The Price of Compliance: Managerial Cognitive Load in Process-Oriented EU R&D Funding

Péter Stern

Hungarian Innovation Agency, Hungary

Abstract

This study examines how process-oriented EU R&D funding can impose persistent burdens on corporate management. Its starting point is a specific organizational phenomenon: the condition in which a company's actual technological trajectory and its documented project path — constructed to satisfy funder expectations — gradually diverge. Drawing on principal-agent theory, cognitive dissonance, and organizational accounts of normalized deviance, the paper argues that compliance-intensive funding environments generate not only administrative but psychological consequences for managers (Jensen & Meckling, 1976; Arrow, 1985; Festinger, 1957; Vaughan, 1996). Information asymmetry, documentation pressure, and internal accountability ambiguity together can produce decision fragmentation and role strain. The manuscript is theoretical in character — grounded not in direct psychological measurement but in the reinterpretation of prior organizational and comparative analyses (Stern, 2014; Stern, 2015). Its central claim is this: the price of compliance is not merely a question of innovation policy or administration. It restructures the conditions under which managerial cognition operates.

Keywords: Managerial cognitive load, EU R&D funding, process-oriented monitoring, organizational duality, principal-agent theory, normalized deviance, compliance cost.

1. Introduction

Assessments of EU R&D grants typically converge on three questions: do they increase innovation activity, do they improve technological performance, and how can the lawful use of public funds be ensured? These are legitimate concerns. Yet one dimension is routinely absent: what internal conditions does the funding system create within the organizations that receive it — particularly within the decision-making environment of management?

Prior analyses indicated that non-repayable, administratively intensive EU R&D funding does not merely supply resources; it also induces specific patterns of organizational adaptation (Stern, 2014; Stern, 2015). The question, therefore, exceeds the compliance-versus-efficiency dilemma. It raises a further issue: what psychological and decision-organizational consequences does a compliance-intensive environment generate?

2. Theoretical Foundations

Principal-agent theory offers a natural entry point for interpreting the organizational consequences of R&D grants. In Jensen and Meckling's canonical formulation, the agency problem arises when the interests of principal and agent diverge, while the principal cannot fully observe the agent's efforts (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Arrow and Holmström add that information asymmetry is not merely a technical inconvenience — it is a structural condition that shapes the form and distortions of incentive systems (Arrow, 1985; Holmström, 1979). Ross's early account of the agency relationship, considered from the principal's perspective, confirms that the difficulty of oversight is not an exception but a structural feature of such relationships (Ross, 1973).

In R&D funding, this problem becomes acute. Project outcomes are partly uncertain, results are often non-linear, and genuine scientific or technological value resists reduction to pre-fixed indicators. In such an environment, the funder cannot rely directly on outcomes and so turns, predictably, to documented process elements as the primary object of control. This does not dissolve the information asymmetry — it displaces it: the recipient organization holds superior knowledge not only of the technological process itself but of how that process is represented in documentation.

EU R&D funding thus generates a paradox. Precisely because the funder cannot meaningfully assess innovation output in the short term, it turns to detailed administrative oversight. Yet heightened documentation requirements can construct an incentive structure in which formally verifiable compliance gains value over the accurate, transparent mapping of the development process. The agency problem does not disappear — it migrates to a new level: the gap between technological uncertainty and administrative certainty becomes the primary terrain of organizational adaptation.

This carries serious decision-level stakes. Management must make decisions in an environment where actual project progress and its formally defensible representation do not always coincide. The funding logic thereby transforms from a contractual into a cognitive problem — the object of

decision is no longer a single process but a system of overlapping, partially divergent process narratives.

Earlier analysis described this condition as organizational duality: the organization sustains in parallel both the actual development process and the formally documented project path constructed to satisfy funder expectations (Stern, 2014). The divergence may initially be minor — a more flexible formulation of a milestone, a failed phase reframed as methodological preparation — yet it can deepen over time and become an autonomous organizational coordination challenge.

Organizational duality is conceptually close to DiMaggio and Powell's coercive isomorphism: organizations, constrained by resource dependency, tend to adopt forms that satisfy external expectations even when those forms do not necessarily serve internal efficiency (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In R&D projects, administrative compliance is not a simple oversight framework — it is an institutionalized expectation that shapes internal communication, role allocation, and the manner in which problems are handled.

