SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2026
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 255

AUDIENCE RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT AS A COMPETENCY CHALLENGE FOR CULTURAL SECTOR STAFF

Katarzyna PLEBAŃCZYK

Jagiellonian University, Faculty of Management and Social Communication, Institute of Culture;
katarzyna.plebanczyk@uj.edu.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-6546-3503

Purpose: The article aims to identify the relationship between audience relationship management and the competencies of cultural sector staff.
Design/methodology/approach: The analysis is based on the assumption that audience relationship management in cultural organisations requires solutions implemented at the level of human resource management. The research model positions the employee—as an internal stakeholder—within a specific HRM system characteristic of a given type of organisation. This system shapes the conditions for developing individual, team and organisational competencies, through which the organisation builds and manages its relationships with audiences. The study was qualitative and exploratory in nature. Interviews were conducted, and the analysis of findings was structured across three levels: individual, team and organisational.
Findings: The results demonstrate the significant role of cultural sector staff competencies in building relationships with audiences. The higher the level of competencies and their organisational support, the greater the institution's capacity to adapt its strategies to environmental expectations. The study identified organisational tensions, competency gaps and the need for systemic support for staff development.
Research limitations/implications: The study was qualitative and based on a purposive sample; therefore, the conclusions are analytical in nature. Future research should consider expanding data sources, applying quantitative methods, and conducting comparative studies across different types of institutions and national contexts.
Practical implications: Effective audience relationship management requires integrating audience development strategies with HRM practices. Investing in staff development is essential for achieving public objectives, while neglecting such investment may lead to employee burnout and a decline in audience experience quality.
Social implications: Strengthening the competencies of cultural sector staff supports increased cultural participation, the development of social capital and the achievement of public policy goals.
Originality/value: The article integrates the perspective of audience development with HRM scholarship and stakeholder theory, offering an analytical framework that incorporates individual, team and organisational levels and providing empirical evidence of their interconnections.
Keywords: human resource management, cultural management, audience development, competencies, stakeholders, audience relationships.
Category of the paper: research paper.

1. Introduction

Achieving public policy objectives presents new challenges for organisations operating in the cultural field. Their activities are increasingly associated with the development of social capital, while the growing importance of participation, accessibility and inclusivity necessitates greater attention to audience relationship management (Kawashima, 2006). This implies changes in how cultural organisations operate: programming, marketing and educational activities not only constitute mutually complementary practices arising from an adopted development strategy, but also emerge through the engagement and competencies of staff, as well as in collaboration with a key stakeholder - the audience.

This raises questions about whether, and to what extent, organisations in the cultural sector are prepared for these changes, and whether the expectations of the external environment are reflected in human resource management processes. The primary aim of the study was therefore to identify the relationship between audience relationship management and the competencies of cultural sector staff, and the findings are presented in this article.

2. The Audience as the Principal Stakeholder

Culture is increasingly viewed within public policy as an integrating factor across various areas of development. It influences the building of social cohesion as well as cultural and social capital, and contributes to the achievement of sustainable development goals (see: Hawkes, 2001; Plebańczyk, 2021). Cultural organisations are ever more frequently expected to serve as spaces for social dialogue, within which diverse interactions occur between different stakeholder groups (Walmsley, 2016). This entails placing greater emphasis on the audience, engaging in dialogue with them, involving them in the design of programmes, and building long-term relationships.

One of the approaches used to describe activities directed towards audiences is the concept of audience development, which - although originating in the 1960s - has been reinterpreted in recent years in the context of achieving sustainable development objectives. Achieving these objectives involves, among other elements, strengthening cultural participation - not merely by increasing attendance, but by deepening relationships with audiences and reducing barriers to access (social, economic, geographical, digital), as well as fostering social inclusion and diversity (Council of the European Union, 2022, 2024). For this reason, audience development is regarded as a strategic tool of public policy rather than simply an organisational initiative (Kawashima, 2006).

