Does the art end when the management begins?

The challenges of making 'art' for both artists and arts managers.

***Author*: Jo Caust**
University of South Australia

Abstract

The terms 'leadership' and 'management' can produce powerful and contradictory responses in the context of arts organisations. There are different expectations or understandings about the 'construct of leadership' and the 'construct of management' in the arts as elsewhere. It is argued that in arts organisations the 'leadership' is provided by the artistic director or artistic leader and the 'management' is provided by the administrator or general manager. But is this the case? Doesn't the artistic director 'manage' and the general manager also 'lead'? And what about everyone else in the organisation; the other artists, administrators and board members, do they contribute to the leadership and to the management of the organisation? In this paper it is argued that it is important for everyone involved in an arts organisation, to understand and take responsibility for its leadership and management, to ensure the organisation's continued survival and success.

Biography

Associate Professor Jo Caust is the Program Director of the Arts and Cultural Management Program in the School of Management at UniSA. She is also the Managing Editor of the Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management. She has extensive experience in the arts sector as a practitioner, manager and consultant. Associate Professor Caust is a Hawke Institute Researcher and is a member of the Research Group into Integrity and Governance.

> The basic goal of artists and art institutions is to remain true to themselves and to honour no art activity compromised by art objectives outside the purposes of art itself.
>
> (Dorn 2004: 146)

> Management is a creative process and creativity is a managed process. If managers and artists wish to pursue creativity they have much to learn from each other.
>
> (Bilton 2007:174)

Introduction

An interesting reality about working in the arts is that there is limited consensus about what is actually happening. Thornton (2009) notes that the way art world is viewed and understood is entirely dependent on where you are located *in* that world. So if you are an art dealer, then it may be the price you sell a work, or, if you are the manager of a venue, it might be the number of times the venue is used. For a funder it might be how effective you believe your dollar was used and if you are an audience member, how well you were entertained. Artists themselves have different views; while Salvador Dali approached his art-production from a position of how to sell it and for how much, other artists are less interested in the notion of selling and more interested in the act of 'creation' and finding the space to create.

```
      Art for Art's Sake                              Art is Business

      ≤-----------------------------------------------------------------------≥

         5    4    3    2    1        1    2    3    4    5
```

So depending on where you locate yourself on a spectrum of 'art for art's sake' at one end and 'art is business' at the other, your views on what you do and how you do it, will be different. Those who, like Dorn (2004), believe arts practice to be a sacred and separate activity that should never be compromised for baser or instrumental goals, might argue that the more 'management practices' are introduced into the arts environment, then the more likely it is that the 'art' part of the equation flies out of the window. Others who see the 'management function' in purely neutral terms (such as Bendixen 2000) may think that managing an arts organisation is the same as managing any activity - managing is managing - so there is no problem in either how the task of management is undertaken or what is being managed.

How does the management function in an arts organisation connect with its leadership? If as Bendixen suggests, there is no difference between managing an arts organisation and managing any other organisation, perhaps the question has no relevance. If an arts organisation is seen as different however, then there are questions about the role of management and its connection with the leadership of the organisation. Framed a little differently then, where does the 'leadership' of an arts organisation reside – in the management/ administration, in the artistic vision, or in another combination?

So to come to grips with this conundrum I would first like to address understandings of the two terms 'leadership' and 'management'.

Leadership

Certainly the practice of leadership can be interpreted very differently from individual to individual, within different cultures and from context to context (Grint 1997). Some writers (for example Hersey & Blanchard 1977; Hosking 1988) see leadership as a skill to be learned. Recent approaches to the question of leadership emphasise the importance of the values of the leader (Covey 1996; DePree 1989; Greenleaf 1991; Handy 1995). Some writers emphasise the significance of relationships and influence for effective leadership (Goleman 2000; Yukl 2002), while other writers emphasise the importance of vision (Bass & Avolio 1997). There are also gender and cultural

constructs on interpretations of leadership (Bass & Avolio 1997; Daft 1999; Heifitz & Laurie 1997; Rosener 1997; Sinclair 1998).

What is understood by the term 'leadership' in the west is very different say to understandings of 'leadership' in Asia. It is noted for instance that the leadership models prevalent in the west are based on a premise of 'individualism' whereas in Asia, leadership can have a 'collectivist' base (Swierczek 1991). In addition the 'distance' between the leader and the led can be much greater in Asia (Swierczek 1991) and this can apply in arts organisations (Scott 2004). The concept of 'leadership' as such is also seen as a 'masculinist' construct and women being seen as leaders then is not included in the discourse (Sinclair 1998) . Western writers about leadership describe it as having certain attributes. These include vision, values, direction, inspiration, action, empowerment, engagement, transformation and enlightenment (DePree 1989; Drucker 1996; Greenleaf 1991). In addition, it is wise to remember that a leader requires followers to be seen as a leader (Drucker 1996:xiv). So 'leadership' in the context of the arts and in arts organisations is likely to have different understandings, different practises and different outcomes between artforms, within artforms and between cultures.