For management, however, organizational duality is more than a structural distortion. It constitutes a decision situation — one in which two partially distinct rationalities must be kept alive simultaneously: the technological, where course corrections are the natural substance of development, and the administrative-financial, where value derives from predictability and formal continuity. Organizational duality thus imposes on the manager a persistent pressure to translate and reconcile.

When the internal technological reality and the external accounting reality persistently fail to align, the work of decision-making grows heavier. Organizational duality thus functions as one structural precondition of managerial cognitive load. Classical stress models hold that in such situations the burden arises not from the volume of tasks but from the actor's inability to subsume competing demands under a single organizing principle (Selye, 1956; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

The practical form through which organizational duality is sustained is creative administration. This need not involve overt rule-breaking — it is interpretive, reframing, and documentary work that manages the gap between formal compliance and actual process. A milestone is reworded; a failed phase is presented as methodological groundwork; a divergent technological path is retrofitted into the project's narrative. The literature addresses this pattern alongside various forms of normalized deviance and organizational workaround (Merton, 1968; Vaughan, 1996).

What makes this significant is that the object of decision, in such cases, is not solely what happened in the project — it is also which administrative form renders what happened manageable. The more energy the maintenance of an administrative narrative demands, the more managerial attention fragments across genuine technological problems, internal coordination, and external compliance. Creative administration is therefore not a marginal phenomenon; it is a concrete mechanism of cognitive load.

Cognitive dissonance theory provides an interpretive frame here. In Festinger's classical formulation, dissonance arises when an individual's beliefs or actions persistently contradict one

another, generating psychological tension (Festinger, 1957). The tension is typically managed through the reinterpretation or rationalization of one element.

In the organizational context of R&D projects, this dynamic can manifest not only at the level of individual roles but at the managerial level itself. A manager may simultaneously be committed to technological accuracy, organizational survival, financial security, and formal regularity — commitments that concrete situations do not always permit to coexist. Dissonance therefore does not appear as a spectacular moral conflict but as a persistent decision-level tension, demanding continual reframing of the meaning of choices.

This is what makes role strain consequential. Management is simultaneously accountable for the project's strategic direction, financial-administrative regularity, professional coordination, and external accountability. Where these roles persistently follow divergent logics, decision-making is oriented not toward optimizing a single objective but toward balancing competing rationalities. In this paper's argument, this constitutes one of the most significant sources of managerial cognitive load.

Vaughan's concept of normalized deviance captures the temporal dynamic. The repetition of minor deviations can be absorbed into organizational routines — initially exceptional solutions can become norms when the organization deploys them successfully in the short term and the environment does not sanction them immediately (Vaughan, 1996). In funded R&D projects, this is particularly salient: as long as disbursement continues and the organization faces no direct negative consequence, small divergences between documentation and technological reality appear manageable. Over time, however, precisely this repetition makes compromise organizationally habitual.

A further implication follows: cognitive load does not crystallize at a single moment. It is cumulative — the small pressures of translation and reconciliation become, over time, a persistent background noise in decision-making.

The theoretical elements assembled here form a coherent explanatory base. Principal-agent theory explains why technological uncertainty and information asymmetry make indirect, process-oriented control probable (Arrow, 1985; Holmström, 1979; Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Organizational duality and creative administration describe how this can transform the internal workings of organizations (Stern, 2014). Cognitive dissonance and normalized deviance account for how the situation can remain sustainably operative without open conflict (Festinger, 1957; Vaughan, 1996). Together, these mechanisms are liable to generate persistent cognitive load at the managerial level, restructuring the internal conditions of decision-making.

3. Institutional Context and the Decision Environment

Management decisions do not arise in a vacuum. Their structure is shaped not only by intra-organizational competencies and roles but by the broader institutional environment, which

determines what activities are rewarded, what outcomes are legitimate, and what form renders a process accountable. In R&D funding, the funding system therefore operates not merely as a resource-allocation mechanism — it functions as a decision architecture, designating the organizationally relevant foci of attention and the available courses of action.

