

tion of their actions (however, the diversity in this field is substantial: beside perfectly functioning societies and foundations, there are still the ones which outsource the preparation of the grant application, and after receiving the support they have a problem with the implementation and settlement of the project). The professionalization often leads to distortions – the so-called ‘grant hunters’ more and more often appear on the market. They represent entities which do not act in order to implement social mission but to bring benefits for the members of the organization⁵.

In the 90s the music and book markets were effectively and successively privatized⁶. It does not mean that the publishers were not looking for the support of public budgets for the less attractive, from the economics point of view, titles; however, the book market in Poland has been functioning relatively well through all these years. Currently, because of a number of socio-economic changes, including the increase in the VAT rate for a book, the development of new media, the availability of on-line books, the possibility to buy cheaper books in internet bookshops, numerous bookshops with cheap books (in supermarkets there are even books sold ‘by weight’!), and decline in reading⁷, the traditional bookshops are not always able to stay on the market⁸. They are looking for new forms of revenue, combining bookshops with the offer of cafés and clubs, which positively influences their image⁹.

The cultural activity is more and more often undertaken by private economic operators (not only art galleries¹⁰, but also artistic agencies¹¹ and impresarios). They cannot count on subsidies from local governments’ budget¹² any more, but they can become

⁵ For „rent seeking activity”, see: prof. dr hab. Urszula Grzełowska, *Ekonomiczny zarys sfery kultury*, presented on a scientific seminar of the Institute of Economic Science (Polish Academy of Sciences) 24th May 2007, text is available on-line: http://www.inepan.waw.pl/wydarzenia/seminaria_naukowe.html?id_seminarium=48 [access: 31.03.2014].

⁶ A. Rottermund, *Przedmowa* [in:] J. Purchla, *Dziedzictwo a transformacja*, Kraków 2005, p. 12.

⁷ R. Chymkowski, I. Koryś, O. Dawidowicz-Chymkowska, *Spoleczny zasięg książki w Polsce w 2012 r.*, the National Library report, <http://bn.org.pl/download/document/1362741578.pdf> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁸ Recently, Księgarnia Hetmańska has disappeared from Krakow’s Market Square, where it had operated since 1990, see: U. Wolak, *Księgarnia Hetmańska przestała być potrzebna*, “Gazeta Krakowska”, 9. January 2014, <http://www.gazetakrakowska.pl/artukul/1083762,z-rynku-glownego-znika-ksiegarnia-hetmanska,id,t.html> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁹ For example: Księgarnia Muzyczna Pod Kurantem (Market Square), Bona Książka i Kawa (Kanoniczna street), Czudy Barbarzyńca (Powiśle street). Currently, the program of support for bookshops is under discussion in Krakow. The bookshops which are gaining less profit are not able to pay the commercial rent rate and disappear from the city center, giving way to cheap bookshops.

¹⁰ As not all art galleries are able to pay the commercial rent rates, in 1996 Krakow’s local government introduced a program of support for galleries, lowering their rent rates.

¹¹ For example, Agencja GAP was the producer of the show *Chopin bez fortepianu*.

¹² They could participate in the competitions for grants from local-governments budget till the end of the 90s of the 20th century. Today they can take part in the competitions organized by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, which is exempted from the application of the Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism, Dziennik Ustaw of 2003 No. 96, item 873 with amendments.

contractors of the services at their request under the Public Procurement Law¹³, what, thanks to the last amendment (raising the threshold for public procurement to more than 30 000 Euro¹⁴) will become a bit easier from the procedural point of view.

The role of public cultural institutions is changing gradually but visibly. Many of them, temporarily disoriented after the period of PRL, redefined their mission and have been successively building new relations with the audience, taking into consideration the changing needs of the consumers, new economic conditions (limited grants from the organizers' budgets for local-government cultural institutions), looking more effectively for new sources of funding¹⁵. Despite the underdeveloped sponsoring in Poland, many of them use the conceptions of CSR and CCR¹⁶, others diversify their offer, both in terms of the merits and the price, often introducing commercial offer as a complementary one. The new infrastructure in Poland, in case of many cultural institutions, contributed to a substantial change and to the improvement of their conditions. After many years of total investment stagnation in this sphere, together with Poland's accession into the EU, the Polish state and local governments started to undertake the tasks in this area more bravely.

New infrastructure naturally generates the need of innovation. Cultural institutions more willingly and effectively, to a varying degree, make use of new media today (communication with the audience, mailing, FB, promotion, marketing, crowdfunding¹⁷, crowdsourcing¹⁸). They more often see the importance of spending money on marketing activities, which they used to economize on, in case of a shortfall of funds for substantive activities¹⁹.

¹³ Act of 19th December 2008 on public-private partnership, Dziennik Ustaw of 2009 No. 19, item 100, of 2010 No. 106, item 675 with amendments.

¹⁴ Public Procurement Law is not applied to the procurements relating to deliveries or services in the field of cultural activity, connected to the organization of exhibitions, concerts, competitions, festivals, shows, theatre plays, undertakings in the field of cultural education or collecting library materials by libraries or museum collections, if these procurements are not used for equipping the contracting entity with fixed assets for the ongoing handling of their activity and their value does not exceed a PLN equivalent of the amount of EUR 30,000, see: Act of 14th March 2014 on amending the act – Procurement law and certain other acts Dziennik Ustaw of 2014 item 423.

¹⁵ See: A. Wąsowska, *Polityka kulturalna Polski 1989–2012* [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, pp. 107–126.

¹⁶ Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Corporate Cultural Responsibility (CCR) are based on the assumption that commercial intermediaries, apart from the maximization of the shareholders' profit, in their activity must take into consideration the duties to the community where they act, playing the role of, so called: 'good citizens'. See: M. Kostera, M. Śliwa, *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2010.

¹⁷ Crowdfunding – social funding, a source of capital provided by a broad virtual community, which wants to support a creative originator. See: K. Król, *Finansowanie społecznościowe jako źródło finansowania przedsięwzięć w Polsce*, Poznań 2013.

¹⁸ M. Przybyła, K. Sobczak, *Crowdsourcing – zbiorowa mądrość e-społeczeństwa* [in:] Falencikowski T., Dworak J. (eds), *Funkcjonowanie współczesnych przedsiębiorstw*, Prace naukowe WSB w Gdańsku, 2010, vol. 8, pp. 75–84.

¹⁹ See: The film promoting the branches of the Historical Museum of the City of Krakow *One Museum, Thousands of Stories*.

In Poland cultural and creative industries started to develop much later than in Great Britain or Germany²⁰. Only in the first decade of the 21st century did we start to discuss more extensively their contribution to the generation of GDP²¹. Today we are more often noticing the relationship between the development and condition of these industries, relying on individual works of artists and creators, and their income.

As the audience taking advantage of the development of new media we started increasingly to recognize a need for contact with art, culture and cultural heritage on-line, which contributed to the increase of public investment in resources digitalization and putting them online. An excellent example of educational activities promoting digitalization in the community is a film, entitled: *Lajkonik's Last Dance, or Next, Please!*²², promoting this idea under the program MALOPOLSKA'S VIRTUAL MUSEUMS²³.