Cultural organisations therefore focus on employing tools characteristic of marketing—aimed at understanding their audiences, diagnosing their needs or removing barriers to participation - while also expanding these practices to include tools for audience relationship management, understood as the management of relationships with a key stakeholder (Hadley, 2017). It should be noted, however, that audience relationship management cannot be analysed in isolation from organisational structures and management processes (Bollo et al., 2017; Plebańczyk, 2022). It thus encompasses not only communication tools, but also the work of internal teams (institutional departments), the capacity to learn from feedback, and requires staff to possess appropriate competencies (Laberschek, Kwiatkowska-Chylińska, 2022). The absence of such practices embedded within organisational structures leads to fragmentation of activities and excessive burdens placed on individuals responsible for audience contact (Plebańczyk, 2021).

3. Human Resource Management in Cultural Organisations

Human resource management in organisations operating in the cultural sector constitutes an area of strategic importance, as it is people - their competencies, motivations, attitudes and capacity for collaboration - who determine the quality of mission delivery, relationships with the environment and organisational sustainability (Król, Ludwiczyński, 2014). Strategic human resource management therefore involves linking personnel policy with the organisation's mission and goals, and treating staff as a key developmental asset (Witczak, 2018), which conditions an organisation's ability to adapt and create value (Boxall, Purcell, 2016). Cultural organisations, which operate at the intersection of public mission, autonomy and growing demands for efficiency and accountability, generate staff multitasking (Konior, Pluszyńska, 2022), tensions between autonomy and control, as well as risks related to the overexploitation of employee engagement. These characteristics make the transfer of HRM models developed in the business sector require careful adaptation (Banks, Hesmondhalgh, 2009; Towse, 2010).

A key dimension of human resource management in culture involves competencies, understood as an integrated set of knowledge, skills, attitudes and motivations that enable effective performance in specific contexts (Armstrong, 2014; Witczak, 2018). Candidates for positions in cultural institutions are expected not only to hold formal qualifications but also to possess well-developed interpersonal, organisational and analytical competencies, alongside particular personality traits such as empathy, sensitivity and the ability to work collaboratively (Mizera-Pęczek, Grzesiak, 2022). Increasing attention is also paid to entrepreneurial attitudes and competencies - as factors that enable adaptation to changing conditions, especially in the context of the multitasking nature of work (Poprawski, 2015) and even to a positivist orientation and the capacity to attribute meaning to undertaken tasks (Dziadzia, 2018). A mismatch

between required and actual competencies may result in employee frustration and diminished motivation, which negatively affects the achievement of organisational goals (Turek, 2015).

Employees are not only the addressees of managerial decisions but active participants in organisational processes. When conceptualised as internal stakeholders (based on the classical theories of Freeman or Clarkson), they become primary stakeholders whose competencies, knowledge and adaptive capacity influence the quality of relationships with other stakeholders (Kujala, Sachs, Leinonen, Heikkinen, Laude, 2022). In the cultural sector, this perspective is particularly important, as employees simultaneously perform the roles of task executors, co-creators of value and intermediaries in relationships with audiences. This means that HRM directly affects the organisation's ability to undertake audience development activities and to build sustainable relationships with external stakeholders.

Research on cultural sector staff in Poland indicates the absence of a systemic approach to developing competencies (Konior, Pluszyńska, 2022), which leads to a situation in which audience relationships depend more on the individual engagement and skills of employees than on organisational capacity. From the perspective of audience relationship management, this implies that the challenge does not lie merely in implementing isolated activities (e.g., audience research or training), but in enhancing the organisation's ability to transform knowledge and experience into sustainable practices.

4. Research Methodology

The assumptions outlined in the introduction enabled the construction of a research model in which it was assumed that the employee - as an internal stakeholder - operates within a specific HRM system characteristic of a particular type of organisation. This system shapes the conditions for the development of individual, team and organisational competencies, through which the organisation builds and manages its relationships with audiences.

The model assumes the following sequence of relationships:

Employee ⟶ HRM ⟶ Competencies ⟶ Audience Relationship

Accordingly, the study focused on three levels of analysis:

- Individual level – employee competencies and experiences.
- Team level – interdepartmental collaboration, knowledge sharing, role distribution.
- Organisational level – HRM practices, organisational culture, change management.

Based on these assumptions, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1. What HRM practices are present in the cultural organisations studied in the context of audience relationship management?