Management

While leadership is described as an 'art', management is often described as a 'science' in the western context (Richardson 2008).   This is interesting of course in the context of the 'arts'. This might assume that the 'leadership' is provided by the 'artists' and the 'management' is provided by a separate class of functionaries: the managers/ administrators.   So what is understood by the term 'management'? While it describes the 'organisation' and 'control' of a task, it also describes the group who does it; the 'management' (OED 2010).   So management as a 'verb' represents particular tasks such as planning, budgeting, controlling, staffing and problem-solving. But 'management' as a 'noun' may represent the power and also the leadership of a traditional hierarchical organisation.

This raises a series of questions. If 'management' is a series of skills that can be learnt (by doing an MBA for instance), how is 'leadership' learnt if it is a quality that is innate? If you can 'manage' one kind of organisation can you manage any other? Are the skills of management generic even if the context and goals are different? When we talk about management are we talking about 'administration' or is there more to the tasks/ role?

Arts Organisations

An important consideration when considering leadership and management in an arts context, is that the arts sector is not homogenous. In the context of the constructs of leadership and management, there are a range of interpretations in both different artforms and in different arts organisations (Cray, Inglis & Freeman 2007). Given the way artforms are organised and communicate, it is possible that distinct interpretations of leadership behaviour may be required for different artforms, as different artforms have particular languages and ways of organising themselves. For instance, the performing arts such as theatre, dance and music tend to work in collaborative modes and in organisational structures that support this mode of working (for example, theatre companies, opera companies, dance companies or orchestras). The 'making' of art in these areas tends to happen in a group. Other artforms such as literature and the visual arts are more individually based. There are organisations that support the sale or production of the work of artists from these artforms, such as galleries and publishing houses, but the primary source of the creative process is normally the individual. Therefore, it is important to recognise that there is no homogeneity about art, its organisation or the production within it.

Within arts organisations there are different structures and cultures, depending on the artform. In the performing arts, for instance, the head of the organisation is sometimes the artistic director, and at other times, the managing director/general manager (Creese 1997). Alternatively there can be two people who 'share' the leadership and management positional roles (Gronn 2003; Reid & Karambayya 2009) both reporting directly to the board or even being members of the board, depending on the legal structure. This can mean that positional leadership is in fact a 'duality' – the administrator/manager and the artistic director are equally placed in the positional hierarchy and work as a leadership team, each reporting directly to the board of the organisation. This is particularly common in performing arts organisations. Creese talks about how this works in a theatre company (1997). Pick and Anderton note that some of the most successful arts organisations, again theatre companies, reflect the practice of a successful creative team of a director and an administrator (1996: 117). Macneill and Tonks also note how this relationship can be gender based with a man playing the role of the artistic director and the female playing the role of the general manager (2009). Gronn talks in the mainstream literature about the concept of distributed positional leadership and leadership couples (2003) He notes that:

> Couples are much more common in leadership and management than is normally acknowledged, and are to be found in a variety of diverse contexts…
> (Gronn 2003:43)

In the orchestra world the positional head of the organisation is usually the managing director, while the person/s providing the artistic leadership (e.g. the conductor or the orchestral leader) may be lower down in the hierarchy. In dance, the positional head is generally the artistic director, but sometimes the positions of the artistic director and general manager can be given equal status in their reporting relationship to the board. In festivals, the general manager is normally the head of the organisation, while the artistic director has the responsibility for the artistic policy and program, but not for the overall leadership of the festival. On the other hand if the festival has a founder/director model then the role of artistic director may be the head of the organisation. In the visual arts, the director of an art museum has traditionally been someone from a curatorial background, but recently some boards of larger institutions are favouring leaders/managers who have been exposed either to the corporate world or to a general arts management context (Palmer 1998). Thus, the positional leader of an organisation and the person providing the artistic leadership may differ from artform to artform, or even from organisation to organisation within an artform.

The role of boards and legal structures

In addition to the designated positional leader/s, depending on the legal structure, there are usually boards of management who influence the culture, structure and practice of the organisation and who carry legal responsibility for the management of the organisation (Byrnes 2009; Hagoort 2000; Pick & Anderton 1996; Radbourne & Fraser 1996). In fact, the chair of an incorporated board of management legally carries the final responsibility, which can mean that he or she may sometimes engage to such an extent in the workings of the organisation that he or she is, in fact, the operational leader of the organisation. This can, of course, cause tension and lead to direct conflict with the director or chief executive officer. The chair usually delegates the power of day-to-day leadership to the positional head of the organisation; however, occasionally the chair takes on a more active role. It is therefore important in this discussion to explore the role of the chair and the board in the structures of different arts organisations to enable an understanding of how such leadership works in practice. While a board may have ultimate legal and financial responsibility for an organisation, they may have little knowledge or understanding of the creative process or of the artform of that organisation. So in seeking to explore the important connection between the board and the organisation we need to consider how does it offer leadership and how can it contribute to the success and mission of the organisation?

