management* is a broader term, it gives the ability to look at the cultural sector not from the narrow cultural organization's internal environment perspective, but by using a more contextual view, paying a proper attention to the external environment of the field.

Cultural management in the culture sector (particularly identified as arts sector management at state, regional or city level) functions in the *complex social system* (Johnson, 2009) and is a unique process, which can determine different ways of development according to national or international policy goals (regarding managing *cultural differences* (Alperytė, 2010), *debureaucratization of decisions* (Bučinskas, Raipa, & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2010), *strategic decision making* (Cray & Inglis, 2011), *transnational cultural policymaking* (Dewey, 2008), *cultural industries* (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005), etc. The system of managerial decisions in cultural policy formation and implementation at the state level, *cultural management,* in the context of globalization and continues technologization (internet opportunities and threats, new technologies in cultural life and art forms, virtual realities, social networking, etc.), is changing continuously: shifting mostly from management based on long-term perspective planning and organizing to the seeking for faster and more rational results. This is effected by social behavioural changes in all lifestyles, *ways of implementing policies* (Bučinskas et al., 2010), *language importance in culture development* (Kairaitis, 2013), *environment of creativity* (Baltrėnas, Baltrėnaitė, & Kačerauskas, 2015) *industry concentrations* (Grodach, 2016), cultural emigration and etc. Policy shifts (changes at national economic/social policy level), interest coherence, the rise of technological capital in general and *knowledge economy* (Hay & Kapitzke, 2009), multiculturalism and growing diversity of cultures, global environment – all of these circumstances provide new *social/cultural challenges for cultural management* worldwide. Some theoreticians state that cultural citizenship should be seen as a particular way of improving cultural management (Mercer, 2005; Martin, 2009; Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2012). We could also predict that cultural citizenship, or the involvement of stakeholders in cultural management becomes crucial for the cultural system development.

Numerous authors agree that cultural management success in ever-changing environment at the state level depends on timeless managerial competencies, like: good knowledge about European (or international) and national cultural policies, knowledge in cultural history and/or arts, planning, organizing knowledge and skills, implementation tactics, decision monitoring, understanding of cultural sector technological, creative, social development aspects (for example, in the field of stakeholder interests analysis and shared value creation), strategic as such and etc. Still, modern management competencies are also becoming more and more important. To sum up – there can be a lot off *cultural manage-*

ment concepts, the spectrum of its understanding variations differs according to the under-standing of culture, but either the concept explains culture as a system, or a process, the cultural management can be seen from the state level perspective broader point of view as state management of the arts sector.

2. Smartness in cultural management: meaning and importance in the context of changing social/cultural environment

Smartness (as a human intelligence quality and a human being characteristic) in manage-ment is seen in these contexts as a new concept (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017). As the XXI century is often named (in social sciences literature) as the new economy era (technological and innovation-driven), *smartness* is, firstly, basically understood from the technological perspective (Jucevičienė & Jucevičius, 2014; Jucevičius, 2014). On the other hand, the smart way of behavior in management or the smartness as the specific quality of decision making and implementation by actively reacting to the ever-changing external and internal environmental by formulating and implementing right and most rational de-cisions faster and in time – is more often seen and understood as a very important *social system quality*, which can be identified only in specific situations according to the concrete environment (Jucevičius & Jucevičienė, 2017). It must be stated here, that, unfortunately, not so many scientific studies have pointed out the link between *smartness* as quality and the *cultural sector management improvement*, or the sector development progress (for bet-ter results, productivity of decision making, ethical vs. efficient decisions, etc.). Smartness is not that type of quality which can be expressed and noticed all the time everywhere, still, it can add additional value to all functions of general management in any cultural context. Due to the small number of smartness studies in management (Albert & Fetzer, 2005; Jucevičius & Jucevičienė, 2017), (this object of the research is still new in cultural management and lacks both: qualitative and quantitative research) (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016), there is still the need of a better conceptualization of *smartness as a managerial competence*. Some rhetoric questions can be provided: how smartness can be identified in cultural management as a complex system (Cilliers, 1998) and what smartness dimensions could be possibly expressed in cultural management? What would conceptual/ theoretical basis of smartness in cultural management allow providing a better ground for the quality and efficiency of management in this domain?