RQ2. What competencies are required of cultural sector staff in the process of building relationships with audiences?

RQ3. How do organisations identify and use knowledge about their audiences?

RQ4. What organisational tensions accompany the implementation of audience development activities?

RQ5. How does human resource management influence relationships with audiences?

The study was qualitative and exploratory in nature. From a broader research project concerning the implementation of audience development in cultural organisations (results currently being prepared for a scholarly monograph), a dedicated component addressing the above issues was extracted. For the purpose of this analysis, semi-structured in-depth interviews were used. These were conducted with representatives of cultural sector staff - senior and middle managers, as well as specialist employees from various organisational departments (50 interviews conducted between 2020 and 2025 and fully coded). The collected material was subjected to thematic analysis.

5. Findings

5.1. Audience at the Centre of Attention

The analysis of the empirical material indicates a clear interest among cultural organisations in building relationships with their audiences. Respondents emphasised that their work is no longer limited to organising events and now includes shaping the audience experience, responding to audience needs and maintaining long-term contact. As the senior manager noted: *In the past, we measured success by attendance. Today, we increasingly ask who comes, why they come and whether they return. This completely changes the way we think about our work.* (R3, management)

The audience has become a reference point for programming, communication and organisational decisions. At the same time, employees observed that:

We are all responsible for the audience, but in reality no one actually has this written into their job description. (R7, programming department)

Audience relationships are built by educators, animators, communication staff and front-of-house employees, who often become "the face of the institution", despite not being formally involved in decision-making processes:

We are on the front line. If something doesn't work, the audience comes to us. But we don't always have influence over how things are designed. (R12, audience services)

Respondents' statements also point to an expanding range of competencies expected of staff. Beyond specialist knowledge, communication skills, empathy, mediation abilities and the capacity to respond to difficult situations are becoming increasingly important. One educator stressed:

You need to be able to read the group and respond to what is happening. It is no longer just about conveying knowledge; it is about building a relationship. (R5, education)

At the same time, respondents highlighted the lack of systemic preparation for such a role. Responsibility for audience relationships is often perceived as a natural extension of duties rather than an area requiring distinct competencies and organisational support:

No one taught us this. We learned on our own, through trial and error. (R9, programme team)

As a result, audience relationships often depend on the individual commitment and experience of employees rather than on a coherent HRM system. In the institutions represented by respondents, professional activities related to analysing audience experience (as described in the concept of customer experience) or spaces for addressing difficult relational situations appeared infrequently. Interviewees pointed to tensions that stem from the simultaneous pressure to deliver programme-related tasks and build relationships. As one project coordinator noted:

On the one hand, we must deliver the project on time and settle the grant; on the other, we should build relationships. Sometimes these logics contradict each other. (R2, project coordination)

Audience relationship management broadens the scope of employee roles, increases competency requirements and generates new tensions, particularly where there is a lack of clear organisational grounding and support for competency development. In the context of the adopted analytical model, this indicates the emergence of the first dimension of the competency challenge.

5.2. Recognising Audience Needs as an Organisational Competence

One of the key areas revealing competency-related challenges among cultural sector staff is the ability to identify and interpret audience needs. Respondents recognised the importance of knowledge about audiences and familiarity with supporting tools, yet the interviews present a picture of rather fragmented practices based primarily on observation, conversation and professional intuition. As one interviewee emphasised:

We know our audiences because we talk to them after events. It is first-hand knowledge, but mostly unwritten. (R4, education)

The intuitive nature of diagnosis is often treated as a natural element of cultural work, particularly in smaller teams where relationships are more direct. However, in the context of rising expectations placed on institutions - regarding the implementation of accessibility, inclusivity and audience diversity standards - such an approach proves insufficient.

Some respondents pointed to a lack of research competencies and a lack of formal data analysis tools:

We don't have anyone responsible for research. Sometimes we run surveys, but we don't really know what to do with them afterwards. (R8, communication)

Audience knowledge is often dispersed across departments and individuals, and its flow is not formalised. Front-of-house staff possess detailed insights into audience reactions, yet mechanisms for passing this knowledge further are not always in place:

We know a lot because we hear comments all the time, but this rarely goes any further. There's no space for it. (R11, audience services)

As a consequence, knowledge about the audience remains at an individual level and does not develop into an organisational competence. Procedures enabling the systematic collection, analysis and use of information in the planning process are lacking, which also indicates the absence of organisational capabilities—understood as repeatable, institutionalised ways of working that allow the organisation to learn and adapt.