Sometimes board members are elected from membership of the association that is behind the arts organisation, sometimes they are appointed by government (particularly if it is statutory authority or has a direct legal connection to government), sometimes members are appointed or invited by existing members of the board, sometimes they are invited by the staff of the organisation and sometimes it is a mixture of all these possibilities. In the United States (and in Canada to a large extent) it is quite common for board members of arts organisations to contribute large sums of money to the organisation, to enable them to become board members (Ostrower 2004). The mantra is 'give, get or get off'. While they remain board members, their ongoing financial commitment to the organisation must be guaranteed. Ostrower notes that boards of arts organisations in the United States,

> …do not exist in a vacuum. Rather, the way that they function reflects a wider system that has developed out of the emphasis on *private* support and governance of arts institutions in the United States.

> (2004: xiii, emphasis in original)

While the practice of expecting a personal financial contribution from board members in exchange for membership is not common everywhere, board members may be expected to contribute to fundraising for the organisation in whatever way they are able. In countries such as Australia where there is a larger amount of government intervention in the governance of arts organisations, board membership is also likely to reflect the views of the government of the day for instance, because generally the larger arts organisations have some board members appointed by either federal or state governments. For many years the Australia Council (Australia's national arts funding body) has pressured arts organisations to adopt a corporate board structure with a particular kind of membership to include an accountant, a lawyer, representatives from the business sector, those with marketing experience and perhaps representatives from government (Caust 2010). It would appear though that this model may now be under threat. Macdonnell observes for instance that,

> The pendulum has swung so far in the direction of appointing people to arts boards whose primary skill is to be business people … This move had restricted the ability of arts boards to make informed judgments. (Macdonnell cited in Morgan 2008)

Members of Boards of arts organisations, while understanding corporate governance, may not understand arts governance (Caust 2005; Hagoort 2000;McDaniel & Thorn 1990) . Hagoort argues that the governance of cultural organisations needs special attention and that a board of trustees of a cultural organisation needs to recognise its distinct mission and its difference from conventional corporate governance. He says,

> It is not sufficient that the Board of Trustees of cultural foundations consider the budget and annual report; they are now expected to develop a pro-active attitude to guarantee that the cultural organization has a cultural function for the future. (2000: 210)

Hagoort argues that the area of cultural governance is a critical one for arts organisations particularly in a changing global environment where arts organisations are competing not just nationally but internationally (2000: 209-11). There are also founder model boards where the arts organisation founder sits on the board and the founder individual still plays a dominant role in the activities of the company. This may be seen as another example of autocratic leadership model as noted earlier, where one individual has most of the power and influence. Another structural model, characteristic of many arts companies in India for instance, is that they are founded by a family member and remain a family run company over several generations.

While they may appear on the one hand to be contemporary in their structure, in fact they are run on hierarchical lines and those employees who are not members of the founding family, do not have an equal place at the table. On the other hand the contribution made by these families to the cultural life of the community may be very significant.

There are also artists run organisations where the board is comprised of people who are actively part of the organisation (or were part of the organisation) and continue to sit on the board and take an active interest in the leadership and vision of the organisation. Sometimes this structure may be there to purely to support the vision of an individual artistic leader (as in a dance company) and at other times it may be related more to a philosophical view about the nature of the work and the way it should be organised and focussed (e.g. political art collectives or cooperatives). There are also membership based organisations where the board is composed of members of the organisations who have a vested interest in the work of the company. The management structure in this model has to be highly responsive to the needs of the members without being captured by a minority group within it.

Thus when addressing the functioning of an arts organisation, questions need to be formulated in such a way as to clearly identify who is the formal head of the organisation, who provides the artistic leadership, what is the governance model and how does the organisational and legal structure impact upon its culture ? If the leadership model and structure are also not in line with the mission, then there is likely to be conflict.

Where does the leadership reside?