In process-oriented EU systems, this architecture takes a distinctive form. The project is rendered legible not primarily through actual outcomes but through milestones, scheduling, cost lines, and documented progress. The logic is intelligible: public funds must be auditable. But given the inherent uncertainty of R&D projects, this generates acute tension between the development process and its administrative representation. The funding regime does not remain a background frame — it becomes a daily decision reality.

The concept of decision architecture illuminates something essential: managerial load does not arise simply from the volume of tasks but from the institutional environment systematically making certain decisions harder or riskier. What matters is not only how successful the project is, but under what conditions management must continuously decide about it.

One key finding of the second working paper was that a fundamental distinction among member-state models can be grasped through the type of oversight employed (Stern, 2015). Where the funder controls predominantly the conformity of the pre-specified project path and the regularity of documentation, process-oriented logic prevails. Outcome-oriented models, by contrast, place greater weight on ex post evaluation, practical utilization, and the recipient's own risk assumption.

This distinction reaches well beyond technical policy questions. In a process-oriented environment, the decision time horizon shortens, formally demonstrable steps gain value, and technological flexibility diminishes. When an iterative development project is required to perform linear progress, management is repeatedly placed in situations where administrative manageability, not optimal professional logic, becomes the primary criterion.

This matters cognitively: managerial attention is constantly divided. Management must simultaneously track the project's actual technological state and maintain its externally acceptable representation. Process-oriented control does not merely generate administrative overhead — it produces a sequence of decision situations in which management must mediate between professional and compliance rationalities.

The second critical institutional dimension is the degree of dependency on structural funds. Where R&D systems rely heavily on non-repayable EU funding, the elevation of documentation compliance is more probable (Stern, 2015): securing the funding stream becomes an organizational priority in itself, while the recipient's own risk exposure remains comparatively limited. This does not mean that non-repayable funding necessarily leads to distortion — but it makes it probable that project evaluation shifts toward a funding-preservation logic, particularly where oversight is detailed and formalized.

For management, this creates a dual pressure: avoid the loss of funding while preserving professional credibility. Where the means to these ends diverge, the structure of decisions can

become persistently unstable. The stronger the organization's dependency on a given grant, the greater the weight of compliance and administrative defensibility — and this can steer organizational decision culture toward formally stable, short-term defensible solutions.

Comparing the two working papers, different member-state models display different probabilities of reproducing the same organizational tension. In the Finnish case, outcome-oriented evaluation, risk-sharing mechanisms, and the institutional acceptability of negative results signaled an environment in which the pressure toward divergence between documentary and technological reality is likely lower (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993; Stern, 2015). The German case showed broadly comparable features, where a mixed financing structure and stronger own-risk assumption played the more significant role.

In the Central and Eastern European cases, process-oriented control and high structural fund dependency appeared more prominently. In Hungary, organizational duality manifested chiefly through identity shift and the erosion of professional norms; in the Czech case, the productivity scissors suggested that institutional adaptation may carry efficiency costs; in Poland, the asymmetry between administrative capacity and the volume of funds drawn stood out. These differences indicate that the probability and form of cognitive load is itself institutionally contingent. The burden on management differs where failure can be treated as a legitimate project outcome from where success depends primarily on the deliverability of a pre-specified plan.

Based on these patterns, four recurring lines of tension can be identified in the managerial decision environment. The first is the conflict between technological uncertainty and administrative predictability: development-process deviations arising from the nature of R&D resist accommodation within a linear project logic. The second is the tension between professional credibility and funding security — not mutually exclusive, but in certain situations pointing in divergent decision directions. The third concerns the relationship between internal coordination and external accountability: management must present a coherent picture not only to the funder but also internally, managing the divergent interests of technical, financial, and administrative actors. The fourth tension is temporal: what is defensible within a given accounting cycle may, over a longer horizon, generate resource diversion or strategic drift.

The simultaneous presence of these four tensions produces the condition in which management does not operate within a single decision logic — it continuously shifts between interpretive frames. This is the source of the cognitive load this paper addresses.

4. A Conceptual Model of Managerial Cognitive Load

This paper does not use the concept of cognitive load in a clinical sense — it does not describe diagnostic mental states. The term denotes an organizational condition in which management must persistently make decisions across multiple, partially competing informational, accountability, and evaluative logics: the structural burdening of managerial attention, interpretation, and decision organization.