What HRM practices operate in the cultural organisations studied.

The statements cited suggest increasing pressure to professionalise audience diagnosis, yet in many cases it remains an individual competence dependent on the experience of particular employees. This implies that the absence of well-developed organisational competencies means that practices continue to rely on individual effort rather than on sustainable organisational capacity.

5.3. Managing Audience Knowledge and Organisational Learning

A key challenge remains the transformation of knowledge into lasting organisational practice. Respondents repeatedly emphasised that knowledge about audiences exists within organisations in a dispersed and unsystematic manner, rarely becoming the subject of collective reflection:

Sometimes after an event we talk among ourselves about what worked and what didn't, but these are rather spontaneous conversations; there is no regular moment for summarising. (R6, programming department)

Many institutions lack regular meetings supporting ongoing research, summary reports regarding audience experience, or procedures for sharing information between departments. Respondents also drew attention to the lack of time and resources dedicated to analysis and reflection, as ongoing project and programme tasks remain the priority:

There is always something that needs to be done immediately. We simply don't have the time or people for calm analysis. (R2, project coordination)

As a result, audience knowledge does not consistently translate into modifications of programme offerings or changes in the institution's operational practices. Changes tend to be incidental and dependent on the initiative of specific individuals:

If someone has the energy and an idea, then something changes. But that's not a system; it's more individual initiative. (R5, education)

This points to a lack of developed organisational competencies, understood as an institution's ability to learn and adapt systematically. It is also important to note that audience relationships rest on the experience of individuals rather than on a systemically designed process. As one respondent commented:

When someone leaves, they take with them an enormous amount of knowledge about our audiences. We don't have it written down anywhere. (R10, communication)

HRM in the organisations studied rarely includes solutions that support knowledge transfer - such as mentoring, formal project debriefings or systematic use of data in decision-making processes. From the perspective of the competency challenge for cultural sector staff, this indicates that the issue does not simply stem from a lack of individual skills, but from the insufficient embedding of knowledge management within organisational practice.

5.4. New Requirements for Staff in the Context of Accessibility and Inclusivity

The findings highlight the growing importance of competencies related to the implementation of accessibility (including that which has been legally regulated in Poland) and the accompanying principle of inclusivity (Dz.U. 2019 poz. 1696). Respondents emphasised that cultural organisations are increasingly required to address the diverse needs of different audience groups, which expands the scope of employee responsibilities—often without adequate preparation:

We attended one training session on accessibility, but it was more of an introduction. In practice, we learn by doing. (R9, programme team)

Many interviewees expressed a sense of uncertainty and a need for support when working with groups requiring heightened communicative sensitivity. As one participant noted:

We want to be open, but sometimes we are afraid of saying the wrong thing. We lack a space to discuss these issues and learn. (R6, animator)

Front-of-house staff play a particularly significant role in delivering inclusive practices. They are the ones who directly confront the diversity of audience needs, respond to difficult situations and mediate between the institution and its visitors. Yet they, too, observed that their preparation for this role is often limited:

We are the first point of contact. If someone has a problem, they come to us. But we don't always have clear guidelines on how to respond in different situations. (R11, audience services)

It is also important to note that tasks related to meeting accessibility requirements are often added to existing responsibilities, increasing staff multitasking without modifying job descriptions or providing additional resources. As one respondent summarised:

Accessibility is another *element we have to take into account, but the project still has to be delivered in the same time frame and with the same team.* (R2, project coordination)

Accessibility functions as an external requirement stemming from legal regulations, and therefore generates changes in management processes and in the preparation of staff for these tasks.