The separation of powers and responsibilities between artistic directors, managers and boards can be confusing for the boards, the audience, the funders and the individuals themselves. This then raises questions about where the leadership resides as well as whether this is effective. If the artistic director is also the organisational or positional head, then there can be concerns about his or her understanding of financial responsibility and accountability. On the other hand, the appointment of general managers without an arts background or involvement can lead to concerns about their understanding of artistic matters and the creative process. It has been observed for instance that,

> …for many artists and arts managers, the context in which they work
> does matter, and the separation of managing from working is not
> sustainable, either in terms of principle or organisational effectiveness.
> (Beirne & Knight 2002: 76)

This suggests that while some may view the process of leadership and management of an arts organisation as no different to that of other organizations (Bendixen 2000), others may see it as something quite distinct (Dorn 2004; Evrard & Colbert 2000). There may also be no disconnection between the two functions of leadership and management in the second context. Pick and Anderton (1996) emphasise that an effective arts administrator needs to have a deep knowledge and understanding of the artform they are involved with. They also talk about the *duality* of the role of the arts administrator, referring to the competing forces inherent in the position – serving the artist and serving the audience (Pick & Anderton 1996: 17).

They see that a fundamental responsibility of the position is the establishment of a communication line between the artist and the audience, ensuring that the artist receives as much appropriate exposure as possible. In addition, they regard the commitment of the leader to 'art' and to serving the 'needs' of the organisation (as opposed to serving their own needs), as critical. This differs and contrasts with the

concept of the charismatic, narcissistic leader who is serving their own needs more than the needs of the organisation (Conger 1990).

When writing about the 'not-for-profit' sector in the US, Drucker (1990: 17), for instance, notes that a characteristic of this environment is the existence of a number of 'bottom lines', not just one. He also draws attention to the multiplicity of constituencies. Drucker notes that a leader in this context must have a high degree of commitment to their organisation, putting the interests of the organisation before any self-interest (1990: 17). It could be concluded then that the leadership and management role in an arts organisation carries with it a greater amount of complexity than one in the conventional corporate world. This is related to the multiple constituencies and the multiple bottom lines as well as the products/outcomes being produced. As Byrnes notes,

> In an arts organization keeping the creative spirit alive is a full-time job for a manager (2009: 234).

Byrnes believes that nurturing the creativity of an arts organisation is possibly the primary role of the arts manager. He describes the arts manager's role as one that demands 'creative' leadership. Byrnes also observes that there is a move away from the older founder–director model of leadership in the arts, as more complex skills are now required from arts managers. He notes there may be a trend towards a 'committee -style' management of arts organisations. He then says:

> If this is the case, a leader with great skill as a transformational leader and negotiator will be required. (Byrnes 2009:236)

This would suggest a leadership model where leadership is shared and where the positional leader has the capacity to involve everyone in 'owning the process' and provide leadership when it is required. This means that the person who is the in the role of the arts manager needs superior communication skills and the capacity to engage and work with people successfully.

Lapierre argues though that the 'leadership' of an arts organisation always resides with the artists and that this involves a continual struggle.

> More than any other type of leader, the artistic leader is engaged in a perpetual struggle against the normal and legitimate tendency of management to apply a logic of organization, bureaucratization and rationalization.   (2001: 6–8)

So Lapierre sees a struggle between the vision and needs of the artist and the 'normalising' impact of management. In his view there is an implication that artists see the function of management as an enemy which they must resist and fight against. This response may relate more to 'managerialism' or in Kotter's terms (1988), 'managerial values' being given precedence over 'leadership values', rather than the function of management per se. Alternatively the artistic leader represents a 'transformational' approach and the manager represents a 'transactional' approach so one is focussed on process, relationship development and achieving change and the other is task orientated, outcome driven and focussed on achieving short term goals. This might then be reflected in a tension between cultures and roles, as noted by McDaniel and Thorn (1990).

In Pick and Anderton's (1996) description there is suggestion of a leader/manager who is ideally a 'facilitator'. The purpose of the leader in this model is not to take the limelight but to enable the flowering of talent and thereby the 'art' of those undertaking what is perceived as the real work – the making of the art.

While acknowledging the importance of allowing 'creativity' to flow, there is no mention of the leader/manager also being creative. But there is a recognition that an 'enabling' or 'facilitator' style of leadership helps to provide the right environment for 'creativity'. Lapierre also argues that the role of the arts manager is one of 'service or support' for the artists/artistic director/artistic direction.

> Leadership is the responsibility of the artists, regardless of their hierarchical position or role within the organization (performer, creative head, director); management on the other hand, is in the service of and subordinate to this ultimate artistic goal.   (2001:6-8)

The potential difficulty with this position, is that the manager is given a lower 'status' in the transaction and this may be problematic if the manager occupies the positional leadership role within the organisation. The manager may also want to be a creative entity as well, not purely a functionary. Nevertheless Lapierre emphasises, as do Pick and Anderton, that the core purpose of an arts organisation is the practice of art (compared with say the realisation of financial profit). Thus the person in the role of the manager or positional leader in this framing, needs to be clear about the central goal of the organisation and recognise that the manager's primary objective is to serve the artists or the artistic practice, despite any pressures or difficulties this may produce in the relationship.

