

Studying Factors Affecting Creation and Fate of Innovations and their Organizations

I: A New Instrument

Eleanor D. Glor

**Adjunct Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration
Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies
York University
Toronto, Canada**

Studying Factors Affecting Creation and Fate of Innovations and their Organizations – I: A New Instrument¹

Eleanor D. Glor

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces a new quantitative measurement instrument assessing factors influencing creation, implementation and fate of innovations and their organizations. Limited attention has been paid to fate and no other quantitative measurement instrument on this subject has been published in the literature. Can antecedents and other factors shed light on why some governments created many innovations, while others did not; why some innovations survived, while others did not? Can these factors also help explain the fate of the organizations that created and managed the innovations? This paper introduces and a second paper evaluates an instrument that assesses these factors. Using a five-point Lickert continuous (interval) scale, the instrument was constructed to assess six types of factors: ideology; politics; external support; the economic and fiscal situation; internal support; program and organizational resources; and program and organizational effects. A copy of the instrument is provided.

Key words: Public sector innovation; innovating organizations; innovation measurement instrument; innovation factors; innovation fate, Saskatchewan government

Introduction

Previous research on public sector innovation has dealt with definitions, diffusion, case studies, award nominees and finalists, and some antecedents of innovations, but it has not yet created a full understanding of what is important to the creation/adoption, successful implementation, positive or negative effects, or the fate of innovations and their organizations. This is somewhat less true in the *private* sector (e.g. Damanpour, 1991; Edquist, 1997) than the public sector. In his meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational factors and innovation, Damanpour (1991), for example, studied the effects of 13 *organizational determinants*, consisting mainly of structural, process, resource, and cultural variables. He also considered the impact of four moderator factors—type of innovation, stage of adoption, type of organization and scope of innovation. Peter Drucker (1985) suggested very high rates of innovation efforts fail in the private sector.

Presumably some innovations fail in the public (government) sector as well but the rate of failure is not known. Why do *public sector* innovations fail? Why do they succeed? Are there specific antecedents that facilitate creation of innovation and subsequent survival or mortality? Some antecedents of public sector innovations and organizations have been identified but we do not have a full picture of these factors.

¹ Some of the material presented in this paper has been previously published in, e.g., Glor (2014a, b; 2015) and Glor and Ewart (2016).

External Factors. In the public sector, researchers have studied the dissemination (adoption) of innovative policies. Collier and Messick (1975) studied the first social security adoption among the 59 countries with formal political autonomy at the time of adoption, Brown et al. (1979) 147 agricultural cooperatives in Sierra Leone, Tolbert and Zucker (1983) civil service reform in 167 cities, and Glor (1997, 2002) identified 159 policy, program and administrative innovations of the Canadian provincial Government of Saskatchewan (GoS), 1971-82. Berry and Berry (2013: 9-10) reviewed three models of policy innovation research and identified internal and external determinants. Diffusion, an external factor, included national interaction, regional, and unified (both national and regional) models. Regional diffusion posits geographic proximity of other adopting governments is the prime determinant in adoption and assumes some jurisdictions are leaders and others laggards. National diffusion posits the federal government has the most important influence. These researchers (2013: 2) addressed both external diffusion and internal determinants, recommended the unified model, and identified the factors involved in the dissemination of innovation among 50 American states as political, economic and social factors.

Studying factors influencing the adoption of administrative innovations in Canada (including the GoS), 1995 to 2011, Bernier, Hafsi and Deschamps (2015) demonstrated that external (environmental/contextual) factors were important to the Canadian federal and provincial administrative innovations submitted for consideration to the innovation award of the Institute of Public Administration of Canada. This database included 1563 administrative innovation nominations (2015: 840). They found the following environmental factors had a significant positive correlation with innovations submitted during the new public management era: high rate of unemployment, large government size and majority government. The factors rejected were high unemployment rate as an indicator of strength of the economy, public investments in research and development (at least in the short term), government slack resources as measured by budgetary surplus, and ideology.

Internal Factors. Glor suggested that innovators face different challenges at different stages of the innovation process (1998: Table 6), as did Torugsa and Arundel (2016). Glor (2001) recommended considering such the global internal factors impacting innovation are individual motivation, organizational culture and magnitude of challenge to secure approval, implement and maintain public sector innovations. S/he (2014a) recommended the study of cases, impacts of and on employees, factors (drivers and barriers) influencing, and the fate of innovations and their organizations. Factors are often an interest of those wanting to invent and implement innovations but they mostly emphasize internal factors.² Torugsa and Arundel examined barrier breadth, search breadth and workplace creativity.

Based on literature reviews and a multi-informant study of English local governments, Walker (2008) attempted to move away from study of individual variables and toward a consideration of the relationships between antecedents and innovation types (organizational, environmental), although not as successfully as he had hoped. He studied service, organizational process and ancillary innovations, examining how organizational and environmental antecedents

² Each time there is increased interest in innovation, these issues are discussed and some new research is done. This occurred, for example, in the USA, Canada, the UK and New Zealand during the 1980s and 1990s, and recently in Europe, always driven by deficit budgets.

may vary by innovation type, and the impact of complementary relationships between innovation types. He concluded that internal antecedents were more important than external antecedents. In the new instrument reported here, both external and internal factors are studied.