    Smart development (Jucevičius & Jucevičienė, 2017)*, the smart social system* (Jucevičienė & Jucevičius, 2014)*, smart city* (Albert & Fetzer, 2005; Jucevičius, 2014) and *smart governance* concepts are all related to each other and to *smartness* as the main quality, which unites unique managerial practices in all processes or systems.

    Smart social system (qualities: *networked, learning, collaborative, digital, innovative, intel-ligent, dynamic, sustainable, agile*) is like a sort of idealistic type of a social system (identified concerning the positivistic perspective), and can include qualities like: *being intelligent, knowledge-driven, digital, willing to learn, networked, innovative, agile, sustainable and so-cially responsible* (Jucevičienė & Jucevičius, 2014; Jucevičius, 2014) In the context of social systems (Jucevičius & Jucevičienė, 2017). *smartness* is defined as *the ability to envisage the*

critical indicators or their system, quickly and creatively react to their crucial factors (challenges, opportunities, trends or symptoms) in adjusting to this environment by taking adequate decisions as well as using it to pursue the goals.

Cultural systems (as social systems) may be considered as products of action, and as conditioning elements of further action (Šlapkauskas, 2010). Complex social systems (cultural systems) may be understood as self-regulating ones, or the ones which are regulated, in both cases, intelligent and knowledge-driven decisions become more important as the world continues to deal with the globalisation processes. A *smart manager* has to be very intelligent to know how to solve problems in a specific (including both policy and politics) cultural arena, marked by a diversity of cultures, influenced by social interactions/networks/ actions/changes and many more. A smart human being is not the absolute given, smartness becomes evident in the relationship of a human being with the physical and socio-cultural environment, action (Barab & Plucker, 2002 cited by Jucevičienė & Jucevičius, 2014). *Cultural and social changes*, *technological progress* (defined as a system of very complicated processes covering all spheres of societal life and all possible directions of social, economic and technological development in the contemporary society in general (Melnikas, 2014) is influencing management styles, tactics, goals, opens up new modern platform for the management action in physical and socio-cultural environment.

Every manager must understand the need of increasing knowledge in facing new social-cultural challenges by making most rational, suitable and right decisions faster. Time management becomes more important. The speed of information sharing and decision making in a virtual environment has increased in every cultural social sphere of life (this is not only a factor, possibly helping organizations or states to increase productivity and efficiency). "Managing fast" (especially in cultural sector) sometimes doesn't help those, who seek to collect more data before choosing the right action, cultivate long discussions, instead of quick brainstorming, analyse different approaches, monitor context instead of acting quickly. Both ways of behaviour in cultural management (fast or standard) are needed (it is still better do not hurry up, if priorities of acting are not clear, but always make the decision faster if the direction is understood. Then it would be possible to name this type of action as a positive example of *smartness in management*.

3. Characteristics of six smartness dimensions in cultural management

Smartness Dimensions in cultural management (Strategy, Creative Development, Intelligent Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector, Empowered Cultural Sector Parties, Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital, Culture of Shared Value Creation) (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017), their criteria/characteristics and elements (from social/cultural environment perspective are presented in table 1). All dimensions must be understood as equally important for the explaining of smartness in cultural management (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016), they were identified in the context of cultural sector social/cultural system (as smart social system), all together dimensions provide a broader view to the field and understanding of its challenges (elements from social/cultural environment perspective (see Table 1) express areas of possible cultural sector challenges. Criteria of Strategics (first

smartness dimension in cultural management, grounded by social system qualities: being intelligent, knowledge-driven, willing to learn, agile) include: understanding the subject of cultural policy that is being formed and implemented at the state level; strategic decision makers and implementation understanding about factors possibly determining cultural management; clear cultural policy orientation in cultural sector development strategic documents (Štreimikienė, 2016); professional governance of cultural policy implementation (Kangas, 2008; Liutkus, 2010; Mercer, 2005; Mulcahy, 2006). A core quality of strategics is intelligence and agility. The strategy was always important in cultural management: by formulating and implementing decisions, identifying priorities, etc. A smart way of planning is linked to strategics as a modern competence needed not only in a narrow specific sphere but used more widely as a tool and good practice based on deep knowledge in the field, etc. (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016).