But is it a mis-reading to say that the manager does not have a leadership role, particularly if they hold the *positional* leadership role in the organisation? While the artist may be providing the vision, the manager has to interpret this vision and sell it to the world at large. Fitzgibbon (2001) argues though that leadership in the arts is often not 'shared' or 'collaborative':

> Not only is leadership dominant and tending at times towards the autocratic, but also in each instance, structures are skewed, albeit to varying degrees, to ensure the centralisation of power.   (2001: 169)

Fitzgibbon suggests that, in fact, arts leadership functions in a way contrary to contemporary leadership literature, in that, in many instances, a large amount of power is vested in one individual, and this individual's creativity or artistic practice dominates an organisation. Fitzgibbon argues that the kind of leadership she has observed in the arts, and which is in her view required for artistic innovation, is very different from that described in some of the literature about leadership and innovation (2001: 171). In other words, she is arguing that, contrary to that literature (Amabile 1998; DeSalvo 1999; Senge 1999; Tierney et al. 1999), a dominant or autocratic leadership style does not prevent creativity (certainly not the creativity of that one individual). This model may be particularly relevant to performing arts companies where reliance is placed on one dominant artistic individual who may be the artistic director, the choreographer or the conductor. This person may behave in a dominating way, but, nevertheless, produce very good art or creative outcomes for the organisation. This is interesting in the context of literature about the right environment for creativity where dominant leadership is seen as a negative to achieve creative outcomes (DeSalvo 1999; Goleman 1998; Senge 1999).

Perhaps the difference in the arts context is that 'artists' need 'artistic freedom' to create, but this can be interpreted as 'freedom' for one dominant individual, not necessarily for the group members as a whole. This also connects with literature which discusses charismatic/transformational leadership models (Conger 1990; Conger & Kanungo 1994). The leader in this context has a powerful personality and is able to be most persuasive in terms of getting what he or she wants. The 'guru' artistic director may therefore fit this mould but is this becoming an outdated approach to arts leadership (as Byrnes suggests)? If the individual 'guru' artist as the only creative/ artistic personality in an arts organisation, is an old-fashioned concept, is it time to

consider successful approaches to leadership and management in arts organisations in a contemporary context?

Contemporary Arts Organisations

Recent approaches to leadership in 'knowledge based' organisations describe models of leadership where the roles of 'leader' and 'follower' are interchangeable (Lloyd & Stewart 2002; Weymes 2003). There are designated positional leaders, but, at times, 'leadership' of a particular project may be provided by another member of the team with more specialised expertise. Therefore leadership may be seen as more of a *dynamic process* rather than the simple recognition of a designated position. Leadership is *distributed* through an organisation and taken by people when they are the 'experts' or the 'knowledge bearers' at a particular moment in time (Heenan & Bennis 1999; Gronn 2000; Zhang & Faerman 2007).

Thus the reality for many arts organisations may be that the leadership is 'shared' and shared throughout the organisation. That is, the responsibility for particular areas of leadership is divided between the board, the artistic leader, the administrator, the other artists and the administrative staff when the need demands.   However, the concept of 'distributed' leadership can be interpreted both positively and negatively. Byrnes talks about 'distributed' or 'multiple' leadership as a reality in the context of contemporary arts organisations (2009: 234-6). However, Byrnes notes, citing Bennis (1989), that distributed leadership may impact negatively on the effectiveness of individual leadership and result in more bureaucracy (Byrnes 2009: 234). Byrnes also notes that, given the increasing emphasis on earned income in contemporary arts organisations, and therefore their reliance on community and audience support:

> ...there is a point [at] which controversial leadership becomes a detriment to the organization.   (2009: 236)

In this statement Byrnes is suggesting that the model of a charismatic artistic or guru leader is problematic when the arts organisation depends on financial support from a broader base than government. He argues that an organisation in this situation can become 'risk-averse' and choose a model of leadership that will not necessarily attract negative attention and primarily focus on the bottom line – possibly a corporate style of leadership and organisational structure.

There is also possible tension or conflict if the positional leadership and artistic leadership roles in the organisational hierarchy, are different individuals (Gronn 2003; Reid & Karambayya 2009). McDaniel and Thorn note the development of two or even three distinct cultures within an arts organisation in this case. These are an artistic culture, a management culture and a board/corporate culture (McDaniel & Thorn 1990). There is a dichotomy then between who is providing the artistic leadership and who is in control of the organisation. They pose an important question when they ask what is the organisation's mission? Is it supporting the work of artists or the work of an institution? (McDaniel & Thorn 1990: 28). Jeffri when referring to the growth of arts organisations and museums comments:

> … In a sense we have ghettoized the living artists into a limbo-like position where he or she is of an institution without being in it.
> (Jeffri 1991: 108–9)