What Else should be Studied? De Vries, Bekker and Tummers (2016), in a systematic review of empirical literature on public sector innovation, investigated drivers and barriers related to four categories of factor that referred to different levels: environmental (e.g. leadership, collaboration with private partners, political mandates and public pressures); organizational (e.g. slack); innovation characteristics (e.g. mouldability of the innovation); and individual/employee (e.g. empowerment, age of personnel) level. Meijer (2015) highlighted barriers to adoption of e-government innovation, by studying phases in the innovation process, and identified government and citizen barriers, structural barriers (e.g. organizational capacities, technological possibilities, financial resources) and cultural barriers (e.g. fear that citizens would interfere with good police work, that the system would result in an “informer state”). They also noted that there is a general lack of empirical research on public sector innovation (this is a substantial shortcoming).

Gray (1973: 1174); Berry and Berry (2013: 1); Glor (2015), and de Vries, Bekker and Tummers (2016) have observed that innovation researchers typically do not study invention of policies, or early adopters, but rather dissemination of policies. Walker (1969) and Glor (1997, 2002) studied the earliness of adoption and Berry and Berry (2013) the probability of adoption. While study of dissemination could allow comparison of the year in which an innovation was adopted by one government to the year it was adopted by other governments and development of an adoption ranking, this is not what has been done. Whether an innovation is adopted and how widely has been the interest. The instrument introduced in the current paper was prepared with invention and early adoption in mind but could possibly be used to study dissemination as well; however, thorough knowledge of the innovations, their organizations and their governments is required to use it. Most study of innovation has been concerned with case studies of innovation and their comparisons, public sector entrepreneurship and innovative organizations (Borins, 2014: Chapter 2: 2-3). Borins noted that researchers tend to study only one of these types. Knill and Lenschow (2001) and Glor (2014 a, b; 2015) suggested expanding the range of issues studied. This paper does so by examining the factors influencing the fate of policy/program and administrative innovations, introducing an instrument to do so, and testing it on five case studies.

Survival/Disappearance. Some work has also been done on the drivers and barriers to the *successful* invention/ adoption, implementation and achievement of the goals of public sector innovations (Glor, 1997, 2002; 1998; Bernier, Hafsi and Deschamps, 2015; Walker, 2008; De Vries, Bekkers and Tummers, 2016: 1). While both practitioners and scholars often assume that the purpose of innovation is to improve organizational performance (Borins, 2014: Chapter 2, p. 22), and focus primarily on administrative innovations, none has considered the survival or disappearance of innovations and their organizations as a performance issue. In previous work, Glor (2001, 2013; 2014a, b, 2015) and Glor and Ewart (2016) identified a range of possible factors and hypotheses influencing the creation and abolition of the five innovations and their organizations.

There has, however, been little examination of the factors influencing the introduction, successful implementation, and survival/mortality of public sector innovations. This article takes

a step in filling this gap by developing a new empirical instrument identifying a range of these factors. The paper identifies definitions; provides a research framework; identifies the case studies, which are included in the instrument; describes the content of the instrument; compares the measures used for primary and secondary variables; provides a copy of the instrument; and identifies the contents of the next paper.

Definitions

In their literature review, de Vries, Bekker and Tummers (2016) found empirical publications often omit definitions. They defined innovations as new to the organization and reviewed the current state of empirical knowledge on antecedents of public sector innovation and its impacts. Innovation in this paper is defined as “the conception and implementation of significant new services, ideas or ways of doing things as government policy in order to improve or reform them and involves taking risks” and is focused on the first, second or third time the innovation was introduced in its government’s community (Glor, 1997: 4; Walker, 1969; Rogers, 1995). A government *community* is the group to which the government compares itself and/or with which it works. The GoS’s community was the Canadian provincial and federal and American state and federal governments. This is a more stringent definition than, for example, that of Rogers (1995), who made no reference to the first few times or to the government’s community. An *organization* is defined in this paper “as a group of people working together for common causes that are registered or captured as an organization in a reliable organizational population database” (Glor, 2013: 3). Berry and Berry (2013) suggested that definitions focused on the first few adopters were used more before 1990 and that since then the focus has been primarily on dissemination. The dissemination literature has assumed each adoption by any organization is an innovation. Osborne (1998) defined “total innovation” as innovations new to the innovating organization and offering a new service to a new group. Even adoption laggards (Rogers’ term), according to these latter definitions, are innovators. This approach builds in a pro-innovation bias: organizations *should* adopt the innovations and whether they have done so is monitored through surveys and awards. While study of dissemination makes an important contribution, this paper proposes that there is still much to learn about the phenomenon of public sector innovation by focussing on the governments inventing or adopting innovations early and on the fate of their innovations and organizations. This approach has the potential to inform understanding of the risks of innovating, the innovation process, the factors that promote and deter innovation, and innovations’ and their organizations’ fates.