The Act of 25 October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity²⁴, amended in 2001, was aimed at giving new possibilities of more effective cultural institutions management. Many times during the last quarter of the century we were debating on the need of changing it.²⁵ Although the present draft is still far from being ideal and did not satisfy many environments, it introduced some valuable, in my opinion, changes, among others the possibility to entrust the managing of public cultural institution to an entity selected under the public procurement law²⁶, the obligation to employ the managers of public cultural institutions for a fixed period²⁷, obligatory managing contract signing between the organizer and the candidate selected for

²⁰ A. Klasik, *Od sektora kultury do przemysłów kreatywnych* [in:] A. Gwóźdź (ed.), *Od przemysłów kultury do kreatywnej gospodarki*, Warszawa 2010, pp. 47–63.

²¹ E.g. the publication edited by J. Szomburg, *Kultura i przemysły kultury szansą rozwojową dla Polski*, Gdańsk 2002; M. Smoleń, *Przemysły kultury*, Kraków 2003, or *The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013*, 2004.

²² <http://muzea.malopolska.pl/> [access: 3.04.2014].

²³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NAchNdvDABw> [access: 3.04.2014].

²⁴ Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 2012, item 406; see also: Act of 31st August 2011 on amending the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity and certain other acts, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 2011 No. 207, item 1230.

²⁵ Prof. M. Kulesza's projects (*Tezy do ustawy o instytucjach kultury*), prof. J. Purchla, prof. A. Rottermund (*Projekt reformy ustroju publicznych instytucji kultury w Polsce*, "Rocznik Międzynarodowego Centrum Kultury" 1999, R. 8, pp. 58–67), prof. W. Misiąga i D. Ilczuk's project (*Finansowanie kultury i organizacja działalności kulturalnej w gospodarce rynkowej*, Gdańsk, *Zeszyt IBnGR* no. 32, 2002), see also: A. Rottermund, *Finansowanie muzealnictwa w Polsce po 1989 roku – historia poszukiwania rozwiązań* [in:] D. Folga-Januszewska, B. Gutowski (eds), *Ekonomia muzeum*, Kraków 2011, pp. 19–26.

²⁶ Article 15a of the Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity gives a possibility to entrust the management of a public cultural institution to an entity selected under the Act of 29th January 2004 Procurement law, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 2007 No. 223, item 1655 with amendments. The city Szczecin as the first in Poland selected the manager of a newly formed cultural institution. "Trafostacja Sztuki" in a tender. See more: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Zarządzanie publiczną instytucją kultury w Polsce – misja a ekonomika*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2013, no. 14, vol. 1, pp. 19–39.

²⁷ In case of art institutions 3–5 seasons, the rest 2–7 years. Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity.

the manager, or bringing back artistic seasons as the period of the substantive activity of artistic institutions²⁸. Even if the contracts, mentioned above, are today a source of many problems (with regard to the fact the budget is for one year and that cultural institutions are often not taken into consideration in the long-term financial plans of local governments, unless they are related to specific investments) and do not fulfill, in my opinion, the expectations of the originators and decision-makers who decided to include this amendment to the act, in the future (in the process of evolution) this contract has a chance of becoming an important protection for the institution's director against the changes resulting e.g. from the terms in office.

Looking for savings in the cultural sector, in the current crisis of public finances, the local governments attempted to liquidate or merge cultural institutions. Merging libraries and museum with other cultural institutions, even the artistic ones, was possible because of the amendment of the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity²⁹. Actions were also taken to reform budget units operating in the cultural sphere under the Act on the Education System (youth cultural centers and school libraries, in this case by attempts to join school libraries with the public ones)³⁰.

Another form which was to lead to economic success in the cultural sphere and relieve public authorities became the introduction of a cultural institution run and financed by two local governments or the ministry and a local government, and with time also the ministry of culture, a local government, and a private operator (usually a non-governmental organization) and also entrusting cultural institution to legal entities³¹ (companies or non-governmental organizations) for the period of minimum three years³².

With a view to speeding up the process of the replacement of management staff in public cultural institutions in order to increase their efficiency, both in substantial and economic terms, through faster innovation implementation and better adaptation of cultural institutions to the needs of the changing world (new media, new means of communication, new tools of marketing and promotion, different viewers' preferences, new management methods) the requirement of employing the managers of public cultural institutions for a fixed period was introduced into the Act of on organizing

²⁸ This decision is not connected to the change of the duration of a financial year.

²⁹ Act of 31st August 2011 on amending the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity and certain other acts.

³⁰ For the differences between a cultural institution and a budget unit (a youth cultural Centre, a school library) see: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Instytucje kultury w Polsce – specyfika ich organizacji i finansowania*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2012, no. 13, vol. 4, pp. 305–328.

³¹ See: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Zarządzanie publiczną instytucją kultury w Polsce...*, pp. 19–23.

³² Article 21 of the Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity constitutes a legal basis for co-managing a cultural institution by more than one entity. At present, according to the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage for the day 7th January 2014, it co-manages 33 cultural institutions (mainly with local governments), including 10 cultural institutions entered into the register of The Ministry, and 23 institutions entered into the register of local governments.

and conducting cultural activity, as I have already mentioned³³. So far, many managers, often regardless of their effectiveness and efficiency, held their positions for life.

Public-private partnership initiatives, understood mainly, pursuant to the Act of 19 December on public-private partnership³⁴, as a long-term paid cooperation between an entrepreneur and an entity belonging to the public finances sector (and not public-civil partnership) were to be the support for the culture development. Each party within the framework of this cooperation assumes this kind of risk which it can deal with the best, the private partner – at the stage of the investment implementation (its financing and credits acquisition), the public partner – at the stage of the operation of the new infrastructure. Unfortunately, despite the popularization of the concept by Public-Private Partnership Institute³⁵, there are still few good practices in this respect in the culture area in Poland.

Together with Poland's accession into the European Union and the beginning of local governments' and institutions' efforts to obtain EU support, people more often started to think about strategic management. It was much easier to obtain funds when the project was secured by institution development strategy, compatible with the strategy of the municipality, region, and country. An integral part of the strategic management process is monitoring and evaluation. Local communities are increasingly interested in these issues. However, local governments hardly ever plan budget allocation for the evaluation of the implemented activities by a third party³⁶.

During the last five years, the local communities in Poland, becoming more aware of their rights, grew in strength significantly. The Act on Public Benefit Activity and Volunteerism, which started to be implemented in 2004, definitely made a contribution to this³⁷. As a result, the boards for public benefit activity of different levels³⁸, as well as social or civil dialogue committees³⁹ were established. The techniques of social participation became more popular. Non-governmental organizations

³³ Article 15 of the Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity

³⁴ Act of 19th December 2008 on public-private partnership, (Dziennik Ustaw of 2009 No. 19, item 100, of 2010 No. 106, item 675 with amendments.