It follows that cognitive load is not equivalent to workload. A manager may operate under heavy workload while maintaining a relatively integrated decision environment, provided that goals, evaluative criteria, and action consequences cohere. In funded R&D projects, management frequently does not operate in such an integrated environment. The source of load is not intensity but the fact that the object of decision appears simultaneously in multiple, only partially compatible realities.

Managerial cognitive load can therefore be defined as the persistent operating condition of management in which the simultaneous presence of technological uncertainty, compliance pressure, internal coordination demands, and external risk management prevents decisions from being organized around a single coherent rationality. The concept's value lies in enabling a business psychology reinterpretation of the organizational mechanisms described above, without claiming more about psychological consequences than is warranted absent direct empirical investigation.

4.1 Preconditions of the Model

The first level comprises the institutional and organizational conditions that make cognitive load more probable. The first is the dominance of process-oriented control: where project evaluation is anchored primarily to milestones, documented deliverables, and fixed cost structures, documentary coherence becomes a premium value. The second is structural fund dependency: under high levels of non-repayable funding, the project appears simultaneously as an innovation venture and as a key element of the organization's resource security — raising the stakes of administrative sustainability. The third condition is the inherent uncertainty of the technological process: the more the development is characterized by iteration and unforeseen deviation, the more probable it is that the actual development path and the formally required project path diverge. The fourth is internal organizational heterogeneity: the actors involved in the project operate with different vocabularies, different definitions of success, and different risk perceptions (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993).

Together, these four factors construct an environment in which the manager is forced into a persistent role of translation and mediation — the direct organizational antechamber of cognitive load.

4.2 Mechanisms of Load

The second level of the model comprises the mechanisms that convert institutional conditions into actual load.

The first is the management of parallel realities: management must simultaneously track the project's technological state and maintain its administrative representation. While the two broadly coincide, the situation is manageable; when divergence emerges, the manager is compelled to sustain two distinct project interpretations in parallel.

The second mechanism is the pressure of decision translation. Technological problems must be continuously rendered in financial, administrative, and funder language, while external expectations must be back-translated into instructions intelligible to the professional team. This interpretive work demands constant selection, prioritization, and reframing — far exceeding mere communication.

The third mechanism is accountability ambiguity. Where the measure of project success is partly technological, partly administrative, and partly reputational, the manager frequently cannot determine in advance which decision will prove correct under which evaluative system. This enhances the appeal of formally defensible decisions and progressively tilts the entire decision culture in that direction.

The fourth mechanism is informal risk redistribution. Sustaining organizational duality requires a tacit arrangement between management and professional staff (Stern, 2014): where the administrative survival of the project becomes a shared interest, a portion of decisions migrates progressively into informal channels. Managing formal and informal decision channels simultaneously is not only a political but a cognitive challenge.

4.3 Structural Components of Load

The model identifies at least three components of cognitive load. The first is attentional fragmentation: if management must continuously shift between professional, administrative, financial, and strategic perspectives — without a clearly primary logic — attention splinters. The second is interpretive overload: the manager does not merely weigh information but must continuously assess what the same development means under different oversight logics. A technological deviation may be professionally justified, administratively problematic, financially risky, and yet strategically defensible — when such situations recur, the decision process itself becomes overloaded. The third is role strain: management must simultaneously function as integrator, control actor, interest mediator, and external legitimation agent. Where no single role can become fully primary, the managerial position is organized not as stable role enactment but as perpetual role-switching.

4.4 Organizational Outcomes

Load carries consequences. The first outcome is the preference for short-term defensible decisions: in an overloaded decision space, the probability increases that the organization selects formally justifiable solutions, even where these are less conducive to innovation over the longer term. The second is the valorization of informal decision channels: where formal expectations are difficult to reconcile with actual operations, critical issues are increasingly handled through tacit negotiations and partially documented compromises. Alongside this, organizational silence can intensify: where open problem-framing increases the project's risk, management develops an interest in handling certain tensions informally.

The fourth outcome is a shift in the balance between professional and administrative roles. Earlier analysis described this as identity shift on the engineering side (Stern, 2014); at the managerial level, the same dynamic appears in a reordering of decision priorities: sustainable compliance, rather than the project's professional substance, becomes the primary coordinating principle.