Research Framework

Most research frameworks employ one theory, such as institutionalism, rational choice, complexity or contingency theory. Knill and Lenschow (2001) argued that scope of change studied, the theoretical schools chosen, and whether the conceptual schools are structure-based or agency-based create key differences among studies of change. They suggested that needless contention arose in the literature because authors used only one approach and scope and did not relate their work appropriately to that of other schools studying other levels. Glor (2014 a, b; 2015) suggested expanding the scope of theoretical schools referenced because study of the fate

of innovations and their organizations is so new and incomplete. S/he recommended (2014 a, b) using elements from four theories—interpretive, humanist, functional and structural (based on Burrell and Morgan, 1979).

An *interpretive approach* considers case studies where there is a plausible link between an organization innovating and surviving/disappearing, preferably matched with case studies of normal organizations (qualitative comparative analysis) (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). A *humanist approach* focuses on employees, e.g. managers (Damanpour and Schneider, 2006, 2009), employees who implemented the innovations, the effects of the innovations and organizations on them and how they affected the innovations and organizations. A *functionalist* approach, the most researched, searches for factors correlating highly with increased innovation and organizational mortality. A *structural* approach focuses on the fate of structures—including innovations and innovating organizations—and their demography, measured by founding and mortality rates (Glor, 2014a). This multi-theory approach permits consideration of case studies and effects on people, functions, and structures. Considering more issues should create better understanding. Glor (2014a) developed a framework for studying the fate of innovations and their organizations that recommended using all these approaches. Glor's research framework (2014a, b) is used to frame the instrument.

Using a combination of experiential, retrospective and historical research, Glor (1997, 2002) developed a comprehensive list of 159 innovations of the GoS, 1971-82. They were identified from the author's knowledge of other governments and by asking public servants and elected officials what they thought was innovative that the government had done. Information on these innovations was published by Glor (1997, 2002) and Harding (1995). Informants were also asked when the innovation was introduced and whether they were aware of any other governments introducing the same or similar innovations before or after the GoS did so. In addition, research was conducted on the ranked time of introduction of these innovations among Canadian and American governments (Hum, 1985a, b).³

Previous research on the innovations of the GoS 1971-82 did not systematically identify the factors involved in their creation, nor what happened to the innovations. Such information is required to identify the factors influencing their creation and fate. To develop a data base of factor information for the 159 innovations would require considerable research. Can the required information be found at this point in time? This research finds out by studying five of them. The five case studies are not a sample, but rather the full sub-population of income security innovations introduced by the GoS. The reasons they were chosen are discussed later.

The Instrument

This paper reports on the development of a *new measurement instrument* assessing

³ The GoC funded and the Province of Manitoba piloted a guaranteed income program in one community in the 1970s. The Province of Ontario announced a three-year pilot guaranteed income (basic income) program in three cities in 2016. Finland introduced a guaranteed income pilot in January 2017, the Netherlands and Kenya are developing projects; a California company is planning a five-year pilot. See also Forget, Marando and Surman (2016). The working poor are likely to benefit most from these programs (Evelyn Forget).

factors influencing public sector innovations and their organizations. Employing Glor's framework (2014a), the instrument examines what are considered to be key factors in the introduction, implementation and fate of five income security innovations and their organizations. The factors are considered twice, to assess the factors at the time of creation and again during the 1980s under a different government, which abolished four of five innovations.

Both external and internal factors are considered. External factors are external to the innovation/organization; internal factors are internal to them. The potential global *external factors* examined are ideology; politics; external support; state of the economy; resources available; and some effects. The potential *internal factors* studied are fiscal situation, resources accessed, internal support; orders of change; whether an efficacious program model was used; and some effects of the innovations.

Previous publications suggested possible hypotheses applicable to the factors (Glor, 2015, Glor and Ewart, 2016, and Glor and Rivera, 2016), described the five innovations and identified some possible factors influencing the fate of innovations and their organizations (Glor, 2015; Glor and Ewart, 2016). The cases' resources and event histories were identified (Glor and Ewart). This paper describes and provides a copy of the instrument developed to assess empirically the factors contributing to the creation, implementation, survival or mortality of the innovations and their organizations.

The Study

The Instrument. The *instrument* measures factors influencing the creation, implementation, survival and abolition of innovations and their organizations. It consists of *four questionnaires* exploring factors identified in the literature and by the author and thought to have potentially affected the fate of the innovations and their organizations. The instrument contains four questionnaires, consisting of 1435 items. Two questionnaires address innovations and two others address organizations. [Appendix I](#) lists statements for primary (contextual) variables for innovations and [Appendix II](#) for secondary variables for individual innovations. [Appendix III](#) has statements for primary variables for organizations and [Appendix IV](#) for secondary variables for organizations. *Primary variables* (Downs & Mohr, 1976: 703) apply to all of the case studies, and there is little or no variation expected in the ratings among them. *Secondary variables* apply to some case studies but not to others or apply differently across innovations/organizations. Both primary and secondary variables are independent variables, factors thought to influence the dependent variable (survival/disappearance) (<https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/types-of-variable.php>). Secondary variables are more specific to an innovation/organization than are primary variables. The instrument addresses both internal and external factors. Examining the factors at two different times should reveal whether there was variation in the scoring across time and whether the same or different factors influenced the survival or disappearance of the innovations/organizations.