³⁵ The foundation undertakes a number of actions, including trainings in PPP developing; it supports the cooperation of the entities interested in the partnership development; it brings them together in two chambers (the Chamber of Private Partners and the Chamber of Public Partners) <http://ipppl.pl/> [access: 31.04.2014].

³⁶ Professor Marek Krajewski, in his speech on 26th March, during the 'Not-Congress of Culture Animators', presented an analysis of the applications for support of the actions in culture education, submitted to the Ministry of Culture's program. He pointed out that in case of many project the funds for evaluation had not been planned and in many cases, while undertaking evaluation, its usefulness for organizers was not noticed, but it was stressed that it was a funder's requirement.

³⁷ Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism.

³⁸ Article 35–41 of the Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism.

³⁹ Article 30 of the Act of 8th March 1990 on commune local government, article 5 of the Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism, and records in individual programs of co-operation between local governments, NGOs and the entities which are mentioned in the Article 3 of the Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism constitute the legal basis for the Civil/ Social Dialogue Committee.

bring together citizens who, with increasing awareness, take part in the decision making processes, co-create projects, programs, and strategies; who take part in public consultations, carried out to a varying degree and on different levels, according to the ladder of social participation⁴⁰.

Preparing and signing the 'Pact for Culture' on 14th May 2011 by the social and governmental party was an exceptional event on the world scale, which confirmed society's willingness to participate in the developing of cultural policy⁴¹. The social party was represented by the 'Citizens of Culture'⁴², an informal social group. The demands formulated on-line with the involvement of the interested citizens (culture managers, animators, artists, creators, social workers, cultural institutions workers) included, among others, the matter of the level of government funding for culture (1% from state's budget for culture in the 2015 perspective), participatory budgets (civil), equal access to public funds, effective cultural/ artistic education⁴³. Some supporters of this type of democracy speculate that "in 10 or 20 years city residents will remember with surprise the times when the city's president and councilors decided about budget expenditure on their own, without asking anyone else"⁴⁴. Is that really going to happen?

Politicians with increasing awareness speak today about the significant influence of culture on the economic development of cities and regions. Even though there is no reliable research in this field (the methodology is not always convincing), we can notice easily that the cultural policy of cities and regions during the last decade was clearly aimed at festivals. Even though currently festivals are being criticized in the literature on this subject⁴⁵, in practice this kind of spectacular actions are and probably will be for years placed by decision makers above the much less spectacular, not so wide-ranging education and animation activities, although we can also observe a tendency to deepen festival formula of existing brands by enriching the festival program with educational activities, which prepare for fuller and deeper participation in the event.

The changes, which I have enumerated, did not appear ad hoc, they are an effect of long-lasting processes, many times supported by concrete laws and/or sector pro-

⁴⁰ A ladder of social participation was described in 1996 by Sh.R. Arnstein in his article: *A ladder of Participation*, see: <http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁴¹ The pact for culture was concluded between the Council of Ministers represented by the Prime Minister and the social party was represented by the movement the 'Citizens of Culture' on 14th May 2011, see: "Animator Kultury" 2011, no. 6, pp. 34–35, available also on-line: <http://obywatelektury.pl/tresc-paktu/> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁴² A social movement, see: <http://obywatelektury.pl/> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁴³ *Pact for Culture*, 2011.

⁴⁴ M. Gerwin, *Budżet obywatelski: od nowych chodników do lokalnej społeczności*, "Miasto" 2013, no. 1 (2), p. 30.

⁴⁵ See: "Czas Kultury" 2013, no. 4 devoted to festivals; D. Klaić, *Festivals in focus*, Budapeszt 2014; D. Klaić, *Kultura a współczesne miasto*, "Respublica Nowa" 31.08.2011 (an authorized record of a lecture given in Maribor in October 2009) <http://publica.pl/teksty/kultura-a-wspolczesne-miasto> [access: 28.10.2012].

grams created and implemented by public authorities, the Ministry of Culture, the managers of culture on local-government levels, and are increasingly co-created by local communities. Because of the limited volume of this text I will focus only on a few issues, selected from the mentioned above.

The notion of “cultural policy”

The notion of ‘cultural policy’ can be understood in many different ways, depending on how we perceive the function of public authorities, the adopted criteria⁴⁶, and how we define the notion of ‘culture’. If we follow J.S. Wojciechowski, who claims that “Culture is not a treasure of solid values, standards and exemplars but a state of their questioning”⁴⁷, then we can state that culture is “a process of reaching the values”, and cultural policy is a sum of targeted actions, a system of tools situated between “non-interference of state” or local government “into culture (in the ideological sense) and the claims to shape it; between a potential obligation of public authorities to support culture and the autonomy of art”⁴⁸.

Depending on the adopted criteria we can distinguish many various definitions and models of cultural policy, widely discussed in the literature on this subject⁴⁹. While analyzing the newest sources it is worth to recall the findings of the “City DNA” report, conducted and published by “Respublica Nowa”⁵⁰. In the report several ways of understanding cultural policy were identified. Most often the respondents⁵¹ understood cultural policy as:

- a method of managing culture sector tasks in order to meet citizens’ needs;
- a specific vision of managing culture sector, which gives the undertaken actions a common direction and goal;
- a tool of social change, citizens integration, social differences elimination, creating common identity;
- a tool of effective management, aimed at rationalization, effectiveness and clarity (“the necessity of rationalizing, ordering, planning and dividing tasks, the need of financial clarity and infrastructure development and the necessity of the cooperation of different environments, people and institutions”)⁵².

⁴⁶ More on the concept of ‘cultural policy’ see: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna państwa po 1989* [in:] *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Kraków 2009, pp. 33–66; see also: E. Orzechowski, *Dlaczego w Polsce nie jest możliwa sensowna polityka...*, pp. 7–15.

⁴⁷ J.S. Wojciechowski, *Kultura i polityki*, Kraków 2004, p. 22.

⁴⁸ P. Bendixen, *Wprowadzenie do ekonomiki kultury i sztuki*, Kraków 2001, p. 83.

⁴⁹ See: M. Dragičević-Šešić, B. Stojković, *Kultura: zarządzanie, animacja, marketing*, Warszawa 2010; pp. 38–47; Z. Jaurová, *Kultura bez polityki, polityka bez kultury...* [in:] J. Purchla, M. Vášáryová (eds.), *Modele mecenatu państwa wobec integracji europejskiej*, Kraków 2008, pp. 31–41.

⁵⁰ A. Celiński, *Miejskie polityki kulturalne*, “Respublica Nowa” 2012, no. 21.

⁵¹ The respondents were the representatives of NGOs and local governments (including officials).

⁵² A. Celiński, *Miejskie polityki kulturalne...*, pp. 93–94.

The necessity of cooperation seems to be fundamental for today's cultural policy. If we asked a question – who decides about its shape in today's Poland – I would answer that the state, local governments, cultural institutions, non-governmental organizations, economic operators functioning in the culture sector, business world (as the adherents of the CSR/ CCR⁵³ idea, or sponsors), media, and finally the citizens themselves, among others by their participation in the events.