Creative Development (grounded by social system qualities: *innovative, dynamic, knowledge-driven*) also is identified through four characteristics: cultural policy which is programming creativity (Florida, 2002; Grodach, 2016); distinctive (original) attitude in cultural policy at the state level; an entrepreneurial attitude in the development of the cultural sector; creative decisions in policy implementation Jucevičius and Pauliukevičiūtė (2017). *Sustainable, agile* and *networked* qualities of smart social system are seen in dimension *Intelligent Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector*, criteria are: understanding stakeholder needs and interests; understanding the influence of interests groups on the cultural sector development; ability to involve different stakeholders in decision making; ability to harmonize stakeholder groups positions and interests (see Table 1).

Empowered Cultural Sector Parties dimension most important aspects include such smart social system qualities, like *networked, learning, digital*.

Four criteria of this dimension are: functional framework (system) of cultural sector development instrumentality; cultural sector development is managed competently; conditions are created for cultural sector specialists for their continuous study and improvement; the rational autonomy of cultural entities is ensured Jucevičius and Pauliukevičiūtė (2017). *Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital* as the smartness dimension in cultural management, grounded by *digital, knowledge-driven and sustainable* (smart social system qualities), can be expressed with these criteria: understanding about cultural sector intellectual resources (Hay & Kapitzke, 2009; Manzaneque, Ramírez, & Diéguez-Soto, 2017); understanding about cultural sector technological instrumentality (Melnikas, 2014); the ability to digitalize intellectual and technological capital in cultural management; the ability to harmonize intellectual and technological capital according to knowledge, structural and technical potential aspects. Last but not least, the sixth dimension *Culture of Shared Value Creation* must be grounded. Four of its criteria: understanding the logic and importance of shared value creation (Porter & Kramer, 2011); decision-making is grounded by the development of a shared value; democratic cooperation culture is dominating; fast response to the change in internal and external circumstances which are important for shared value creation to be assured. *The culture of Shared Value Creation* is based on smart social system qualities: *dynamic, sustainable, innovative*.

All six smartness dimensions in cultural management need a more deep analysis from the theoretical point of view (this can be an important direction for future studies and research in this field), every dimension has four criteria and every criterion (in another broader research of the authors of this article) is grounded by different indicators. By not trying to ground every characteristic with a specific argument (what would be needed for a further research in this field), we try to focus in this article more on general aspects of all dimensions and their characteristics. Discussing the criteria of *strategics,* it is important to state, that those characteristics rely on the importance of understanding the field (from the subject level to the policy orientation).

We see *creative development* as a way of innovatively, dynamically strengthen the cultural sector. In this case, the original new attitude or approach is needed. The cultural sector is rich with its sector parties, there are many different stakeholders, interested in results and perspectives of the cultural sector development at the state level. The criteria which underline the importance of stakeholders interests analysis are important for a today's cultural manager, who at the state level is dealing with different political parties and there interest groups in every day manage. Cultural or social emigration, traditions versus novelty, long-term policy versus short-term decisions, a proper regulation of cultural goods, cultural programmes and projects implementation strategics (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016) – these all spheres could be seen as difficult ones for a manager acting in a traditional sometimes more bureaucratic way. *Cultural and social changes and challenges* are generally changing traditions in social-cultural life. Managers are influenced by those changes. Every new experience or knowledge from a philosophical point of view in a long perspective changes the way a manager is understanding the cultural life. To develop a conceptual model of how management works and/or could work in cultural sector according to changing social and cultural environment, what functions it includes, what problems it can solve, regarding to which cultural sector understanding it can link – this is still a rhetoric question, important future goal for theoreticians and management practitioners. By adding the concept *smartness* (in cultural management) instead of sustainable, creative or any other term, in a specific way conceptualising the unique type of management in cultural sector, we believe that only with the meaning and value smartness concept and smartness dimensions (with all criteria) can provide and using smartness in practice, challenges in cultural management could be possibly solved out in a more efficient way, because the smart way of thinking and acting includes all already above mentioned smart social system qualities (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017).