The Cases Studied. The five innovations to be studied were new income redistribution programs in the Canadian and American context (Glor, 1997). Versions subsequently became staples of the welfare state in Canada, before it began to be dismantled during the 1980s by the

GoS and elsewhere. The GoS was the first government in North America to establish innovations of the type Family Income Plan (FIP), Employment Support Program (ESP) and Workers Compensation Board (WCB); tied for first to introduce cost-shared generously-subsidized day care, and the second to establish programs of the type of the Seniors Income Support Program (SIP).⁴ They were thus highly innovative. The organizations delivering the innovations were also studied. Demographics of the innovations and organizations are outlined in Glor and Ewart (2016).

Four of the innovations were located in the regular public service, in the Department of SS, the fifth in an administrative tribunal, the WCB. The Saskatchewan Ombudsman describes an administrative tribunal as “the boards, commissions, appeal committees and other administrative bodies created by government to assist in carrying out its decision-making responsibilities....” (Ombudsman Saskatchewan, 2017: 11). The WCB is self-funded. The five innovations and their organizations are described in more details in Glor and Ewart (2016).

These cases were chosen from the 159 Blakeney government innovations for study for several reasons: (1) They were highly innovative; (2) They encompassed all of the government’s income security innovations; they were thus a coherent group of innovations that could potentially have the same or a similar fate; (3) While the four SS innovations were not especially controversial during the Blakeney government, the conservative government that followed it, Canada’s first neoconservative (neoliberal) government, abolished four of them. It therefore had reason to obscure this unpopular move: if it could be determined whether or not information remained transparent and whether the needed information could be found for the five innovations and organizations; this would be some indication that similar information could be found for the full 159 innovations;⁵ (4) These innovations and their organizations included both budgetary programs (appeared in budget estimates) and non-budgetary ones (did not—WCB); this would help determine whether information could and could not be found; (5) This government and two of its successors were well documented in published works; (6) The author was familiar with these innovations; and (7) The full population of 159 innovations had been identified for this government (Glor, 1997, 2002): many of the other 154 could also potentially be studied if the methodology was appropriate and the information available. The five innovations are thus not a representative sample of all of the innovations but are representative of key problems researchers would face trying to do a larger study and at the same time would illuminate the fate of a full sub-population.

Method and Measures

Using accessible documents,⁶ personal knowledge,⁷ and creating descriptive statistics,

⁴ Author (1997) reported Sask. as first for day care cost-sharing but Manitoba was first, introducing a similar program a couple of months earlier, during the same year. Data is reported yearly, so they were tied for first. Source: Ron Hikel.

⁵ The Devine government passed legislation that made reorganizations more opaque, and refused to answer most questions in the Legislature or by media about reorganizations.

⁶ Only recent documents are available online. Earlier documents are rarely available outside Regina, Sask.

⁷ Having worked as Social Services Budget Analyst in the Department of Finance; done a special project on the WCB while there; and having worked on the WCB conversion while in Executive Council.

this retrospective (historical) study began by identifying potential factors thought to contribute to the creation and to the fate of Saskatchewan income security innovations and their organizations. It presents an instrument that scores these factors for two governments, the Blakeney government 1971-82 (New Democratic Party, NDP), and the Devine government 1982-91 (Progressive Conservative Party). **Creation** of an innovation was *defined* as appearance in the budgetary Estimates or other official document such as an Annual Report, **mortality** was defined as disappearance from official documents or the Estimates or a name change in the Estimates. These criteria for survival and mortality were outlined in Glor (2013) and have also been used in other studies (Glor, 2013), making results comparable to other studies.

Studying *publicness*, Andrews, Boyne and Walker (2011: 7) summarized what is needed for an ideal quantitative research design: models that have a lag between the independent and dependent variables to ensure that the measures precede their hypothetical performance effects; and internal and external controls to address possible confounding effects due to management, organization, and the environment. Longitudinal data address these central characteristics of causation, but also permit consideration of longer term effects of innovation. They also permit study of causal direction—for example does innovation result in changes in performance or do changes in performance lead to innovation? In the GoS, for example, day care was reorganized before the innovation was introduced while delivery of the Seniors Income Plan and Family Income Plan were amalgamated into one delivery unit after the programs were created. When data sets are built, they need to be able to test the interactions between variables in order to tease out relationships. Researchers must collect clear and accurate measures of their variables, and have sufficient external constraints in the data sets to capture the circumstances in which organizations operate and that contribute to or constrain innovation. Good internal and external measures of management and organizational context are also needed. Berry and Berry (1990, 1992; summary 2013); Wright, Erikson and McIver (1987); Lieberman and Shaw (2000); Arsneault (2000); and Boehmke (2009) found both external and internal factors were important in determining whether innovations were adopted in the public sector. Glor (2015) concluded researchers should address several dimensions of impacts, because a gain in one dimension (e.g. efficiency) may be realized by sacrificing another (e.g. equity or equality).