System of culture financing in Poland

Before the year 1990, in the PRL times, the main source of culture financing was the state's budget. Not only public cultural institutions, but also the non-governmental organizations functioning in the culture sphere received earmarked funds provided that they achieved the objectives of the state's cultural policy. Generally, there were enough resources for culture⁵⁴, among others because of the tool, which was in the years 1982–1991 a special 'para-budget' – The Fund for Culture Development⁵⁵, which had a legal personality and was accumulating culture resources on a separate account⁵⁶. In accordance with the Article 15 of the Act establishing the fund, the resources which had not been used in the given budget year were passed for the following year⁵⁷. In result, in years 1982–1990⁵⁸, the resources for culture were increasing every year. At the moment of the liquidation of the Fund for Culture Development, beginning from the year 1991, there was a return to direct culture financing at the government and local government level. The creators of the document *Culture in the transitional period*, from year 1990, in the chapter about the transformation of culture financing system "taking into consideration the specific character of creative process and artistic activities"⁵⁹ announced the creation of the Foundation for culture, based on the resources remained after the liquidation of the Fund for Culture Development. It was stressed that "in culture, as opposed to other areas of life, the unpredictability of occurrences is a positive thing"⁶⁰ and hence "the culture sphere should

⁵³ See: footnote 16.

⁵⁴ Between the year 1982 and 1989 expenditures for culture from the state's budget increased from 1,25% to 1,81% (for comparison, in the year 1995 – 1,05%; 1998 – 1,13%; 1999 – 0,83%; 2007 – 0,87%; 2009 – 0,53%; 2012 – 0,87%); see: D. Ilczuk, *Poland: Chapter 1. Historical Perspective: Cultural Policies and Instruments* [in:] *Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. Compendium*, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/poland.php?aid=1> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁵⁵ Established by the Act of 4th May 1982 on The National Culture Council and The Fund for Culture Development, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 1982 No. 14, item 111.

⁵⁶ See more: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, pp. 14–15.

⁵⁷ Article 15 of the Act of 4th May 1982 r.

⁵⁸ The fund liquidated by Act of 14th December 1990 on the cancellation and liquidation of some funds, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 1990 No. 89, item 517.

⁵⁹ A. Siciński, *Kultura w okresie przejściowym* [in:] A. Siciński (ed.), *Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki w dokumentach 1918–1998*, Warszawa 1998, p. 327.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

not be subjected to the rigor of planning, financing and budget clearing⁶¹. It was believed that this way “the organizational and financial systems of cultural sphere entities would not change”⁶². Unfortunately, even though the Culture Foundation, created to manage funds, had in its management, among others, Krzysztof Zanussi or Jacek Woźniakowski, it lost the assigned funds⁶³.

Izabela Cywińska, the first Minister of Culture in the times of transformation, accepting the position in the government of Tadeusz Mazowiecki, on the threshold of the transformation of Polish socialist (planned) economy into market economy⁶⁴, facing lack of funds, was presented with a very difficult challenge of developing the habit of paying for services in the art and culture sphere, i.e. “building a conventional conviction that who orders a melody – pays the violinist...” so culture can correspond to “healthy market rules”⁶⁵. However, privatization affected the culture sector to a very small extent, only publishing sector and music industry were successfully privatized⁶⁶. The museums reform, proposed by professor Andrzej Rottermund⁶⁷, aimed at finding the ownership of the works of art in museums (valuation, repurchase or return of the less valuable for museums works to their owners, especially those who to a greater extent were family heirlooms) was not successful. Nobody in our country wanted to hear about entrusting museum resources to the management of a private organization (a foundation, society or company). Only on the basis of the revised Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity, pioneering solutions in this sphere appeared in Poland (however, they do not concern museums)⁶⁸.

Culture management and culture economics as sciences were not popular in Poland then.⁶⁹ In Europe and around the world in the 60s of the 20th century (UNESCO Conference in 1966 and 1970⁷⁰) the attention was turned to the need of educating the

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ B. Gierat-Bieroń, *Kultura kontraktowa* [in:] *Ministrowie kultury doby transformacji, 1989–2005 (wywiady)*, Kraków 2009, p. 31.

⁶⁴ Izabella Cywińska (non-partisan) held the position of the Minister of Culture for 15 months, from 12 IX 1989 to 14 XII 1990.

⁶⁵ B. Gierat-Bieroń, *Kultura kontraktowa...*, p. 25.

⁶⁶ A. Rottermund, *Przedmowa* [in:] J. Purchla, *Dziedzictwo a transformacja...*, p. 12.

⁶⁷ The Deputy Minister of Culture during the term of the Minister M. Rostworowski.

⁶⁸ See: Article 15a of the Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity; J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Zarządzanie publiczną instytucją kultury w Polsce...*, pp. 19–39.

⁶⁹ Culture management, interdisciplinary branch of science about mutual influence of culture and economy, as a scientific discipline originated at the beginning of the 70s. See: M. Sternal, *Dobrze wyształcony menedżer kultury? Wyzwania edukacyjne w zarządzaniu kulturą* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Kultura–Gospodarka–Media. Ogólnopolski Kongres*, Kraków 2002, p. 66.

⁷⁰ During the First World UNESCO Conference devoted exclusively to culture (Venice, 1970) the rules and priorities of an international cultural cooperation were broadly discussed. They had been elaborated during the UNESCO Conference in 1966, where, among others, the lack of qualified culture workers on the world scale was pointed out. It was agreed that it is a shared responsibility of all member states to educate these workers with the help of UNESCO. In the finale report the necessity of a cooperation between the member states’ administration and research centers was highlighted, among others, in order to study culture and its development. Research activities on cultural

personnel for culture. New faculty of studies – culture management – appeared at the world universities already in the second half of the 60s of the 20th century, not coincidentally, in my opinion, in the departments related to Life Performing Art⁷¹. In Poland it happened only in the first half of the 90s, with a great contribution of professor Emil Orzechowski, the originator and founder of Krakow's School of Culture Management, initially created within the structures of the Institute of Public Affairs of the Jagiellonian University⁷².

The time when the management studies were created at the world universities, was also the time when W.J. Baumol and W Bowen announced the results of their research into culture economics, including, among others, the concept of so called 'cost disease' concerning artistic institutions⁷³. In Poland we started discussing wid-

policy during regional continental meetings were planned. 85 Member States, 2 non-member states, 12 international organizations and 2 foundations took part in the conference. It was the first this kind of meeting with 49 Ministers of Culture or culture department managers. J. Grad, U. Kaczmarek, *Organizacja i upowszechnianie kultury w Polsce. Zmiany modelu*, Poznań 2005, pp. 201–205.