The need for a new, dynamic evolutionary model of cultural management is rising (this is especially seen in Eastern European countries, Lithuania is no exception) (Bučinskas et al., 2010; Dewey, 2008; Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017). The dependency of decisions made in cultural sector management is linked to the timely knowledge and modern education in both: culture (behavioural studies, arts, subcultures, creative industries and the new economy spheres) and management history, theory and practice (management discourse, functions, strategies, tools, decisions, etc.). New ways of management are important not only in the arts sector organizations internal environment but at the state cultural sector level (external/

internal environment from the state demographic perspective). External environment as the environment of social/cultural changes must also be well identified. In this article, we do not analyse (due to the publication extend limits) the regional, international or global context of cultural management (but this doesn't mean it is not understood by us as equally important). We argue, that the external social/cultural environment of the state as its main cultural conditions, cultural policy factors, relate not only to the economy of the state but also to its cultural traditions and core national strategies.

Table 1. Smartness Dimensions in cultural management: their criteria/characteristics and elements (from social/cultural environment perspective) (source: compiled by the authors)

Smartness Dimension	Criteria/characteristics *(through which dimensions are expressed)*	Elements (from social/cultural environment perspective)
Strategics	Understanding the subject of cultural policy that is being formed and implemented at the state level	Subject of cultural policy (Bučinskas et al., 2010; Cilliers, 1998; Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005; Kangas, 2008; Pruskus, 2013)
	Strategic decision makers and implementors understanding about factors possibly determining cultural management	Knowledge of decision makers and implementers in strategics (Doz & Kosonen, 2014; Melnikas, 2015)
	Clear cultural policy orientation in cultural sector development strategic documents	Cultural policy orientation, priorities (Liutkus, 2010; Mulcahy, 2006)
	Professional governance of cultural policy implementation	Professional governance (Bovaird & Loffler, 2003; McNabb, 2009)
Creative development	Cultural policy which is programming creativity	Creativity in policy conceptualization and visions (Florida, 2002; Grodach, 2016; Hesmondhalgh & Pratt, 2005)
	Distinctive (original) attitude in cultural policy at the state level	Attitude originality (Albert & Fetzer, 2005; Baltrėnas et al., 2015; Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017; Lee, 2016; McNabb, 2009; Osborne, 2006)
	An entrepreneurial attitude in the development of the cultural sector	Entrepreneurial way of thinking and acting (Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016)
	Creative decisions in policy implementation	Creative decisions (Martin, 2009; Reimeris, 2016; Staniulytė, 2017)
Intelligent Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector	Understanding stakeholder needs and interests	Stakeholder needs and interests (Martin, 2009; Mercer, 2005)
	Understanding the influence of interests groups on the cultural sector development	Type of interests groups influence (Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2011; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011)
	Ability to involve different stakeholders in decision making	Stakeholders involvement (Thibodeau & Rüling, 2015; Woronkowicz, 2018)
	Ability to harmonize stakeholder groups positions and interests	Harmonization of interests (Martin, 2009; Mercer, 2005)

End of Table 1

Smartness Dimension	Criteria/characteristics *(through which dimensions are expressed)*	Elements (from social/cultural environment perspective)
Empowered Cultural Sector Parties	Functional framework (system) of cultural sector development instrumentality	Instrumentality in cultural sector development (Grodach, 2016; Lee, 2016; Pauliukevičiūtė, 2011)
	Cultural sector development is managed competently	Competencies in managing the development (Albert & Fetzer, 2005; Alperytė, 2010; Bovaird & Loffler, 2003)
	Conditions are created for cultural sector specialists for their continuous study and improvement	Cultural sector specialists improvement system (Liutkus, 2010; Pauliukevičiūtė & Raipa, 2011)
	The rational autonomy of cultural entities is ensured	Autonomy of sector parties (Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017)
Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital	Understanding about cultural sector intellectual resources	Intellectual resources (Florida, 2002; Hay & Kapitzke, 2009; Manzaneque et al., 2017)
	Understanding about cultural sector technological instrumentality	Technological resources (Melnikas, 2014)
	The ability to digitalize intellectual and technological capital in cultural management	Digitalization (Osborne, 2006; Pauliukevičiūtė & Jucevičius, 2016; Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2011)
	The ability to harmonize intellectual and technological capital according to knowledge, structural and technical potential aspects	Harmonization of resources (Manzaneque et al., 2017)
Culture of Shared Value Creation	Understanding the logic and importance of shared value creation	Core idea of shared value creation (Porter & Kramer, 2011)
	Decision-making is grounded by the development of a shared value	Decision-making for a better-shared value (Jucevičius, 2014; Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017)
	Democratic cooperation culture is dominating	Democratic cooperation (Albert & Fetzer, 2005; Bovaird & Loffler, 2003; Cray & Inglis, 2011)
	Fast response to the change in internal and external circumstances which are important for shared value creation to be assured	Ability to respond quickly and make decisions fast (Jucevičius & Jucevičienė, 2017; Jucevičius & Pauliukevičiūtė, 2017)