5.5. Change Management

The implementation of activities oriented towards audience development is associated with processes of organisational change. One of the most frequently recurring themes in the interviews was the ambiguity surrounding where responsibility for managing audience relationships is located. This ambiguity affects practice, as it is not always clear who makes decisions and who coordinates activities. Even senior managers observed this issue:
We all say that the audience is the most important, but when it comes to concrete decisions, it is not always clear who is responsible for what. (R3, management)

Respondents - particularly those employed at lower organisational levels - noted that audience development activities often constitute an additional burden, where:
It functions a bit like a side project rather than something that permeates the whole organisation. (R7, programming department)

As a result, tensions emerge between the need to deliver programme tasks and measurable outcomes, and the need to focus on building relationships—an activity that requires time, reflection and flexibility:
We have to deliver the project, settle the grant, achieve the attendance. There isn't always space for building relationships. (R2, project coordination)

Change aimed at strengthening audience relationships also requires leadership competencies. Respondents frequently highlighted the significant role of managers who are able to combine a programme perspective with attention to the audience, and who support staff in adapting to new requirements:
If the management clearly shows that relationships are a priority, it is easier for us to change how we work. If not, we go back to old patterns. (R5, education)

According to respondents, some cultural organisations demonstrate a readiness to experiment, while others show resistance rooted in habit or fear of expanding responsibilities:
Some people say: we've always done it this way and it worked. Change requires extra effort. (R8, communication)

Effective change management requires a coherent alignment of institutional strategy with personnel policy - this includes clearly defined roles, support for competency development and the creation of spaces for internal dialogue. Where such elements were present, respondents more often reported greater consistency in activities and a stronger sense of purpose in undertaken initiatives. The tensions accompanying change are therefore not solely the result of individual resistance but stem from the need to transform the way the institution operates.

6. Conclusions and Discussion

The findings presented allow audience relationship management to be interpreted as a multi-level phenomenon whose effectiveness depends on the alignment of individual, team and organisational factors. In this perspective, audience relationships are the outcome of internal organisational processes - particularly HRM practices and the competencies of cultural sector staff. Accordingly, conclusions may now be formulated in relation to the research questions posed.

RQ1. What HRM practices are present in the cultural organisations studied in the context of audience relationship management?

In the empirical material analysed, responsibility for managing audience relationships is often not clearly assigned to specific positions, resulting in dispersed accountability. Tasks related to audience relationships tend to be added to existing duties, which may lead to excessive workload and a mismatch between required and actual competencies. Knowledge about audiences appears to rely primarily on individual knowledge (accumulated through daily interactions) and is not consistently transformed into organisational competence, as it is rarely documented or systematically analysed.

Respondents' statements also suggest that planned actions aimed at developing relevant staff competencies were infrequent. Learning most commonly occurred through practice, professional experience or individual initiative. This indicates limited utilisation of opportunities in the areas of knowledge management, knowledge transfer between individuals and the organisation, data-informed decision-making and organisational learning.

RQ2. What competencies are required of cultural sector staff in the process of building relationships with audiences?

Of key importance are competencies that support relationship building, whose significance extends beyond the standard competencies formally assigned to job positions, although these remain relevant. In the context of developing relationships with audiences, particular importance is attached to dialogic skills and the ability to adapt communication to different audience groups (especially in roles involving direct contact with audiences), as well as the capacity to observe audience behaviour, respond to expressed needs and interpret them—also in relation to the ability to use marketing tools effectively. The findings further indicate the growing importance of competencies related to working with people with diverse needs (not limited solely to persons with disabilities) and to recognising and accommodating audience diversity.

Individuals working in the cultural sector are also expected to demonstrate a capacity for continuous learning, multitasking and the ability to combine multiple professional roles. Although these competencies are generally not fully defined within formal competency models nor systematically supported by HRM practices, they arise from the specific characteristics of the cultural work environment.

RQ3. How do organisations identify and use knowledge about their audiences?

In the organisations studied, the identification and use of audience knowledge take place along two parallel pathways, with informal approaches predominating. On the one hand, within the work of individual departments in cultural organisations (e.g. programming, education, marketing), data are gathered through formalised activities such as audience research or the collection of various forms of quantitative and qualitative data. However, organisations rarely conduct regular audience studies or in-depth analyses of audience needs; systematic monitoring is uncommon and such activities are not embedded in a permanent management system.