4.5 The Model's Logic

Process-oriented control, structural fund dependency, technological uncertainty, and organizational heterogeneity can together construct an environment in which management must persistently mediate among multiple, partially incompatible rationalities. This mediation — through the management of parallel realities, decision translation, accountability ambiguity, and informal risk redistribution — converts into cognitive load, increasing the probability of attentional fragmentation, interpretive overload, and role strain. At the organizational level, these dynamics can reinforce patterns of operation that are short-term optimized, formally defensible, and informally coordinated.

The model is not deterministic. It does not assert that every compliance-intensive R&D project necessarily produces these consequences, nor that cognitive load invariably takes the same form. The conceptual connection that the two working papers render plausible serves as a starting point for subsequent qualitative and comparative inquiry. Once the model is established, the question is no longer whether such mechanisms can exist — it is which institutional configurations make them more or less probable.

5. Comparative Implications

The conceptual model of managerial cognitive load is not a self-contained theoretical construction: its significance lies in connecting the structure of the funding system to the levels of organizational adaptation and managerial functioning. Where funding is process-oriented, structural fund dependency is high, and the oversight logic is built on administrative compliance, the decision environment is also liable to become more fragmented (Stern, 2015). A system that evaluates project quality primarily through administrative traceability signals to managers that compliance is an autonomous strategic objective. In such an environment, management does not merely allocate resources — it continuously mediates between professional development logic and accounting logic.

The Finnish and partly the German case suggest that in more outcome-oriented, risk-sharing systems, cognitive load takes a different structure. Where funding and evaluation place greater weight on results and market utilization, and accept failure to some degree as a natural part of the development process, the managerial decision space can remain more integrated. This does not mean the manager's work is less complex — but it makes it probable that attentional fragmentation is less tied to maintaining documentary coherence (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993). In such systems, management can concentrate primarily on managing professional uncertainty rather than sustaining

the project simultaneously under two distinct logics. The role of risk-sharing is critical here: where the organization has its own stake in the development's success, there is less incentive to translate problems purely into administrative language.

The Hungarian, Czech, and Polish cases suggest, by contrast, that process-oriented control and high structural fund dependency are liable to generate stronger managerial load. In Hungary, organizational duality manifested most prominently through identity shift and the erosion of professional norms; from a business psychology perspective, this signals that managerial load is legible not only in the number of decisions but in the continuous reordering of their meaning (Stern, 2014). This is not simply stress — it is a condition in which the manager is progressively less certain on what grounds to decide correctly.

In the Czech case, the productivity scissors indicated a persistent divergence between inputs and outputs. For management, this is a particular burden: a development narrative must be maintained whose professional and institutional interpretations do not necessarily align — a duality that, over time, can surface at the level of self-assessment. In Poland, the asymmetry between administrative capacity and the volume of funds drawn was the distinguishing feature — here, cognitive load is more plausibly characterized not as identity tension but as coordinative overload: the problem is not what the "real" project is, but that there is simply insufficient capacity to satisfy every requirement simultaneously.

The earlier comparative analysis underscored one important nuance: the Central and Eastern European cases do not produce identical organizational distortions. A common denominator nevertheless exists: the funding system constructs a decision environment in which management must simultaneously manage multiple, partially incompatible organizational realities. Whether this manifests as identity shift, efficiency loss, or coordinative overload is determined by the specific institutional configuration.

From a business psychology perspective, the most significant conclusion is this: cognitive load is not an isolated, personal phenomenon. It should not be treated as merely the stress experience of individual managers or a matter of personal coping — but as an operating problem embedded within organizational and institutional architecture. Where the funding system rewards documentary compliance, managerial attention is readily drawn in that direction, which over time can erode strategic prioritization, openness to innovation, and internal coherence. The allocation of managerial attention is therefore not merely a response to market performance — it is partly a consequence of the attentional field the funding system designates. Cognitive load is thus not only a companion symptom of performance decline; it is one of its causes, driving the organization toward short-term defensible but longer-term less innovative trajectories.

The model has acknowledged limits. Since this paper draws neither on primary interviews nor psychometric measurement, claims about cognitive load remain conceptual and indirect. The model does not assert that every manager experiences the situation identically, or that every organization develops the same pattern; it shows, rather, in which direction the structure of the funding environment can tilt decision-level load. A further limitation is that the 2014–2015 comparative

material does not permit clean separation of structural-fund-financed R&D from purely market-funded R&D — the claims are therefore to be read not as statistical proof but as plausible institutional explanations. Even so, the comparative material provides sufficient grounds for the model to warrant further investigation through qualitative or comparative methods.