The development of high technology sectors, increase in efficiency of national/regional economic systems could be defined as a critical precondition for successful cultural development (Melnikas, 2014). *Cultural management* is in the need of smartness and smart decisions because the development of the cultural sector is like the ever-changing process in which new challenges arise regarding changes in policies and civil society, also the global and national economy. Six smartness dimensions (see Table 1) (24 criteria) fully show the need and importance of smartness in cultural management.

Conclusions

Cultural management in the culture sector (particularly identified as arts sector management at state, regional or city level) functions in the complex social system. Cultural sector or cultural environment could also be seen and interpreted as the sphere of the cultural system, in which a variety of concept culture meanings influence the cultural management understanding. In both, political and managerial discourse, culture is commonly used and identified as the arts. Analysing the cultural management from the state level perspective it is important to clarify the cultural management concept, know its history, understand and agree on its main field of action (in other words directions of management).

Smartness in cultural management is important and significant in the context of changing the social/cultural environment. Every manager must understand the need for increasing knowledge in facing new social-cultural challenges. Cultural systems may be understood as self-regulating ones, or the ones which are regulated, in both cases, intelligent and knowledge-driven decisions become more important as the world continues to deal with the globalisation processes. A smart manager has to be intelligent, have the ability to envisage the critical indicators or their system, quickly and creatively react to their crucial factors (challenges, opportunities, trends or symptoms) in adjusting to this environment by taking adequate decisions as well as using it to pursue the goals. Smartness in cultural management is still new and modern theoretical framework with the potential in many future directions for further research.

All Smartness Dimensions in cultural management must be understood as equally important for the explaining of smartness in cultural management (Strategy, Creative Development, Intelligent Harmonization of Interests in the Cultural Sector, Empowered Cultural Sector Parties, Harmony of Intellectual and Technological Capital, Culture of Shared Value Creation). Cultural and social changes and challenges are generally changing traditions in social-cultural life. Managers are influenced by those changes. Cultural management is in the need of smartness and smart decisions because the development of the cultural sector is like the ever-changing process in which new challenges arise regarding changes in policies and civil society, etc.

Such elements (possible cultural social environment challenges) from social/cultural environment perspective can be identified: subject of cultural policy; knowledge of decision makers and implementers in strategy; cultural policy orientation, priorities; professional governance; creativity in policy conceptualization and visions; attitude originality; entrepreneurial way of thinking and acting; creative decisions; stakeholder needs and interests; type of interests groups influence; stakeholders involvement; harmonization of interests; instrumentality in cultural sector development; competencies in managing development; cultural sector specialists improvement system; the autonomy of sector parties; intellectual and technological resources; digitalization and harmonization of resources; core idea of shared value creation; decision-making for a better shared value; democratic cooperation and the ability to respond quickly and make decisions fast. All of them contribute to a better understanding of the need of smartness in cultural management.

References

Albert, S. R., & Fetzer, R. C. (2005). Smart community networks: self-directed team effectiveness in action. *Team Performance Management, 11*(5), 144-156. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527590510617738

Alperytė, I. (2010, May). Managing cultural differences in business: identity versus otherness. *Global Business Management*, Selected papers (pp. 67-75). FH Oberösterreich, University of Applied Sciences. Aachen: Shaker.

Baltrėnas, P., Baltrėnaitė, E., & Kačerauskas, T. (2015). Social environment of creativity. *Filosofija. Sociologija, 26*(1), 46-54. Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademijos leidykla.