The instrument consists of four questionnaires (to make it more manageable): two for innovations and two for organizations. Two questionnaires assess global factors applicable to all innovations and organizations and two assess more specific factors requiring individual assessments by case study (this was confusing for Rater2, who consequently did not respond to [Appendix III](#)). The raters completed the questionnaires for two time periods, both of which appeared in the questionnaires: for the period when the innovations and organizations were created, during the Blakeney government 1971-82, and for the period when four were abolished, the Devine government, 1982-91. The fifth continues to exist. Event histories and comparisons of the survival periods for innovations and organizations were published in Glor and Ewart (2016), after the raters had completed the questionnaires. On the questionnaires, the items were grouped into possible factors that were given names (e.g. ideology, effects). Time 1 and Time 2 were assessed on the questionnaire in proximity to each other, either in the same item or in items that followed one another. In some cases, the same or similar statements were used to examine both innovations and organizations.

How the Factors are Measured

Factors are presented in the instrument separately for primary and secondary variables (see appendices). This will help with the analysis of external (environmental) and internal factors, as primary factors are thought to be environmental. At the same time, the primary and secondary variables can be amalgamated to analyze factors. External factors lie outside the innovation and its organization, internal factors within it. As the reader can see, most factors are measured with both primary and secondary variables. The primary and secondary external and internal factors for the innovations and organizations are summarized in [Table 1](#). [Table 1](#) will help with the analysis of the factors in future essays.

External Variables – Innovations

Primary external factors for *innovations* included politics, external support, resources and effects. **Politics** were measured by (1) the strength of the government's majority in the Legislature; the effect of federal governments on provincial governments; (2) how long governments were in power; (3) the ideological significance of a change of government; (4) whether the government taking decisions was in power a long time; (5) the ratio of time in power between the innovating and the next governments (three elections versus two but in years they were relatively equal), action and elections; and (6) whether the voting of the electorate was consistent across provincial and federal governments. **External Support** was measured by whether Sask was influential with the federal government at the time of creation/abolition. **External effects** were measured by: whether the innovation was efficacious, reduced poverty, fulfilled its goals and was respectful of clients. The economy was thought to be a secondary attribute because the innovations were created in different economic environments from one to another.

Secondary external factors affecting the *innovations* included ideology, politics, external support, the economy, resources and effects. **Ideology** was measured by the strength of the party in power's ideology (based on the raters' judgments) and the strength of the public's support for the ideology as measured by the consistency of the federal and provincial election results at particular points in time. Wright, Erikson and McIver (1987) found public opinion surveys were the best measure of dominant ideology, but surveys were not available for Sask. Berry et al. (1998) used results of federal elections compared to results of state elections as a measure of ideology, supplemented by other measures. Five measures were used here, including theirs'. **Politics** were measured by whether (1) There was a change of provincial government soon after action on innovation; (2) The government was in power a long time (3 years or more) after taking action; (3) There was federal funding for the innovation: (a) at the time of creation/abolition, (b) at the time of the election after that, (c) at the time the Tory government was elected, (d) at the time the Tory government was re-elected; (4) Lack of/ availability of federal funding strengthened/ weakened the Sask government's position; and (5) Federal funding, if it had been made available, did not continue to be available.

External support was measured by whether the innovation: (1) Was supported by the party in power; (2) Had been previously introduced/abolished by another government, (3) Was in the governing party's election platform, and (4) had been proposed in an official report. **The**

economy was measured by economic growth rate, government debt, decrease in unemployment rate and fiscal situation. **Resources available to the government** were measured by: *financial resources* (surplus/balanced/deficit budget, size of debt, windfall revenues, competition, funding allocations, information available to track); *administrative support* (size, infrastructure, staffing, change, importance); *how successfully the innovations were implemented* (full and quick: funding, retention, staffing, implementation, how long government in power); *employee support* (SS personnel supported, personnel well treated, Not competing for funding with other programs). **Effects** were measured by whether the program was *efficacious* (achieved program's objectives, augmented incomes of the poor), *reduced poverty* (e.g. increased incomes of poor substantially, poverty rate declined, unemployment declined, prevented cheating, did not attract the poor from other provinces⁸ [measured by unemployment rate], did not have unwanted side effects); *fulfilled its goals* (e.g. served public good, paralleled monitoring, achieved and maintained objectives, enhanced equality); and *was respectful of clients* (administered quickly, easily, unobtrusively; removed stigma of undeserving poor).

Internal Variables – Innovations

Internal variables were internal to the innovation. **Primary internal factors** for *innovations* were resources and effects. *Resources* were measured by administrative support. *Effects* were measured by whether: the innovations were efficacious, reduced poverty, fulfilled their goals, and were respectful of clients.