⁷¹ At the Department of Theatre Management of Yale University, USA (in 1966), at the Department of Art Administering of the City University in London, GB (in 1967), at Theatre Academy in Sankt Petersburg (1968), at York University in Canada (1969), Compare: M. Sternal, *Dobrze wykształcony menedżer kultury? Wyzwania edukacyjne w zarządzaniu kulturą...*

⁷² The Warsaw School of Economics, at the Global Economy College, as the first in Poland, launched post-graduate studies for Culture Managers. Then similar faculties were started in Poznań (1992) and Krakow – School of Culture Management JU. It was established by the regulation no. 33 of the Jagiellonian University Rector of 8 June 1994. Its foundation and development was a shared initiative of the Jagiellonian University and the Municipality of Krakow. Professor Emil Orzechowski and Danuta Głondys, then the director of the Culture Department of the Municipality of Krakow, were patrons of this idea. Today, after many transformations, the Culture Institute of the Jagiellonian University exists in place of the school. Compare: M. Sternal, *Dobrze wykształcony menedżer kultury? Wyzwania edukacyjne w zarządzaniu kulturą...*

⁷³ The phenomenon, called: 'Baumol's Cost Disease' was described by William Baumol and William Bowea in the book: *Performing Arts: the Economic Dilemma*, Twentieth Century Fund, 1966. Professor Urszula Grzełowska writes: "W. Baumol noticed that artistic activity is not subjected to technical progress to the same extent as other sectors of the economy. In normal sectors the work efficiency increases as a result of the technical progress; as the workers' salaries also increase, consequently, the average salary of an employed person rises. Each 'normal' sector can pay these higher salaries as, at the same time, the labour intensity in production decreases as a result of technical progress. In the art sector the work efficiency stays roughly the same, but the alternative incomes (expenses) of artists grow, as well as the salary expectations of the people employed in organizations offering cultural assets. Ultimately, the production costs of cultural goods, more precisely – of art objects, grow. However, the demand for art objects does not increase together with the growth of an average income. More precisely, even if the demand grows, it is directed towards some cultural goods, which are then called 'commercial art'. In other cases a permanent gap remains between the price the consumers are willing to pay for art goods (a demand price) and the price which will cover all the production expenses (a supply price). Therefore, a patronage is necessary, which, in cases where a society or a community do not want the activities in the field of art to be completely dependent on market forces, will cover this gap." U. Grzełowska, *Ekonomiczny zarys sfery kultury*, presented on a scientific seminar of the Institute of Economic Science at the Polish Academy of Sciences on 24th May 2007, on-line: http://www.inepan.waw.pl/wydarzenia/seminaria_naukowe.html?id_seminarium=48 [access: 31.03.2014].

er the 'cost disease' only in the last decade (although earlier, as one of the reasons of more costly supply of works of art this argument was mentioned by professor Urszula Grzelońska in her lectures⁷⁴). Together with the flood of articles, book publications and textbooks about culture economics⁷⁵, this notion and topic became not only useful but also fashionable. However, it is worth noticing that the first publication devoted to culture economics on the Polish market was a translation of a book by Peter Bendixen *Introduction to the economics of culture and art*⁷⁶, published in 2001. It was possible, among others, thanks to the professor Emil Orzechowski and the already mentioned School of Culture Management, founded by the professor. The book showed extensively the absurdity of discussing culture problems separately from the reality of market economy. However, as the edition of the publication was limited only a decade later we started in Poland to discuss the economics of culture and art, also in the context of public cultural institutions. Bendixen's publication is still a significant, unique in terms of content and conclusions study on the economics of different areas of art – theatre, music, painting and literature. Today books on culture economics are published under the auspices of the National Centre for Culture⁷⁷, hence the promotion is more effective and their scope wider.

Decentralization of management in the sphere of culture

Till 1989 the authority in Poland was strictly centralized and cultural policy utterly subordinated to the directives formulated by the Polish United Worker's Party. It was defined as "the whole of purposeful and organized activity of the country, and political and social organizations which inspires the artistic creativity development and protects the creative environments development, influences the manner and extent of society's participation in the culture by the popularization of cultural goods and by developing active forms of participation in cultural life"⁷⁸. The basic aims of

⁷⁴ U. Grzelońska, *Ekonomiczny zarys...*

⁷⁵ Among the most valuable, worth mentioning are: the translation of R. Towse, *Ekonomika kultury. Kompendium*, Warszawa 2011; H. Trzeciak, *Ekonomika teatru*, Warszawa 2011; *Ekonomia muzeum*, D. Folga-Januszewska, B. Gutowski (eds.), Kraków 2011. Also published: D. Throsby, *Ekonomia i kultura*, Warszawa 2010; D. Ilczuk, *Ekonomika kultury*, Warszawa 2012; *Ekonomia kultury. Przewodnik krytyki politycznej*, Warszawa 2010, or *Ekonomika kultury. Od teorii do praktyki*, B. Jung (ed.), Warszawa 2011.

⁷⁶ P. Bendixen, *Wprowadzenie do ekonomiki kultury i sztuki*, Kraków 2001.

⁷⁷ National cultural institution, whose history dates back to 1950 (at first it functioned as the Community Centre Guidance Service and Art Showroom, then as the Instructional-Methodical Centre of Cultural and Education Work). In 2002, the Culture Animation Centre, the Institute for National Heritage and the National Centre for Documentation of Regional Cultural Societies merged into the National Centre for Culture. In 2005 the NCC was merged, for short time, with the Centre for International Cultural Cooperation to create the Adam Mickiewicz Institute. It operated under the NCC name between 2002 and 2005 and operates at present (since 2006).

⁷⁸ *Encyklopedia PWN*, Warszawa 1984, p. 595.

cultural policy were: “lasting and consequent opening of the access to culture for different social environments, granting them common and democratic participation in cultural life, overcoming differences in preparing them to benefit fully from cultural goods and to enrich culture with their own activity (...)”⁷⁹. Today, even though the social and political situation changed the access to culture is still one of the most important challenges of the cultural policy of the country (Article 6 of the Polish Constitution of 2 April 1997⁸⁰) and local governments (local cultural policies, development strategies, sector programs), and is still identified by citizens as a ‘need’ (Pact for Culture 2011, The Citizens of Culture⁸¹).

Together with the Act of 8 March on commune local government⁸² entering into force, in accordance with the assumptions of the decentralization of the public tasks management process (also in the sphere of culture), which was promoted and gradually implemented after 1989, a part of public tasks was taken over by reactivated self-governing communes⁸³. Since 1999 also the newly created self-governing regions-voivodeships⁸⁴, and to a smaller extent – districts, have been included into this process⁸⁵. As a result of these changes cultural policy in Poland is today implemented and financed (more or less effectively) at several levels: central, regional, district (mainly in case of the cities based on district laws) and commune. It is worth stressing that most of the local governments fulfill the tasks, they are entrusted with, very well, taking part in culture financing substantially. If we compare the expenditure on culture from the state budget and local governments after 1999 (since three levels of local government were separated) then the percentage share of the local government units’ expenditure was definitely higher (in 1999 – 18,2%; in 2004 – 20%; in 2007 – 22,8%) than the state budget’s expenditure (in 1999 – 10,2%; in 2004 – 11,9%; in 2007 – 10,5%)⁸⁶. In recent years we can observe slight increase of expend-

⁷⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁰ Article 6 of the Act 1 states: “The Republic of Poland shall provide conditions for the people’s equal access to the products of culture which are the source of the Nation’s identity, continuity and development.” Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2nd April 1997, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 1997 No. 78, item 483 with amendments.