Barab, S. A., & Plucker, J. A. (2002). Smart people or smart contexts? Cognition, ability, and talent development in an age of situated approaches to knowing and learning. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(3), 165-182. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3703_3

Bovaird, T., & Loffler, E. (2003). Evaluating the quality of public governance: indicators, models and methodologies. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 69*, 313-328.0 https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852303693002

Bučinskas, A., Raipa, A., & Pauliukevičiūtė, A. (2010). Modern aspects of implementation of cultural policy. *Bridges, 4*, 1-14.

Cilliers, P. (1998). *Complexity and postmodernism: understanding complex systems* (156 p.). London, New York: Routledge. ISBN 0-203-01225-9.

Cray, D., & Inglis, L. (2011). Strategic decision making in arts organizations. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 41*(2), 84-102. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2011.573444

Dewey, P. (2008). Transnational cultural policymaking in the European Union. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 38*(2), 99-120. London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group. https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.38.2.99-120

Donskis, L. (2009). *Moderniosios kultūros filosofijos metmenys* (216 p.). Vilnius: mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla. ISBN: 9789955341673

Doz, Y., & Kosonen, M. (2014). *Governments for the future: building the strategic and agile state* (52 p.). Helsinki: Erweko, Sintra Studies Publications. ISBN 978-951-563-889-2.

Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life* (434 p.). New York: Basic Books. ISBN-10: 04 650 24777.

Grodach, C. (2016). Mapping the arts: industry concentrations, distribution, and change in the US, 1980–2010. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 22*(3), 353-375. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2014.987667

Hay, S., & Kapitzke, C. (2009). Smart state for a knowledge economy: reconstituting creativity through student subjectivity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30*(2), 151-164. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690802700206

Hesmondhalgh, D., & Pratt, A. C. (2005). Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 11*(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630500067598

Johnson, N. F. (2009). *Simply complexity: a clear guide to complexity theory* (256 p.). Oxford: Oneworld Publications. ISBN-10: 1851686304.

Jucevičienė, P., & Jucevičius R. (2014, May). What does it mean to be smart?. *Proceedings of the 8th Scientific Conference "Business and Management 2014"* (pp. 911-918). Vilnius, Lithuania: selected papers. Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Riga Technical University, Tallinn University of Technology, Brno University of Technology, Cracow University of Economics. Vilnius: Technika.

Jucevičius, R. (2014). Sumaniojo miesto vystymo strateginės dimensijos. *Viešoji politika ir administravimas* [Public policy and administration], *13*(3), 427-441.

Jucevičius, R., & Jucevičienė, P. (2017). Sumaniosios socialinės sistemos koncepcija. Iš R. Jucevičius, ir J. Šiugždinienė (Ed.), *Sumanioji socialinė Sistema* (pp. 12-34). Kaunas: Technologija. https://doi.org/10.5755/e01.9786090213773

Jucevičius, R., & Pauliukevičiūtė A. (2017). Sumanumo dimensijų raiškos kultūros vadyboje teorinės prielaidos. Iš R. Jucevičius ir J. Šiugždinienė (Ed.), *Sumanioji socialinė Sistema* (pp. 193-226). Kaunas: Technologija. https://doi.org/10.5755/e01.9786090213773

Kairaitis, Z. (2013). Vieta, kalba, kultūra kaip švietimo erdvės apibrėžtys. *Logos, 74*, 172-182.

Kangas, A. (2008). *Nauji kultūros politikos drabužiai. Kultūros politika* (pp. 39-64). Straipsnių rinktinė. Žaidytė G. (Ed.). Baltos lankos.

Lee, H. K. (2016). Politics of the 'creative industries' discourse and its variants. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 22*(3), 438-455. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2014.991783

Liutkus, V. (2010). *Compendium cultural trends in Europe. Country Profile Lithuania*. Council of Europe/ERICarts: „Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe" (12th ed.).

Manzaneque, M., Ramírez, Y., & Diéguez-Soto, J. (2017). Intellectual capital efficiency, technological innovation and family management. *Innovation, 19*(2), 167-188. https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2016.1272828

Martin, S. (2009). Engaging with citizens and stakeholders. In T. Bovaird & E. Loeffler (Ed.), *Public Management and Governance* (pp. 279-297). London: Routledge.