Secondary internal factors for innovations included external support, economy, resources and effects. *External support* was measured by whether the innovation proposed in an official report and the *economy* by whether the government's fiscal situation was good. *Resources* were measured by financial and administrative support, success of implementation of innovation and employee support) (Table 1). *Effects* were measured by the efficaciousness of the program model, its ability to control cheating, whether controlled the attraction of the poor from other provinces, achievement of goals and respect for clients. *Internal factors* included internal effects of external support, the economy, resources and internal support (Table 1).

External Variables—Organizations

For organizations that delivered the innovations, similar factors were measured. Factors for the organizations were again assessed separately for primary (apply to all organizations) and secondary variables (apply to organizations individually) (appendices III and IV).

The primary external variables considered for *organizations* were ideology; politics; external support, the economy and resources available to the government and organization; internal support; internal challenges; and effects (outcomes). The effect of *ideology* on the organizations was measured by (1) whether the organization's approach integrated well with the

⁸ Concerning acting as a magnet for the poor from other provinces, Berry and Berry (2013 summary) showed that this did not occur in the USA, but this has nonetheless been a concern of social service administrators. What happened in Canada? Did the programs act as a disincentive to work or reduce work disincentives? Expand or reduce eligibility for welfare? Keep up with the cost of living or fail to do so?

dominant ideology in the province and (2) whether the organization's approach matched the ideology of the government. **Politics** was assessed by (1) whether the government spoke publicly and negatively about the public service and (2) whether there was no change of government within three years of creation/mortality of the organization. **External support** was gauged by (1) whether the GoS was influential with the GoC at the time the innovations were created/abolished; (2) whether the organizations implementing the innovations were not competing for funding with other administrative areas. For the **economy and resources and organizations**, primary variables were only assessed for the sub-factor economy, and not for resources because the resource situation was a secondary variable. Sub-factor *the economy* was determined by whether: (1) The organization was created, abolished or maintained in a growing economy; (2) the government was not in deep debt; (3) the government's budget was balanced or close to balanced when the change was made; and (4) the government was not in significant deficit.

Secondary external factors for organizations included ideology, politics, external support, the economy and resources. **Ideology** was gauged by (1) no change of dominant ideology within three years of creation/abolition of the organization; (2) organizational (personnel) levels were a matter of ideology; (3) employee salaries were a matter of ideology; (4) government was highly ideological on the subject of the organization. **Politics** was gauged by whether: (1) there was a change of provincial government soon after an organizational change, (2) GoS spoke publicly and negatively about the public service, (3) GoS had other costly priorities that were absorbing much of its marginal resources, (4) the organization was fully funded, (5) external departmental employees considered the new organization competition, and (6) employees showed greater respect for clients. **External support** included federal government and other competition for funding among organizations of the department. **The economy and resources** were assessed by sub-factors the economy and resources. *The economy* was assessed as a secondary factor by whether the economy was in good shape (growing 3% per year or more) at the time of creation/abolition. *Resources* were gauged by sub-factor *resources*, assessed by whether: (1) the government's finances were in good shape (little debt, near balanced budget), (2) the organization was fully funded; (3) the government had windfall revenues at the time the organization was created/abolished; (4) the GoS had GoC support (political, legal, financial) to create/abolish the innovation; (5) the organization retained its resources after five years; (6) the organization retained its resources after ten years; (7) the organization retained its resources after fifteen years; (8) the organization retained its resources after twenty years.

Internal Variables—Organizations

Primary internal factors for organizations included **internal support**, measured by administrative and employee support and full implementation. **Administrative support** was measured by whether the needed administrative support was provided, the organization (infrastructure) was fully funded, and the organization retained its funding over time. **Employee support** was assessed by whether employees supported the government's principles for the innovations and personnel were well treated, respected, and received salary increases (there was high inflation during the late 1970s and early 1980s). **Full implementation** was measured by whether the organizations were fully implemented, were large, were funded for new positions to deliver innovations, administrative support was fully and quickly implemented and maintained, and the government remained in power after approval long enough for the innovation to gain

legitimacy. *Effects* were evaluated by whether employees achieved the government's program/service/ administration objectives, the organization respected the public's desire not to see the system cheated, the government's goals and objectives were achieved quickly, the achievements with principles were maintained, the innovations were respectful of clients, and the administration respected the government's desire to remove the stigma of the undeserving poor.

Secondary internal factors for organizations included resources available to the organizations, internal support, and effects. *Resources* were evaluated by (1) whether the GoS's finances were in good shape, (2) the organization was fully funded, (3) the government had windfall revenues, (4) the GoS had GoC political/legal/financial support for the innovation, (5) the organization retained its funding after five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. *Internal support* was measured by four sub-factors: administrative support, employee support, full implementation, and orders of change. *Administrative support* was gauged by whether government support remained in place while the organization existed. *Employee support* was measured by whether departmental employees outside the delivering unit considered that the organization represented competition for their resources. *Full implementation* consisted of whether the innovation (organization) was fully and quickly staffed and funded, retained its funding over time, and the program was fully and quickly implemented by personnel. *Orders of change* were gauged by whether: (1) the organization had not recently changed; (2) the change for the organization was first order (change in activities); (3) second order (change in structure); (4) third order (change in goals); and (5) the organization was large in the Sask context (large organizations survive better). *Effects* included whether: (1) employees showed greater respect for clients, as desired by the government; and (2) the fate of the innovation affected the fate of the organization.