In this context, therefore, the artist is seen only as playing an 'instrumental' role and is given no power or influence within the organisation. In fact it could be interpreted that the artist is an outsider and has no direct connection to the management or leadership of the arts organisation. If the arts are seen as separate from society and no longer integral to it, the artist is also seen as an outsider within the arts organisation, with no legitimacy or place at the table. George Thorn argues though that:

> Most artists are good managers….Every day in the creative process artists solve complex problems through collective and collaborative efforts.
>
> (1990:40-1)

This begs the question of whether the structure and philosophy of many arts entities actually diminishes the artist/s and treats them as if they are to be controlled or marginalised, rather than allowing them to be seen as the driving force of vision and leadership within the organization as Lapierre suggests.   While Thorn argues that artists make good managers and problem solvers, the way artists are depicted is often quite the opposite.   They can be framed as 'naughty children' who need to be disciplined and/or require careful handling if they are going to serve the needs of the organisation as a whole.   George Thorn notes though that artists share some responsibility for this. He says,

> As the artists turn their backs on organisational responsibility, artistic and management functions begin to separate. This implies that management is value neutral and that artistic life and organisational life are not of the same impulse – are not interdependent and connected. (1990: 41)

So he is suggesting that in a sense artists are responsible for the power and growth of the arts administrators because they are less interested in the management detail and more interested in making art.   Yet the management of arts organisations and its artistic leadership or vision needs to be interdependent and strongly connected. If the management is separate and reflects a different culture or understanding, then this is potentially destructive for the organisation as a whole.   On the other hand it is noted artists can be framed as 'businesses' themselves, given the nature of their work and their need to survive economically, so they have an urgent need in this context to understand and practice the skills of management (Burns & Pichilingi 2000).

Beirne & Knight comment however that there are many artists and arts managers who see the workplace as entirely interconnected and so the separation between management and arts making, is not an issue (2002: 76). Hagoort in fact argues for an organisational model in a new contemporary age where leadership, responsibility and therefore cultural innovation is shared *across* the arts/cultural organisation, as compared with the conventional hierarchical model where it is all concentrated on one or two individuals. This resonates with Byrnes's earlier comment about distributed leadership and contemporary arts organisations (2009: 236).

The contemporary arts organisation then is often described as an 'ecosystem' where everything affects everything else. In this context every player is interdependent and relies on and needs the cooperation of the others to succeed and thrive. This supports again the concept of 'distributed' leadership within the arts organisation. While artists can feel disconnected from the organisation, so can the managers. If the dominant leader is the artistic director, then the manager may feel that they are there only to serve this person's vision, with little capacity for creativity or autonomy themselves. So while empowering the artists to take more responsibility for leadership and management within the organisation, it is also important to empower the manager to be 'a creative' rather than only being a 'supportive' functionary. The contemporary arts organisation needs to be a place which functions as a collaborative inter-connected team rather than a hierarchy. This might be a place where artists do not avoid management responsibility because they think it is boring and where arts mangers have arts knowledge and understanding of creative environments. This organisation would demand mutual co-operation amongst all its players and the acknowledgement of shared responsibility for the future of the organisation while respecting each other's specialist skills. In this way it may be possible for artists and arts managers alike, to be both true to their mission as well as mutually supportive in their roles, while also ensuring the generation of exciting and innovative arts practice.

Conclusion

A successful arts organisation needs leadership and management at all levels. To see these functions as related to position alone is problematic in a complex world where traditional models of leadership and management are no longer viable. So in understanding more about the concepts of leadership and management, it may be possible to improve the understanding and practices with arts organisations. Everyone is a leader and everyone is a manager. Artists have to be responsible for their management and leadership as much as everyone else. If artists withdraw from the responsibility of understanding the management and the leadership of their organisation, then they may find they are in difficulty about the direction and even survival of the organisation. And at the same time managers and leaders need to be 'creative' and 'engaged' as much as artists, in the content of the organisation's mission, so that arts organisations survive, succeed, innovate and adapt successfully. Board members need also to be committed to the vision and needs of their specific organisation and recognise that art organisations are involved in something different than making money. They need to understand the organisation's unique mission and work to support it, rather than try and change it. In this way all those involved in the leadership and management of arts organisations can work successfully together to make interesting and dynamic art.

References

Amabile, T 2001, 'How to kill creativity' in Jane Henry ed. *Creative Management*, London, Sage.

—— 1999, 'Changes in the work environment for creativity during downsizing;' *Academy of Management Journal*, December 2003.

—— 1998, 'How to kill creativity', *Harvard Business Review*, 76(5):76–87.

Bass, Bernard & Avolio, Bruce 1997, 'Shatter the glass ceiling: women may make better managers', in K Grint ed. *Leadership*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bass, Bernard & Stogdill, Ralph 1990, *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership, theory, research and managerial applications*, New York, Free Press.