⁸¹ Pact for Culture, “Animator Kultury” 2011, no. 6, pp. 34–35, <http://obywatelektury.pl/tresc-paktu/> [access: 30.03.2014].

⁸² Act of 8th March 1990 on commune local government.

⁸³ More about the pilot program: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Realizacja i skutki programu pilotażowego reformy administracji publicznej w Krakowie* [in:] J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, pp. 77–96.

⁸⁴ Under the Act of 24th July 1998 on a basic three tier division of administration, *Dziennik Ustaw* of 1998 No. 96, item 603; Act of 5th June 1998 on voivodeship government (*Dziennik Ustaw* of 2001 No. 142, item 1590); Act of 5th June 1998 on government administration in voivodeship (*Dziennik Ustaw* of 2001 No. 80, item 872, No. 128, item 1407 with amendments).

⁸⁵ District competencies are defined in the Act of 5th June 1998 on district government. *Dziennik Ustaw* of 1998 No. 91 item 578.

⁸⁶ Table 4. *Struktura głównych źródeł finansowania kultury* [in:] J. Głowacki, J. Hausner, and others (eds) *Finansowanie kultury i zarządzanie instytucjami kultury*, Kraków 2009, p. 43, http://www.kongreskultury.pl/title,Raport_o_finansowaniu_i_zarzadzaniu_instytucjami_kultury,pid,217.html [access: 30.03.2014].

iture on culture in the state budget⁸⁷. However, the local governments expenditure is decreasing⁸⁸. The percentage share of the state in the general public expenditure on culture was 16,6% (2010), 17,6% (2011), 19,5% (2012), and local governments' was 83,4% (2010), 82,4% (2011), 80,5% (2012)⁸⁹.

The role of the ministry of culture

In the last decade of the 20th century the unwritten mission of the Ministry of Culture was only to act ad hoc and settle current conflicts. At the times of the Minister W. Dąbrowski⁹⁰ the office “is transforming slowly from an office for complaints and applications into the centre of building the state’s strategy in the sphere of culture”⁹¹. Resigning gradually from the role of a direct organizer of cultural institutions, which after the year 1999 were passed to local governments⁹², after the period of serious doubts whether the existence of such office makes sense⁹³, after the spectacular actions of consecutive Ministers, whose aim was only to change the name of the office (taking into consideration the heritage or not), the office actually assumed the responsibilities of a strategist and main coordinator of the activities in the field of culture management in Poland⁹⁴.

⁸⁷ It is probably related to the Minister of Culture and National Heritage’s declaration about the implementation of the postulates of the Pact for Culture, signed by the Prime Minister, D. Tusk and social party (The Citizens of Culture).

⁸⁸ ‘I’m not satisfied with this state of progress; it would be satisfying if local governments did not cut the expenditure on culture’ – He admitted. As he specified, in 2013 local governments for the first time in 20 years planned their gross expenditures on culture smaller than in the previous years.” See: “The Sejm Commission for Culture’s positive opinion on the culture budget for 2014”, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage information of 22.10.2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/sejmowa-komisja-kultury-pozytywnie-o-budzenie-resortu-kultury-na-2014-r-4224.php> [access: 2.04.2014].

⁸⁹ *Kultura w 2012 r.* Raport GUS, Warszawa 2013; *Kultura w 2010 r.*, Raport GUS, Warszawa 2011.

⁹⁰ Waldemar Dąbrowski, the Minister of Culture between 5th July 2002 and 31st October 2005.

⁹¹ R. Pawłowski, *Pan od kultury*, “Gazeta Wyborcza”, no. 210 of 5th September 2005.

⁹² See more: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, pp. 77–90 and J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Realizacja i skutki programu pilotażowego w Krakowie*, “Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2006, vol. 7, pp. 39–53.

⁹³ See: J.S. Wojciechowski, *Kultura i polityki*, Kraków 2004, p. 116.

⁹⁴ In the State’s Cultural Policy, adopted by the Council of Ministers in 1993, we read: “As the new culture system is taking shape, the role of the Ministry of Culture and Art shall focus more on standard setting (legislation, setting the standards of public services in the sphere of culture), while direct decisions and the organization of cultural activity shall lie in the hands of local government administration and specialized public institutions.” The Principles of the Cultural Policy, the Ministry of Culture and Art, Warszawa, 10 August 1993, p.19. This document was prepared in July 1993 by The Council for Culture and the president (L. Wałęsa), and on 10 VIII 1993 it was adopted by the Council of Ministers and announced by the Ministry of Culture and Art. See more: J. Szulborska-Lukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna państwa po 1989 roku* [in:] *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, pp. 33–65.

In W. Dąbrowski's opinion, the implemented decentralization required revisions – therefore he took measures to support continually the selected local and regional cultural institutions from the state's budget, creating this way new categories of institutions – co-run or co-financed. However, on the other hand W. Dąbrowski introduced the decentralization of the Ministry of Culture power, developing a system of industry institutes⁹⁵, which has taken over a substantial part of the tasks so far carried out by ministerial departments⁹⁶, thus relieving the government administration.

*The National Strategy for Culture Development*⁹⁷, created at that time on the initiative of W. Dąbrowski, had the key importance for modern cultural policy in our country. It was the first strategic document preceded by the diagnosis of culture sector and including very specific designed operational programs, supported by concrete financial recourses for their implementation. It is worth noticing that at that time the resources for culture significantly increased in the state's budget. For the first time the financial resources from the additional payment to the stakes in lotteries, being the country's monopoly, were transferred to the account of the Ministry of Culture. From these funds the cultural tasks started to be financed under the patronage of the state⁹⁸. In connection with the Polish accession to the European Union on 1st May 2004 wider possibilities of obtaining grants from the European funds opened up, what was excellently used by the Ministry of Culture.

Today, the Ministry of Culture defines the main directions of culture development, more or less effectively influencing the implementation of the defined targets through: establishing the priorities in operational programs, being a very important tool of culture financing; supporting, in various ways and dimensions, the habits and the need of participation in culture and art; trying not to interfere directly with the ideological layers of art; and taking into consideration the cultural policy of the European Union.

⁹⁵ At present there are 11 national cultural institutes under the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in Poland (Adam Mickiewicz Institute, Book Institute, F. Chopin National Institute, Polish Film Institute, Filmotechnika, Theatre Institute, National Audiovisual Institute, National Centre for Culture, National Heritage Institute, National Institute of Museology and Collections Protection, Institute of Music and Dance). Leaving aside the issue of reorganization, only one of them, the Institute of Music and Dance, was established under the Minister B. Zdrojewski, as the result of debates and arrangement adopted during The Congress of Polish Culture In Krakow in 2009.

⁹⁶ More: J. Szulborska-Łukaszewicz, *Polityka kulturalna państwa po 1989 roku...*, pp. 33–65.

⁹⁷ *The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update of The National Strategy for Culture*, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/polityka-wewnetrzna-i-zagraniczna/programy.php?searchresult=1&sstring=strategia#wb_10 [access: 30.03.2014].