Mcnabb, D. (2009). *The new face of government. How public managers are forging a new approach to governance* (280 p.). New York: CRC Press. ISBN-9781-4200-9387-2. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420093889

Melnikas, B. (2015). Innovation strategies for the European Union. Viešasis Administravimas [Public Administration], *1*(45)-*2*(46), 67-77.

Melnikas, B. (2014). Culture and technological progress in the context of European integration: new challenges. *Economics and Culture = Ekonomika un Kultūra, 9*, 57-76. Riga: The University College of Economics and Culture.

Mercer, C. (2005). From indicators to governance to the mainstream tools for cultural policy and citizenship. In C. Andrew, M. Gattinger, M. S. Jeannotte, & W. Straw (Ed.), *Accounting for culture: thinking through cultural citizenship* (pp. 9-21). Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press.

Mulcahy, K. V. (2006). Cultural policy: definitions and theoretical approaches. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 35*(4), 319-330. https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.35.4.319-330

Osborne, S. P. (2006). The new public governance?. *Public Management Review, 8*(3), 377-387. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030600853022

Pauliukevičiūtė, A. (2011). Regional cultural policy changes in the context of new public governance: developing a creative economy in Lithuania. *Social Research* [Socialiniai Tyrimai], *3*(24), 89-99.

Pauliukevičiūtė, A., & Jucevičius, R. (2016). Strategiškumo kaip sumanumo dimensijos kultūros vadyboje vertinimas. Viešoji Politika ir Administravimas [Public Policy and Administration], *15*(3), 375-389.

Pauliukevičiūtė, A., & Raipa, A. (2011). Cultural personnel governance in the stage of globalisation. In R. Kattel, W. Mikulowski, & B. G. Peters (Eds.), *Public administration in time of crisis* (pp. 195-209). Bratislawa: NISPAcee.

Pauliukevičiūtė, A., & Raipa, A. (2012, May). Culture management key challenges in changing economic environment. *The 7th International Scientific Conference "Business and Management 2012"* (pp. 701-708). Selected papers. Vilnius, Lithuania. Vilnius: Gediminas Technical University.

Pauliukevičiūtė, A., & Raipa, A. (2014). Kultūros politikos įgyvendinimas: teorinis konceptualizavimas ir modeliai. *Viešoji Politika ir Administravimas* [Public Policy and Administration], *13*(2), 243-257. https://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-14-13-2-05

Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2011). *Public management reform: a comparative analysis – new public management, governance, and the Neo-Weberian State* (374 p.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN-10: 0199595097.

Porter, M. E., & Kramer, M. R. (2011). The big idea: creating shared value. *Harvard Business Review 89*(1/2), 62-77.

Pruskus, V. (2013). Kultūros samprata ir inkultūrizacijos procesas tarpkultūrinės komunikacijos kontekste. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, *24*(3), 121-130.

Reimeris, R. (2016). Theoretical features of the creative society. *Creativity studies, 9*(1), 15-24. https://doi.org/10.3846/23450479.2015.1088902

Staniulytė, E. (2017). Kūrybinis miestas: nuo teorinės koncepcijos prie praktinio įgyvendinimo. *Filosofija. Sociologija, 28*(1), 84-88.

Street, B. V. (2018). Sir Edward Burnett Tylor. British Anthropologist. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online.* Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Šlapkauskas, V. (2010). The inner tensions of legal culture in consumer society. *Jurisprudence, 4*(122), 371-385.

Štreimikienė, D. (2016). Lithuanian cultural policy: challenges and achievements. *Journal of International Studies, 9*(1), 219-228. https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-8330.2016/9-1/16

Thibodeau, B. D., & Rüling, Ch. C. (2015). Nonprofit organizations, community, and shared urgency: lessons from the arts and culture sector. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 45*(3), 156-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2015.1080640

Williams, R. (1977). *Keywords: a vocabulary of culture and society* (286 p.). New York: Oxford University Press. ISBN- 01 952 04697.

Woronkowicz, J. (2018). Community engagement and cultural building projects. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 48*(1), 32-43. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2017.1366962