On the other hand, knowledge about audiences often derives from the everyday experience of employees and their direct interactions with audiences. As a result, this knowledge is accumulated and processed intuitively, remains at the individual level and is not aggregated at the organisational level. Consequently, it is used primarily for operational purposes in day-to-day work and only rarely informs strategic decisions or organisational change.

RQ4. What organisational tensions accompany the implementation of audience development activities?

The implementation of audience development activities is accompanied by numerous organisational tensions arising from the misalignment between openness to collaboration with a key stakeholder and existing working conditions and organisational arrangements. These tensions can be identified, inter alia, as tensions between:

- project-based logic and relationship management, where discrepancies arise between the short-term logic of projects (deadlines, indicators, accountability requirements) and the long-term nature of building relationships with audiences;
- expectations and competencies, when growing demands placed on employees are not matched by adequate levels of competency preparation or training support. The lack of tools and procedures not only deepens employees' sense of uncertainty but also limits opportunities for organisational development;
- multitasking and lack of support, when tasks related to audience relationship management are added to existing responsibilities without a corresponding increase in resources and without formal anchoring within the organisational structure, leading to employee overload and a perceived lack of support;

- departmental scope of work and responsibility for relationships, when there are no clearly defined positions responsible for managing audience relationships and multiple departments or individuals undertake such tasks simultaneously. In the absence of mechanisms for cooperation and coordination, responsibility for outcomes becomes dispersed, weakening the effectiveness of audience-oriented activities.

RQ5. How does human resource management influence relationships with audiences?

Human resource management influences relationships with audiences indirectly, by shaping the conditions under which employees carry out their activities. This influence is expressed primarily through the design of professional roles, competency development, work organisation, and the creation of frameworks for collaboration and organisational learning.

In situations where the tensions identified above are present, an organisation's capacity to learn becomes constrained. For example, where there are no clearly defined principles governing work organisation and job roles, responsibility for audience relationships becomes dispersed and uncoordinated, while audience knowledge remains largely at the individual level and is not systematically incorporated into decision-making processes. Moreover, the expansion of employee responsibilities characteristic of cultural organisations—where competencies formally assigned to job positions do not fully reflect actual expectations—leads to staff overload and, ultimately, burnout.

Competencies that do not directly arise from formal job descriptions—such as communication skills—are of particular importance for managing audience relationships. Respondents repeatedly suggested the need for greater organisational support in this area. HRM co-shapes the work environment in which information exchange, interdepartmental collaboration and reflection on audience experience are either enabled or constrained. A culture that supports cooperation strengthens relational activities, while its absence results in fragmentation.

Audience relationships are thus the outcome of specific configurations of HRM practices. Where human resource management is aligned with organisational strategy and recognises the relational nature of organisational activity, relationships with audiences tend to be more coherent and sustainable. Where this alignment is lacking, relationships depend on individual employee initiatives and remain incidental.

A significant challenge for contemporary cultural organisations is, in many cases, the reinterpretation of their established modes of operation. The results of this study can be situated within stakeholder theory, which emphasises that organisations operate within networks of relationships with entities that influence organisational goals and are themselves affected by organisational actions (Freeman, 1984). Cultural organisations that declare audiences to be at the centre of their attention (Plebańczyk, 2021) position them as key external stakeholders—a perspective most clearly reflected in marketing practices.

The adoption of the audience development concept shifts this emphasis further, as it requires strategic change and becomes the outcome of internal organisational processes, including the recognition of employees as internal stakeholders. It is employees who implement strategic assumptions and translate them into operational practice; thus, supporting the development of their competencies becomes a necessary condition for achieving strategic objectives. This approach is consistent with more recent developments in stakeholder theory, which stress the integration of diverse stakeholder interests within a coherent management system (Eskerod, Huemann, Ringhofer, 2015; Kujala et al., 2022).

7. Research Limitations and Implications for Further Analysis

The study was qualitative and exploratory in nature, and the sample was purposively selected. This enabled an in-depth examination of the experiences of cultural sector staff; however, the findings should be interpreted as analytical rather than representative of the sector as a whole. Future research could benefit from expanding data sources, for example by incorporating the perspectives of audiences, institutional organisers, organisational observations or document analysis.