⁹⁸ These tasks were commissioned with the application of the procedures defined by The Regulation of The Minister of Culture of 18th July 2003 on the conditions of promoting and supporting the cultural tasks financed or supported from the resources coming from the additional payments to the stakes in lotteries, being the country's monopoly, the procedure of applications submission and transferring resources for the tasks implementation and their clearing. *Dziennik Ustaw* of 24th July 2003, No. 130, item 1194.

Bibliography

- Arnstein Sh.R., *A Ladder of Participation*, see: <http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Baumol W.B., *Performing Arts: the Economic Dilemma*, Twentieth Century Fund, 1966.
- Bendixen P., *Wprowadzenie do ekonomiki kultury i sztuki*, Kraków 2001.
- Bębenkowska J., Hieropolitańska A., *Program Kultura – przewodnik* [in:] *Kulturalna Unia Europejska Program Kultura pod lupą*, J. Bębenkowska, A. Hieropolitańska (eds), Warszawa 2011.
- Celiński A., *Miejskie polityki kulturalne*, “Respublika Nowa” 2012, no. 21.
- Chymkowski R., Koryś I., Dawidowicz-Chymkowska O., *Spoleczny zasięg książki w Polsce w 2012 r.*, National Library report, <http://bn.org.pl/download/document/1362741578.pdf> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Ćwikła M., *Fabryka inicjatyw, kopalnia pomysłów – wykorzystanie obiektów postindustrialnych w działalności kulturalnej jako impuls do twórczego zarządzania*, “Zarządzanie Kulturą” 2010, vol. 3 (3), pp. 261–265.
- Datko A., Necel R., *Nowoczesna instytucja kultury. Raport z badań*, Poznań 2011.
- Dragičević-Šešić M., Stojković B., *Kultura: zarządzanie, animacja, marketing*, Warszawa 2010.
- Dragojević S., *Definicje polityki kulturalnej*, “Zarządzanie Kulturą” 2008, no. 1(1), p. 254.
- Dudkiewicz M., Rymsha M., *Jubileuszowo-refleksyjnie o sektorze pozarządowym* [in:] *NGOs – Projekt nadal w budowie?*, “Kwartalnik Trzeci Sektor” 2013, no. 30.
- Ekonomia kultury. Przewodnik krytyki politycznej*, Warszawa 2010.
- Encyklopedia PWN*, Warszawa 1984.
- Folga-Januszewska D., *Muzea w Polsce 1989–2008. Stan zachodzące zmiany i kierunki rozwoju muzeów w Europie oraz rekomendacje dla muzeów polskich*. (Report on museums), Warszawa 2008.
- Folga-Januszewska D., Gutowski B. (eds.), *Ekonomia muzeum*, Kraków 2011.
- Gerwin M., *Budżet obywatelski: od nowych chodników do lokalnej społeczności*, “Miasto” 2013, no. 1(2), p. 30.
- Gierat-Bieroń B., *Europejskie miasto kultury. Europejska stolica kultury 1985–2008*, Kraków 2009.
- Gierat-Bieroń B., *Ministrowie kultury doby transformacji, 1989–2005 (wywiady)*, Kraków 2009.
- Glon dys D., *Europejska stolica kultury. Miejsce kultury w polityce Unii Europejskiej*, Kraków 2010.
- Glon dys D., *Kraków europejskie miasto kultury. Summa Factorum*, Kraków 2010.
- Głowacki J., Hausner J. i in. (eds.), *Finansowanie kultury i zarządzanie instytucjami kultury*, Kraków 2009, p. 43, http://www.kongreskultury.pl/title,Raport_o_finansowaniu_i_zarzadzaniu_instytucjami_kultury,pid,217.html [access: 30.03.2014].
- Grad J., Kaczmarek U., *Organizacja i upowszechnianie kultury w Polsce. Zmiany modelu*, Poznań 2005, pp. 201–205.
- Grzelońska U., *Ekonomiczny zarys sfery kultury*, presented on a scientific seminar of the Institute of Economic Science (Polish Academy of Sciences) on 24th May 2007, on-line: http://www.inepan.waw.pl/wydarzenia/seminaria_naukowe.html?id_seminarium=48 [access: 31.03.2014].
- Ilczuk D., *Ekonomika kultury*, Warszawa, 2012.
- Ilczuk D., Kulikowska M., *Festiwal w Europie. Polityka władz publicznych*, “Zarządzanie Kulturą” 2009, no. 2(2), p. 269.
- Ilczuk D., Poland: Chapter 1. *Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments* [in:] *Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe. Compendium*, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/poland.php?aid=1> [access: 31.03.2014].
- Jaurová Z., *Kultura bez polityki, polityka bez kultury....* [in:] J. Purchla, M. Vášáryová (eds.), *Modelle mecenatu państwa wobec integracji europejskiej*, Kraków 2008, pp. 31–41.