Beckhard, R 1996,'Our future leaders', in F Hesselbein, M Goldsmith and R Beckhard eds, *The leader of the future*, New York, The Drucker Foundation.

Beirne, Martin & Knight, Stephanie, 2002, 'Principles and Consistent Management in the Arts:Lessons from British Theatre', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* Vol 8, No 1 May 2002.

Bendixen, P 2000, 'Skills and roles: concepts of modern arts management', in *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 2, No. 3, Spring 2000.

Bennis, W 1989, *Why Leaders Can't Lead* San Francisco Jossey Bass

—— (1984) "Four traits of leadership", in JN Williamson ed. *The leader-manager*, New York, John Wiley and Sons.

Bilton, Chris & Leary, Ruth 2002, 'What can Managers do for Creativity? Brokering Creativity in the Creative Industries', *The International Journal of Cultural Policy* Vol 8, No 1 May 2002.

Burns Susanne & Pichilingi Dave 2000, 'Training artists as managers within a higher education context: A case study', *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society;* Summer 2000; 30, 2 P.113-122.

Byrnes, W, J 2009, *Management and the arts*, Woburn, MA, Focal Press.

Caust, J 2010, 'Arts and business: The impact of business models on the activities of major performing arts organisations in Australia', *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture and Policy* Issue 135 May 2010 University of Queensland.
—— 2005 'Does it matter who is in charge? The influence of the business paradigm on arts leadership and management.' *The Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management*, *3,* 1, pp 153-165

Chong, D 2003, *Arts management*, London, Routledge.
—— 2000, 'Why critical writers on the arts and management matter' in *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, United Kingdom.

Conger, J, A 1990, 'The dark side of leadership', *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(2).

Conger, JA & Kanungo, RN (1994) "Charismatic leadership in organizations: perceived behavioral attributes and their measurement", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15:439–45.

Cray, D, Inglis, L & Freeman, S. (2007) "Managing the Arts: Leadership and Decision Making under Dual Rationalities", *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society,* vol.36, no 4, pp. 295-312.

Daft, RL (1999) *Leadership theory and practice*, Forth Worth, Texas, Dryden Press.

Dale, M (1993) *Developing management skills: techniques for improving learning and performance*, London, Kogan Page.

DePree, Max (1996) *Leadership jazz*, New York, Dell.
—— (1989) *Leadership is an art*, Melbourne, Australian Business Library.
——Desalvo, T (1999) "Unleash the creativity in your organization", *HR Magazine*, 44 (6):154.

DiMaggio, P 1987, *Managers of the arts*, Washington DC, Seven Locks Press.

Dorn, C 2004, 'The Deterritorialization of Art', in the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* Washington, Vol 34, No 2, Summer 2004

Drucker, P 1998, *Tasks. Responsibilities. Practices*, Oxford, UK, Management Heinemann.
—— 1996, foreword in *The leader of the future: the Drucker Foundation*, F Hesselbein, M Goldsmith and R Beckhard eds, New York, The Drucker Foundation.
—— 1990, *Managing the non-profit organization*, New York, Harper Collins.

Evrard, Y & Colbert, F 2000, 'Arts management: a new discipline entering the millennium?', *International Journal of Arts Management*, 2(2) Winter.

Fitzgibbon, M 2001, *Managing innovation in the arts*, London, Quorum Books.

—— 2001 'Managing innovation in the arts: preserving environmental uncertainty—the case of the Druid Theatre Company, Ireland', *International Journal of Arts Management*, 3(3).

Goleman, D, 2000 'Leadership that gets results, *HBR Boston*, 78(2):78–90.

—— 1998 'What makes a leader?', *Harvard Business Review*, (November– December), pp.93–102.

—— 1998 *Vital lies: simple truths*, London, Bloomsbury.

Goleman, D 2000, 'Leadership that gets results', *HBR Boston*, 78(2):78–90.

—— 1998, 'What makes a leader?' *Harvard Business Review*, (November– December), pp.93–102.

—— 1998, *Vital lies: simple truths*, London, Bloomsbury.

Grint, K, 2000, *The art of leadership*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

—— ed. 1997 *Leadership*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gronn, P 2003, 'Substituting for leadership: the neglected role of the leadership couple'' *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1).

—— 2000 'Distributed Properties: A new Architecture of Leadership' *Educational Management & Administration* vol, 28 Issue, 3

Hagoort, G 2000, *Art management*, The Netherlands, Eburon.

Heifitz, R 1996, *Leadership without easy answers*, Boston, MA, Harvard University Press.

Heifitz, R & Laurie D,L 1997, 'The work of leadership', *Harvard Business Review on Leadership*, Harvard Business School, Jan–Feb, pp.124–34.

Heenan, D. A. & Bennis W 1999, *Co-leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships* New York: Wiley & Sons.