While the qualitative analysis confirmed relationships between employee roles, HRM practices, competencies and audience relationships, future studies could apply quantitative methods to test the strength of these relationships. Comparative research across different types of institutions (such as theatres, museums, cultural centres or non-governmental organisations), as well as cross-national studies, would further enable an examination of how varying cultural and institutional contexts shape HRM practices and audience relationship management.

References

1. Armstrong, M. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page.
2. Banks, M., Hesmondhalgh, D. (2009). Looking for work in creative industries policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy, 15*(4), 415-430. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902923323
3. Bollo, A., Da Milano, C., Gariboldi, A., Torch, C. (2017). *Study on audience development – How to place audiences at the centre of cultural organisations: Final report*. European

Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2017.1345739

4. Boxall, P., Purcell, J. (2016). *Strategy and human resource management*. Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Council of the European Union (2022). Resolution of the Council on the Work Plan for Culture 2023-2026 (2022/C 466/01). *Official Journal of the European Union*, C 466, 1-18. Retrieved from: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/60399/st15381-en22.pdf
6. Council of the European Union (2024). Council conclusions on improving and fostering access to culture (C/2024/7446). *Official Journal of the European Union*. Retrieved from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52024XG07446&qid=1769016909752
7. Donaldson, T., Preston, L.E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 65-91. https://doi.org/10.2307/258887
8. Eskerod, P., Huemann, M., Ringhofer, C. (2015). Stakeholder inclusiveness: Enriching project management with general stakeholder theory. *Project Management Journal, 46*(6), 42-53. https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.21546
9. Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
10. Hadley, S. (2017). European Commission final report: Study on audience development – How to place audiences at the centre of cultural organisations. *Cultural Trends, 26*(5), 1-4. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/557971
11. Hawkes, J. (2001). *The fourth pillar of sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Common Ground.
12. Heidelberg, B.M. (2025). *Human resources in the arts*. Routledge.
13. Juchnowicz, M. (2016). *Elastyczne zarządzanie kapitałem ludzkim z perspektywy interesariuszy*. PWE.
14. Kawashima, N. (2006). Audience development and social inclusion in Britain. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *12*(1), 55-2. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630600613309
15. Kocój, E., Laberschek, M., Kopeć, K., Plebańczyk, K. (Eds). (2022). *Metodologia badań w sektorze kultury i mediów*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
16. Konior, A., Pluszyńska, A. (2022). Kadry kultury – przegląd literatury. *Zarządzanie w kulturze*, *23*(3), 217-236. https://doi.org/10.4467/20843976ZK.22.014.16403
17. Król, H., Ludwiczyński, A. (Eds.) (2014). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi. Tworzenie kapitału ludzkiego organizacji*. Warszawa: PWN.
18. Kujala, J., Sachs, S., Leinonen, H., Heikkinen, A., Laude, D. (2022). Stakeholder engagement: Past, present, and future. *Business & Society, 61*(5), 1136-1196. https://doi.org/10.1177/00076503211066595
19. Mizera-Pęczek, P., Grzesiak, L. (2022). Wymagania kompetencyjne stawiane kadrom kultury. Analiza ogłoszeń o pracy. *Zarządzanie w kulturze*, 237-254. https://doi.org/10.4467/20843976ZK.22.015.16404

20. Plebańczyk K. (2022). Wybrane narzędzia i techniki wspierające *audience development* w organizacjach kultury. In: Kocój, E., Laberschek, M., Kopeć, K., Plebańczyk, K. (Eds.), *Metodologia badań w sektorze kultury i mediów* (pp. 11-31). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
21. Plebańczyk, K. (2021). Zrównoważony rozwój w organizacji kultury: kontekst audience development. In: M. Pawleta, A. Marciniak (Eds.), *Dziedzictwo kulturowe w kontekście wyzwań zrównoważonego rozwoju* (pp. 87-113). Kraków: Universitas.
22. Walmsley, B. (2016). From arts marketing to audience enrichment: How digital engagement can deepen and democratize artistic exchange with audiences. *Poetics*, *58*, 66-78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2016.07.001
23. Witczak, H. (2018). *Strategiczne zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi*. Warszawa: PWE.