- Jagodzińska K., *Charakterystyka działalności kulturalnej w Polsce po transformacji ustrojowej* [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, pp. 127–159.
- Jung B. (ed.), *Ekonomika kultury. Od teorii do praktyki*, Warszawa 2011.
- Klaić D., *Festivals in focus*, Budapeszt 2014.
- Klaić D., *Kultura a współczesne miasto*, “Res Publica Nowa” 31.08.2011, <http://publica.pl/teksty/kultura-a-wspolczesne-miasto> (an authorized record of a lecture given in Maribor in October 2009) [access: 28.10.2012].
- Klejbuk-Goździalska B., *Muzeum wśród diamentów*, Krakow.pl, 27th February 2013, pp. 4–6.
- Kodeks Sponsoringu Kultury*, “Animator Kultury” 2011, no. 5, pp. 29–31.
- Kostera M., Śliwa M., *Zarządzanie w XXI wieku*, Warszawa 2010.
- Kozik R., *Sukcesy i ekscesy 25-lecia*, “Gazeta Wyborcza”, 10th January 2014 r., Magazyn Krakowski, p. 10.
- Król K., *Finansowanie społecznościowe jako źródło finansowania przedsięwzięć w Polsce*, Poznań 2013.
- Kuligowski W., *Ludzie, sztuka, pieniądze. Festiwalizacja w Polsce*, “Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, pp. 4–15.
- Majewska U., *‘Podzielmy się kulturą’ Budżet partycypacyjny domu kultury Śródmieście*, “Miasta” (quarterly) 2013, no. 1(2), p. 35.
- Misiąg W., Ilczuk D., *Finansowanie kultury i organizacja działalności kulturalnej w gospodarce rynkowej*, Zeszyt IBnGR 2002, no. 32.
- Nawrocka M., *Fashion week Poland. Beneficjent i ofiara*, “Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, pp. 28–38.
- Orzechowski E., *Dlaczego w Polsce nie jest możliwa sensowna polityka kulturalna?*, “Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2004, vol. 5, pp. 7–15.
- Pęczak M., *Święto zdesakralizowane*, “Czas Kultury” 2013, no. 4, pp. 24–27.
- Przybyła M., Sobczak K., *Crowdsourcing – zbiorowa mądrość e-społeczeństwa* [in:] T. Falencikowski, J. Dworak (eds), *Funkcjonowanie współczesnych przedsiębiorstw*, Prace naukowe WSB w Gdańsku, 2010, vol. 8, pp. 75–84.
- Purchla J., Rottermund A., *Projekt reformy ustroju publicznych instytucji kultury w Polsce*, “Rocznik Międzynarodowego Centrum Kultury” 1999, R. 8, pp. 58–67.
- Rottermund A., *Finansowanie muzealnictwa w Polsce po 1989 roku – historia poszukiwania rozwiązań* [in:] D. Folga-Januszewska, B. Gutowski (eds.), *Ekonomia muzeum*, Kraków 2011, pp. 19–26.
- Rottermund A., *Przedmowa* [in:] J. Purchla, *Dziedzictwo a transformacja*, Kraków 2005, p. 12.
- Rymsza A., *Eksperci o kondycji sektora pozarządowego w Polsce w latach 2004–2011* [in:] *NGOs – Projekt nadal w budowie?*, “Kwartalnik Trzeci Sektor” 2013, no. 30, p. 9.
- Kultura w okresie przejściowym* [in:] A. Siciński (ed.), *Ministerstwo Kultury i Sztuki w dokumentach 1918–1998*, Warszawa 1998, p. 327.
- Sonik B., Gierat-Bieroń B., *Europejska stolica kultury 10 lat później*, Kraków 2011.
- Sternal M., *Dobrze wykształcony menedżer kultury? Wyzwania edukacyjne w zarządzaniu kulturą* [in:] E. Orzechowski (ed.), *Kultura–Gospodarka–Media. Ogólnopolski Kongres*, Kraków 2002, p. 66.
- Suchan J., *Instytucje publiczne, czyli jakie?* [in:] B. Sobieszek (ed.), *Regionalny Kongres Kultury 2011. Raport*, Łódź, pp. 66–71.
- Szulborska-Łukaszewicz J., *Festiwale w kontekście odpowiedzialności biznesu za kulturę* [in:] *Administracja publiczna. Studia krajowe i międzynarodowe* 2012, no. 2(20), WSAP Białystok, pp. 21–40.
- Szulborska-Łukaszewicz J., *Instytucje kultury w Polsce – specyfika ich organizacji i finansowania*, “Zarządzanie w Kulturze” 2012, no. 13, vol. 4, pp. 305–328.

- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Czy Kraków ma szansę stać się prężnym europejskim ośrodkiem teatralnym? Rozważania na temat potencjału Krakowa w kontekście gminnego projektu Strategii Rozwoju Kultury w Krakowie*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2010, vol. 11, pp. 55–80.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Kultura to proces dochodzenia do wartości*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2009, vol. 10, pp. 345–354.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Polityka kulturalna w Krakowie*, Kraków 2009.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Realizacja i skutki programu pilotażowego w Krakowie*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2006, vol. 7, pp. 39–53.
- Szulborska-Lukaszewicz J., *Zarządzanie publiczną instytucją kultury w Polsce – misja a ekonomika*, "Zarządzanie w Kulturze" 2013, no. 14, vol. 1, pp. 19–39.
- Throsby D., *Ekonomia i kultura*, Warszawa 2010.
- Towse R., *Ekonomia kultury. Kompendium*, Warszawa 2011.
- Trzeciak H., *Ekonomia teatru*, Warszawa 2011.
- Wąsowska A., *Polityka kulturalna Polski 1989–2012*, [in:] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla (eds), *Kultura i rozwój*, Warszawa 2013, pp. 107–126.
- Wojciechowski J.S., *Kultura i polityki*, Kraków 2004, p. 22.
- Wolak U., *Księgarnia Hetmańska przestała być potrzebna*, "Gazeta Krakowska", 9th January 2014.

Reports and documents:

- The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2013 and The Update of The National Strategy for Culture*, the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, http://bip.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/polityka-wewnetrzna-i-zagraniczna/programy.php?searchresult=1&string=strategia#wb_10 [access: 30.03.2014].
- The Update of The National Strategy for Culture Development for 2004–2020*, Warszawa 2005; www.mk.gov.pl.
- Pact for Culture*, "Animator Kultury" 2011, no. 6, pp. 34–35, on-line: <http://obywatelekultury.pl/tresc-paktu/> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Pact for National Culture PiS*, 2001, see: PiS website: <http://www.pis.org.pl/article.php?id=3125> [access: 30.03.2014].
- The report *City DNA: Diagnosis on the inclusion of public opinion in the cities' preparation for the European Capital of Culture 2016*. <http://publica.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/dnamiastadiagnozaraport.pdf> [access: 30.03.2014].
- Union funds in culture*, Announcement of 13.12.2013, the Ministry of Culture website: Events 2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/fundusze-unijne-w-kulturze-4321.php> [access: 13.02.2014].
- The Sejm Commission for Culture's positive opinion on the culture budget for 2014*, MKiDN information of 22.10.2013, <http://www.mkidn.gov.pl/pages/posts/sejmowa-komisja-kultury-pozytywnie-o-budzecie-resortu-kultury-na-2014-r-4224.php> [access: 2.04.2014].

Legal acts:

- Act of 4th May 1982 on The National Culture Council and The Fund for Culture Development, Dziennik Ustaw of 1982, No. 14, item 111.
- Act of 14th December 1990 on the cancellation and liquidation of some funds, Dziennik Ustaw of 1990 No. 89, item 517.

- Act of 8th March 1990 on commune local government, Dziennik Ustaw of 2001 No. 142, item 1591 with amendments.
- Act of 25th October 1991 on organizing and conducting cultural activity, Dziennik Ustaw of 2012, item 406.
- Act of 21st November 1996 on museums, Dziennik Ustaw of 2012, item 987 with amendments.
- Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997, Dziennik Ustaw of 1997 No. 78, item 483 with amendments.
- Act of 5th June 1998 on district government. Dziennik Ustaw of 1998 No. 91 item 578.
- Act of 5th June 1998 on voivodeship government (Dziennik Ustaw of 2001 No. 142, item 1590);
- Act of 5th June 1998 on government administration in voivodeship (Dziennik Ustaw of 2001 No. 80, item 872, No. 128, item 1407 with amendments)
- Act of 24th July 1998 on a basic three tier division of administration, Dziennik Ustaw of 1998 No. 96, item 603.
- Act of 24th April 2003 on public benefit activity and volunteerism, Dziennik Ustaw of 2003 No. 96, item 873 with amendments.
- Act of 29th January 2004 Procurement law, Dziennik Ustaw of 2007 No. 223, item 1655 with amendments.
- Act of 19th December 2008 on public-private partnership (Dziennik Ustaw of. z 2009 No. 19, item 100, of 2010 No. 106, item 675 with amendments.
- Act of 31st August 2011 on amending the Act on organizing and conducting cultural activity and certain other acts, Dziennik Ustaw of 2011 No. 207, item 1230.
- Act of 14th March 2014 on amending the act – Procurement law and certain other acts Dziennik Ustaw of 2014 item 423.