6. Conclusions and Future Research Directions

The study's central claim is that process-oriented, compliance-intensive EU R&D funding can generate not only organizational distortions but persistent cognitive load at the managerial level. Building from the two earlier working papers, this paper has shown that organizational duality, creative administration, and identity shift are not exclusively administrative or innovation-policy problems — they also restructure the conditions governing managerial attention and decision organization (Stern, 2014; Stern, 2015).

The paper's contribution lies in recasting this organizational-regulatory problem within a business psychology framework. The concept of managerial cognitive load enables the effects of the funding system to be examined not only through the lens of outputs, regularity, or innovation performance, but with attention to the psychological structure of decision work. This becomes especially salient where management must persistently mediate among multiple, partially incompatible rationalities: where a project is simultaneously a technological venture, an administrative accounting unit, a key element of organizational resource security, and a reputational risk.

What this paper does not claim warrants emphasis. It does not assert that compliance-intensive R&D funding is necessarily burdensome for every manager, nor that cognitive load invariably takes the same form. The argument operates at the conceptual level: it aims to establish the probability that certain institutional configurations make such consequences more likely than others. This probabilistic claim is itself of value — if it holds, it is not without consequence for innovation policy: the design of funding systems should consider not only administrative efficiency and the protection of public funds, but the internal operating conditions the systems create within recipient organizations.

Three directions for future research follow. The first is qualitative investigation: longitudinal case studies that document how decision priorities and role perceptions shift across a project's lifecycle. Such data could test whether organizational duality genuinely restructures managerial cognitive functioning or should instead be interpreted as rationalized adaptation. The second direction is comparative systems research: deeper qualitative comparison of Finnish, German, and Central and Eastern European cases could identify which concrete institutional elements moderate the emergence of cognitive load — and which may be amenable to mitigation. The third direction is measurement framework development: if the conceptual model holds, it would be valuable to identify indicators capable of approximating the extent of decision fragmentation and role strain within organizations — without requiring clinical psychometric instruments.

The broader argument of this paper is that the funding system is not merely an instrument of resource allocation — it is also a shaper of the organizational decision environment. Neglecting this renders innovation policy evaluation necessarily incomplete. The price of compliance is not measured only by the extent of administrative burden, but by the internal conditions under which the manager — on whom the development project ultimately depends — makes decisions.

References:

Arrow, K. J. (1985). The economics of agency. In J. W. Pratt & R. J. Zeckhauser (Eds.), Principals and agents: The structure of business (pp. 37–51). Harvard Business School Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160.

Festinger, L. (1957). A theory of cognitive dissonance. Stanford University Press.

Holmström, B. (1979). Moral hazard and observability. The Bell Journal of Economics, 10(1), 74–91.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer.

Lundvall, B.-Å. (Ed.). (1992). National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and interactive learning. Pinter.

Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure (Enlarged ed.). Free Press.

Nelson, R. R. (Ed.). (1993). National innovation systems: A comparative analysis. Oxford University Press.

Ross, S. A. (1973). The economic theory of agency: The principal's problem. American Economic Review, 63(2), 134–139.

Selye, H. (1956). The stress of life. McGraw-Hill.

Stern, P. (2014). A finanszírozás csapdája: Szervezeti kettősség, mérnöki identitás és kényszer devianciák a magyar KKV-szektor uniós K+F-finanszírozásban [The trap of funding: Organizational duality, engineering identity, and forced deviances in EU R&D funding of the Hungarian SME sector]. Magyar Innovációs Ügynökség Nonprofit Zrt.

Stern, P. (2015). Az uniós K+F-finanszírozás modelljei 2014 körül: Összehasonlító intézményi elemzés öt tagállam példáján [Models of EU R&D funding around 2014: A comparative institutional analysis based on the examples of five member states]. Magyar Innovációs Ügynökség Nonprofit Zrt.

Vaughan, D. (1996). The Challenger launch decision: Risky technology, culture, and deviance at NASA. University of Chicago Press.