Conclusion

This paper has introduced and provided a copy of a new instrument constructed to measure internal and external factors influencing the introduction, implementation and fate of public sector innovations and their organizations. In the second of these paired articles, an attempt will be made to verify the instrument by having three raters complete it for the five income security innovation case studies and their organizations. The data produced will be used to test rater reliability and interrater reliability, whether one rater would have been sufficient (compared to using three raters), and instrument reliability and validity.

About the Author:

Eleanor D. Glor spent her working life as a public servant in the Canadian public sector at four levels of government and has written about public sector innovation for publication since the 1980s. She ran the Innovation Salon, a dinner meeting on public sector innovation, for ten years. She is the publisher and current and founding editor of *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*. She is Adjunct Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies and Fellow, McLaughlin College, York University, Toronto, Canada. Most recently she published *Building Theory of Organizational Innovation, Change, Fitness and Survival*, What Happens to Innovations and Their Organizations (with Garry Ewart), and "Innovation and Organizational Survival Research," with Mario A. Rivera, a chapter in James D. Ward, *Leadership and Change in Public Sector Organizations: Beyond Reform*. She can be reached at: glor@magma.ca

References:

- Andrews, Rhys, George A. Boyne & Richard M. Walker. 2011. Dimensions of Publicness and Organizational Performance: A Review of the Evidence. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 21 (Supplement 3): i301–i319.
- Arsneault, Shelly. 2000. Welfare Policy Innovation and Diffusion: Section 111 Waivers and the Federal System. *State and Local Government Review*, 32(1): 49-60.
- Bernier, Luc, Taïeb Hafsi & Carl Deschamps. 2015. Environmental Determinants of Public Sector Innovation: A Study of Innovation Awards in Canada. *Public Management Review*, 17(6) (December): 834-56. DOI: 10.1080/14719037.2013.867066
- Berry, Frances Stokes & William D. Berry. 1990. State Lottery Adoptions as Policy Innovations: An Event History Analysis. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2): 395-415.
- Berry, Frances Stokes & William D. Berry. 1992. Tax Innovation in the States: Capitalizing on Political Opportunity. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3): 715-42.
- Berry, Frances Stokes & William D. Berry. 2013. Innovation and Diffusion Models in Policy Research. Chapter 9, pp. 307-362 in Paul Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview
- Berry, William D., Evan J. Ringquist, Richard C. Fording, & Russell L. Hanson. 1998. Measuring Citizen and Government Ideology in the American States, 1960-93. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(1): 327-48.
- Boehmke, Frederick J. 2009. Policy Emulation or Policy Convergence? Potential Ambiguities in the Dyadic Event History Approach to State Policy Emulation. *The Journal of Politics*, 71(3): 1125-40.
- Borins, Sandford F. 2014. *The Persistence of Innovation in Government*. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Brown, L., R. Schneider, M. Harvey & B. Ridell. 1979. Innovation Diffusion and Development in a Third World Setting: The Cooperative Movement in Sierra Leone. *Social Science Quarterly*, 60(2): 249-68.
- Burrell, G. & G. Morgan. 1979. *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London, UK: Heinemann
- Collier, David & Richard E. Messick. 1975. Prerequisites Versus Diffusion: Testing Explanations of Social Security Adoption. *American Political Science Review*, 69(4): 1299-315.
- Damanpour, Fariborz. 1991. Organizational Innovation: A Meta-analysis of Effects of Determinants and Moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3): 555-90.

Damanpour, F. & M. Schneider. 2006. Phases of the Adoption of Innovation in Organizations: Effects of Environment, Organization and Top Managers. *British Journal of Management*, 17(4): 215-36.

Damanpour, F. & M. Schneider. 2009. Characteristics of Innovation and Innovation Adoption in Public Organizations: Assessing the Role of Managers. *JPART*, 19(4): 495-522.

De Vries, H., V. Bekkers, L. Tummers. 2016. Innovation in the public sector: A systematic review and future research agenda, *Public Administration*, 94(1): 146-66.

Downs, George W., Jr. & Lawrence B. Mohr. 1976. Conceptual Issues in the Study of Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(December): 700-14.

Drucker, Peter. 1985. *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York, NY: Harper & Row

Edquist, Charles. (Ed.). 1997. *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*. London and New York: Routledge

Forget, Evelyn L., Dylan Marando, Tonya Surman. 2016. Pilot lessons: How to design a basic income pilot project for Ontario. Mowat Research #26. Toronto, Canada: Centre for Social Innovation, Mowat Centre, School of Public Policy and Governance, University of Toronto.

Glor, Eleanor D. (Ed.). 1997. *Policy Innovation in the Saskatchewan Public Sector, 1971-82*. Toronto, CA: Captus Press.