Hosking, D 1988, 'Organising, leadership and skilful process', in K Grint ed. *Leadership*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

House, R, J 1971, 'A path goal theory of leader effectiveness', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, No. 16, pp.321–39.

Jeffri, J 1991, 'The artist in an integrated society', in Stephen Benedict, ed. *Public money and the muse*, New York, W W Norton & Co.

Kotter, J, 1988, *Leadership factor*, New York, Free Press.

—— 1982, *The general managers*, New York, Free Press.

Lapierre, L 2001, 'Leadership and arts management', *International Journal of Arts Management*, 3(3), Spring.

Lloyd, B, Stewart T, A, 2002, 'Leadership and knowledge management' *Leadership & Organization Development Journal ,* vol. 23, Issue 5/6

MacNeill K, Tonks A, 2009, 'Co-leadership and gender in the performing arts' *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management* vol. 6, Issue 1.

McDaniel, N, Thorn, G 1997, *Arts planning, a dynamic balance*, New York, Arts Action Research.

—— 1993,*Towards a new arts order*, New York, Arts Action Research.

—— 1990, *Rethinking and restructuring the arts organisation*, New York, FEDAPT.

Morgan, J 2008, 1206851005398-smh.com.auhttp://www.smh.com.au/news/arts/businesslike-arts-a-failure-says-entrepreneur/2008/04/02/1206851005398.htmlsmh.com.auSydney Morning Herald2008-04-03Business-like arts a failure, says entrepreneurJoyce MorganEntertainmentArtshttp://www.smh.com.au/ffximage/2008/04/02/justinmacdonnell_narrowweb__300x390,0.jpgJustin Macdonnell … "The pendulum has swung so far."300390Michele Mossophttp://www.smh.com.au/ffximage/2008/04/02/th_justinmacdonnell_index-lgthumb__90x60.jpgJustin Macdonnell … "The pendulum has swung so far."9060Michele Mossophttp://www.smh.com.au/ffximage/2008/04/02/justinmacdonnell_syndicated__330x430.jpgJustin Macdonnell … "The pendulum has swung so far."300390Michele Mossophttp://www.smh.com.au/ffximage/2008/04/02/th_justinmacdonnell_mobile__240x160.jpgJustin Macdonnell … "The pendulum has swung so far."9060Michele Mossop'Business-like arts a failure says entrepreneur', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 April 2008, viewed <http://www.smh.com.au/news/arts/businesslike-arts-a-failure-says-entrepreneur/2008/04/02/1206851005398.html>.

Palmer, I 1998, 'Arts managers and managerialism: A cross-sector analysis of CEOs' orientations and skills', *Public Productivity and Management Review,* vol. 21, issue 4, pp. 433–52.

Pick, J, Anderton, M 1999, *Building Jerusalem: art, industry and the British millennium*, The Netherlands, Harwood.

—— 1996 *Arts administration*, London, E & F N Spon.

Protherough, R, Pick, J, 2002, *Managing Britannia: culture and management in modern Britain*, Harleston, Edgeways.

Reid, W, Karambayya, R 2009, 'Impact of dual executive leadership dynamics in creative organizations", *Human Relations*, vol. 62, no. 7, pp 1073-1110.

Richardson, K 2008, 'Managing Complex Organizations: Complexity Thinking and the Science and Art of Management', *Emergence: Complexity and Organization* Issue Vol. 10 No. 2 2008 pp. 13-26

Scott, J 2004, 'Accommodating for 'Difference': Developing a Context for Arts Practice in Shanghai" *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management* vol 2, no 1

Sinclair, A 1998, *Doing leadership differently*, Melbourne, Melbourne University Press.

Stevens, L,K 1996, 'The earnings shift, the new bottom line paradigm for the arts industry in the market-driven era', *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 26(2), Summer',

Stogdill R, M 1950, 'Leadership, membership and organization', in K Grint ed. *Leadership*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Swierczek, F, W 1991, Leadership and Culture: Comparing Asian Managers' *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, vol. 12 no. 7, 1991, pp. 3-10.

Thorn, G 1990, 'Cultural Darwinism: survival of the smartest', in Nello McDaniel and George Thorn *Rethinking and restructuring the arts organisation*, New York, FEDAPT.

Thornton S, 2009, *Seven Days in the Art World* Granta, London.

Tierney, P, Farmer, S,M, Graen, G,B 1999, 'An examination of leadership and employee creativity: the relevance of traits and relationships', *Personnel Psychology*, Durham, Autumn.

Weymes, E 2003, 'Relationships not leadership sustain successful organizations' *Journal of Change Management*, May 2003, vol. 3, issue 4.

Zhang J, Faerman, S, R 2007, 'Distributed leadership in the development of a knowledge sharing system" *European Journal of Information Systems* vol. 16, Issue, 4.