Glor, Eleanor D., 1998. "Public Sector Innovation in Canada." Pp. 300-340 in Randy Hoffman, Diane Jurkowski, Victor MacKinnon, Janice Nicholson, and James C. Simeon (eds), *Public Administration: Canadian Materials, Third Edition*. Toronto, CA: Captus Press.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2001. Key Factors Influencing Innovation in Government. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 6(2), article 1. Accessed March 11, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol6-iss2.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. (Ed.). 2002. *Is Innovation a Question of Will or Circumstance? An Exploration of the Innovation Process through the Lens of the Blakeney Government in Saskatchewan, 1971-82*. Second Edition. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*. Accessed August 28, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/books.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. 2013. Do innovative organisations survive longer than non-innovative organisations? Initial evidence from an empirical study of normal organizations. 2013. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 18(3), article 1. Accessed August 28, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol18-no3.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. 2014a. Studying the Impact of Innovation on Organizations, Organizational Populations and Organizational Communities: A Framework for Research. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 19(3): article 1. Accessed March 11, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol19-no3.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. 2014b. Proposal for Comparative Research on the Fate of Innovative Public Sector Organizations, a paper presented to the International Research Society for Public Management, April 9-11, 2014, Ottawa, Canada.

Glor, Eleanor D. 2015. *Building Theory of Organizational Innovation, Change, Fitness and Survival*. Ottawa, CA: The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 20(2): article 1. Accessed August 28, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/books.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. & Garry Ewart. 2016. What Happens to Innovations and their Organizations? *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 21(3), article 1. Collected August 28, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol21-no3.htm>

Glor, Eleanor D. & Mario Rivera. 2016. Assessing the Relationship between Innovation and Survival in Organizations: An Empirical Review, Research Synthesis, and Analytical Case Study. *The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal*, 21(2), article 1. Accessed August 28, 2017 at: <http://www.innovation.cc/volumes-issues/vol21-no2.htm>

Gray, Virginia. 1973. Innovations in the States: A Diffusion Study. *American Political Science Review*, 67 (Dec): 1174-85.

Harding, Jim (Ed.) 1995. *Social Policy and Social Justice: The NDP Government in Saskatchewan during the Blakeney Years*. Waterloo, CA: Wilfred Laurier University Press

Hum, D. P. J. 1985a. "Chapter Seven: The Working Poor, the Canada Assistance Plan, and Provincial Responses in Income Supplementation." Pp. 120-138 in Jacqueline S. Ismael (Ed.), *Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions*. Toronto, CA: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Hum, D. P. J. 1985b. "Social Security Reform during the 1970s." Pp. 29-47, Chapter 3 in Jacqueline S. Ismael (Ed.), *Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions*. Toronto, CA: The Institute of Public Administration of Canada.

Knill, Christoph & Andrea Lenschow. 2001. Linking Different Perspectives on Institutional Change. *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(2) (March): 187-215.

Lieberman, Robert C. & Greg M. Shaw. 2000. Looking Inward, Looking Outward: The Politics of State Welfare Innovation under Devolution. *Political Research Quarterly*, 53(2): 215-40.

Meijer, Albert. 2015. E-governance Innovation: Barriers and strategies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(2): 198-206.

Ombudsman Saskatchewan. 2017. *Practice Essentials for Administrative Tribunals*. Regina, CA.: Saskatchewan Ministry of Justice and Attorney General, Dispute Resolution Office.

Osborne, Stephen. 1998. *Voluntary Organizations and Innovations in Public Services*. London, UK: Routledge

Rogers, Everett M. 1995. *Diffusion of Innovations*. 4th Edition. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Strauss, A. & J. Corbin. 1998. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Tolbert, Pamela & Lynne Zucker. 1983. Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 22-39.

Torugsa, Nuttaneeya (Ann) & Anthony Arundel. 2016. Complexity of Innovation in the public sector: A workgroup-level analysis of related factors and outcomes. *Public Management Review*, 18(3): 392-416.

Walker, Jack L. 1969. The Diffusion of Innovations among the American States. *American Political Science Review*, 63(3): 880-99.

Walker, Richard M. 2008. An Empirical Evaluation of Innovation Types and Organizational and Environmental Characteristics: Towards a Configuration Framework. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4): 591-615.

Wright, Gerald C., Robert S. Erikson & John P. McIver. 1987. Public Opinion and Policy Liberalism in the American States. *American Journal of Political Science*, 31(4) (August): 980-1001.

Former officials of the GoS consulted for this paper: Larry Flynn, regional & acting director, ESP 1974-84; Ron Hikel, former Associate Deputy Minister, social development (income security), Manitoba and Associate Deputy Minister, SS, Sask.; Ian Potter, Planning Bureau, Executive Council and Director Social Services Planning Unit, Department of Social Services, Sask; Merran Proctor, Director, Social Services Planning Unit (personal email from JustCause, July 28, 2014), Department of SS, Sask. (she replaced Ian Potter); Toby Stewart, head of ESP. Thank you.